



Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

Northamptonshire

Neighbourhood Development Plan



Outcome of Aspirational Development Sites Submission

NDP-S005 – Eildred – Goldcrest, St Georges Row

1 Introduction

Following consultation with residents on 23rd January 2014 (Meeting: [NDP-C003](#)¹) and subsequent [question/answer](#)² exchanges, you submitted a revised proposition [NDP-S005](#)³ to be considered by residents in the poll held from 6th-20th March 2014.

Your proposition was included in the booklet distributed to all households ([NDP-PROPS](#)⁴). Each registered elector on the latest electoral roll (Dated: 21st February 2014) received personalised, security coded, voting papers (Example: [NDP-VOTE](#)⁵).

Turnout in the poll was **82%** of households and **80%** of voters. There were no spoilt ballot papers. Over 2,300 detailed comments were made by residents. These included comments on the individual propositions and details of their wishes for the future of the Village. The complete results of the poll have been published ([NDP-RESULTS](#)⁶).

The Working Party has analysed the results, and has discussed them in depth to assess which of the proposals should go forward as “preferred options” into the development plan. The full recommendation made to the Parish Council has been published ([NDP-0180](#)⁷). This recommendation was discussed and approved at the Parish Council meeting on 14th April 2014 and forms the basis of the decision made regarding the suitability of your proposition to go forward as a preferred option.

2 Basis of the analysis

As part of the poll, we asked the Village what level of development they might be prepared to accept in each settlement. The results have been analysed using the methodology published in ([NDP-RESULTS/Q6](#)⁸)

Table 1 - Q6 – Additional properties residents might accept in each settlement

	2014 Baseline	New properties by 2026	New Properties by 2035	Maximum Potential Growth
Caldecott	21 ⁹	1-5	1-5	48%
Chelston Rise	50	6-10	0	20%
Chelveston	149 ¹⁰	6-10	6-10	18%
Parish Total	220	13-25	8-20	20%

This gives a clear view that the Parish is prepared to expand at a sustainable rate of around 1% per annum over the next 20 years. For the last 20 years we have had a “restricted in-fill” status and have grown by 26 properties, approximately 18% growth, all by in-fill between existing properties. These sites are now all full, and to allow for any growth we need to accept developments on new sites in each settlement.

In the Call for Aspirational Sites ([NDP-0078](#)¹¹), we made it clear that the Parish Council was under no obligation to adopt a particular submission as a preferred site. We also made it clear that **for proposed sites to be included in the plan, they must enjoy wide support from residents** and be **supported by policy**. The results of the poll have been used to assess the level of support received.

Neighbourhood Development Plan – Outcome of Aspirational Site Submission

The Working Party has published the criteria used for the analysis ([NDP-0177](#)¹²). These criteria show how the results of the popular vote have been assessed, and the emerging policy considerations that have been formulated after analysing comments

3 Poll results for your proposition

Table 2 – Results for NDP-S005 – for detail see [NDP-S005/votes](#)¹³

Vote	Votes Cast	% of voters
Support	131 (97 with no comments)	37.4%
Conditional Support	42 (1 with no comments)	12.0%
Reject	159 (103 with no comments)	45.4%
No Opinion	18 (18 with no comments)	5.1%
Total	350	100%

Your proposition received **37% full support** from the whole Parish, which was a clear **minority** of all voters. **12%** of voters gave the proposition *conditional* support. Even if the concerns of these conditional voters were addressed, you would still not be able to secure a clear majority from the whole electorate.

Your proposition received **9% full support** from *St Georges Row* and *Sawyers Crescent* voters. The proposition was rejected by **73%** of voters from *St Georges Row* and *Sawyers Crescent*. This represents a clear **majority** rejection from the nearest neighbours.

On the basis of the vote, the Parish Council has decided that there is insufficient popular support for this proposition.

4 Policy considerations

- (a) The proposition is clearly back land development, requiring the demolition of a modern property to achieve access to the rear. Comments from residents in the poll made it clear that back land development is not popular. This provides support to the Parish Council's historical position that back land development should not be supported. We have applied this position consistently in all planning applications that have come for our comment. Your garden was excluded from the Village confines when they were last drawn ([NDP-0041](#)¹⁴) in 2004 because it was considered unsuitable for development at that time.

There are no examples of new back land development in Chelveston. *The Byre* and *Granary Barn* involved the re-use of existing farm buildings. *5 Pokas Cottages* brought a derelict building back into use. A recent planning application to develop a house on the site of garages in the back garden at *Redwood* was refused by East Northamptonshire Council.

A change to the Council's policy position would have required clear support from residents for your proposition, and for opening up Ray Knight's field to create a new Close of which your land could have been part. The poll showed clearly that none of the back land development propositions enjoyed majority support, and that Ray's field should not become a Close.

As such your proposition would fail to meet one of the emerging policy considerations outlined in [NDP-0177](#)¹² (4d). This emerging policy is strongly supported by the Department for Transport *Manual for Streets* ([NDP-0162](#)¹⁵). This manual recommends that all new dwellings should have frontages which are visible and directly accessible from the highway, to promote community integration.

- (b) Both the Core Spatial Strategy (CSS - [NDP-0037](#)¹⁶) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF - [NDP-0141](#)¹⁷) give precedence to the reuse of existing buildings and

Neighbourhood Development Plan – Outcome of Aspirational Site Submission

development on previously developed land. (Hence *The Byre* and *Granary Barn*) Residential gardens are specifically excluded from the definition of previously developed land by the NPPF.

The CSS considers Chelveston to be rural in character and not a service centre. As such development should occur primarily on previously developed land. Policy 1 of the CSS is clear:

Development adjoining village boundaries will only be justified where it involves the re-use of buildings or, in exceptional circumstances, if it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required in order to meet local needs for employment, housing or services. Development will be focussed on those villages that perform a sustainable local service centre role.

To overturn this, there would have needed to be a strong demand from residents for smaller houses to replace yours and, crucially, nowhere else to build them.

5 Decision of the Parish Council

Your site has failed to meet a number of policy criteria and has not secured widespread support from residents. There was evidence in the poll of a need for the smaller houses offered by your proposition but the Parish Council's view is that this demand can be satisfied elsewhere in Chelveston on more suitable sites.

On the basis that: (a) the site NDP-S005 received insufficient popular support, (b) the development would be back land development and (c) the proposition would exceed the numbers of new properties that would be accepted in Chelveston during the period of the plan, this proposition is rejected for adoption.

6 Preferred options in Chelveston

Table 1 shows an appetite for 6-10 houses to be developed in Chelveston in both of the 10-year periods of the plan. Two other locations in Chelveston already have planning permission. There are also another 5 properties which are not currently habitable but which are in the process of being brought back into use. These must all be factored into the growth figures.

Two propositions in Chelveston secured clear majority support. [NDP-S013](#)¹⁸ (JST – Higham Road, 8-9 dwellings) secured **72% full support** and **11% conditional support**. [NDP-S007](#)¹⁹ (Knight – Water Lane, 1 dwelling) secured **62% full support** and **3% conditional support**.

Given this majority support, the Parish Council has approved those propositions as *preferred options* and has allocated them to be released for development in the first period of the plan (2015-2025). With the other dwellings already approved and those being redeveloped, this will fulfil the requirements for Chelveston outlined in Table 1. No other new dwellings will therefore be permitted between 2015-2025.

In the second period of the plan (2026-2035), the Parish Council has adopted two other propositions as *preferred options*. [NDP-S002](#)²⁰ and [NDP-S006](#)²¹ were both able to secure majority support if they addressed concerns raised by residents. These sites will deliver an additional 10 dwellings and fulfil the aspirations outlined in Table 1 for the period 2026-2035.

7 Next steps

The preferred options will be presented to residents at the Annual Parish Assembly on 22nd April 2014, and be sent to all households as a newsletter shortly afterwards. The Working Party will then develop a draft Neighbourhood Plan for consultation with residents over the summer. The plan will be sent for inspection by an independent examiner in October 2014 and then the revised plan will be proposed for adoption to residents in a formal referendum in May 2015. If a majority of voters support the plan, then it will be formally adopted by East Northamptonshire Council as the Local Plan for this Parish. All planning applications will need to demonstrate conformance with the plan before permission can be granted.

Neighbourhood Development Plan – Outcome of Aspirational Site Submission

Issued on behalf of the Parish Council

18th April 2014

Mark H Hunter
Clerk to the Parish Council

NOTES

1 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-C003>

2 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/view/NDP-S005>

3 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S005>

4 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-PROPS>

5 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-VOTE>

6 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-RESULTS>

7 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0180>

8 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-RESULTS/Q6>

9 3 additional properties are currently under construction and another 1 has outline permission. 2 properties are currently empty pending redevelopment.

10 5 properties that have been long term vacant and are in the process of being made habitable for re-occupation. 2 other properties have outline permission. These are included in the growth totals.

11 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0078>

12 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0177>

13 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S005/votes>

14 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0041>

15 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0162>

16 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0037>

17 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0141>

18 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S013>

19 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S007>

20 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S002>

21 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S006>