

NDP-S005 Eildred **3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row**

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	131 (97 with no comments)
Conditional Support	42 (1 with no comments)
Reject	159 (103 with no comments)
No Opinion	18 (18 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S005[Extracted from NDP-RESULTS/v2.0](#)

Post Code	NDP-S005 Votes	NDP-S005 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I would like the idea of the smaller developments as long as the neighbours are overlooked
AB, AS, AY	Support	Only option B
AB, AS, AY	Support	Support for option A
AD, AE	Support	In keeping with village character. Infill. Would deliver advantage of creating a safer Sawyers Crescent. Option B offers best mix.
AD, AE	Support	Infill and in keeping with village character. Prefer option B as more space between dwellings. Offers opportunity to improve corner of sawyers crescent/st.Georges row.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I prefer A or B. Option C looks a bit cramped and there needs to be space for cars.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I prefer Option A. Speed bumps or rigorous speed enforcement could cut the number of 'rat run' vehicles using Water Lane.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I think it would improve the look of the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Improvement on current development and provides opportunity for further expansion without distracting from the 'feel' of the village.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Option C
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I support this proposal because replacing old inefficient housing with more efficient housing sized to modern needs is the right thing to do. I favour option B, but do not object to any.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	In support of option b
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	New efficient houses for inefficient old ones makes sense and looks to be a reasonable size.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Option A.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Small development ok

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Small scale infill.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Within the village and not really in view
AQ, AW	Support	A sensible re-use of land for a different housing type.
AQ, AW	Support	As the dwelling already exists, this would not be too imposing and will not intrude on green space
AQ, AW	Support	I support this infill
AQ, AW	Support	In keeping with size and location in the village, in-fill of unused land.
AQ, AW	Support	Out of the way.
AQ, AW	Support	This would be in keeping with infill and sympathetic development. Therefore would not be intrusive.
AR, AT	Support	It is hidden.
AR, AT	Support	No reason to object. Infill site within village boundaries.
AR, AT	Support	There are no reasons for objection. This site is infill and within the village boundaries.
AU	Support	Do not know the location well enough to vote on this
AU	Support	I am a believer in not standing in people's way without having a genuine reason for doing so. However, people living closer may have different views. This is my reason for supporting all other proposals henceforth
AU	Support	I would support option B as these properties seem well spaced and more in keeping with the area and there is more area to park additional cars so not causing more of a nuisance to the village
AU	Support	In fil proposal.
AU	Support	It is removing an eye sore and replacing them with new
AU	Support	nice small number of properties, spread out so not on top of existing residents
AU	Support	Only if they are in keeping with the old houses
AU	Support	Use of in fill.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	2 houses
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the access could be sorted out I see no problem with Option B, provided there was adequate parking provided on site as St Georges Row is already a problem parking area.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the road was made wider somehow as was discussed at the meeting
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the widening of Sawyers Crescent happens
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	It is unlikely that Planners would find four dwellings acceptable on this site. The build form is currently linear and placing dwellings behind each other as shown in the proposed plans, would break that line and tose at the far end would extend beyond the settlement boundary
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	too many buildings to replace just one - 2 should be maximum

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Did not spoil the views across the fields from Sawyers Crescent. The properties are in keeping with other houses surrounding. Allowances made for traffic if Sawyers Crescent made a one way street and widened
AD, AE	Conditional Support	It is not my view that Sawyers Cres needs widening. Traffic moves slowly through the village. That's how it should stay.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Providing this did not impact on an already congested area - ie each house had parking which is proposed is acceptable
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	A maximum of 3 properties only.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Fewer properties.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would support option C as a mews development if some of the land on the corner was given over to widening Sawyer's Crescent.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If only option B was proposed they were all smaller in keeping with surrounding (Sawyers Crescent) type properties
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If Sawyers was widened and an additional close added running by the side of John's house to accommodate the new dwellings I feel this would be an acceptable expansion.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Issues with traffic movement on a single lane road. Road improvements to allow better parking for existing residents in St Georges Row.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Providing they are suitable and affordable for young families
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Remove "Goldcrest" altogether and do not replace it with another development. Just build the 3 properties to the rear shown in option A. All to have double garages, off road parking and retain turning area. Goldcrest site could then be used as off road parking for St George's Row and Sawyers Crescent residents.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I support option A and maybe option B, but not C.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I support option A or B but not C
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If option C will improve Sawyers Crescent
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Prefer to see
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is revised to 2 or 3
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is revised to 2 or 3

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Three houses only as option B.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	2 houses maximum, development restricted to level with second house from right under option A (middle house option B), not further back behind existing properties on Water Lane
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Generally I accept to proposal to build houses in this area. The roadway is inadequate for present traffic so a significant improvement is required
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I would support this if the new houses came to the level of the farm building adjacent & more so if it was for only 2 buildings
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If option B or A
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Improvement of Sawyers Crescent, the road cannot take the existing traffic let alone traffic from more houses.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Only support option B - but reservations on access especially if other housing approved on Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	subject to road widening
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	This road is very narrow and is already used as a "rat run". I feel that if the road could be widened, particularly on the bend where this development is proposed could support the proposal.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I feel Option B would be less crowded
AR, AT	Conditional Support	if only 3 dwellings
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Optional A with 2-storey affordable housing as well as the proposed dormer;Or option B with similar consideration
AU	Conditional Support	2 dwellings not 4
AU	Conditional Support	I would support 2 dwellings not 4 and only if they were in keeping with the rest of the village
AU	Conditional Support	If new builds kept to similar styles as existing & no access issues
AU	Conditional Support	only 3 dwellings as this will not box in existing dwellings and keep the integrity of the village
AU	Conditional Support	Only if the new buildings were in keeping with existing surrounding dwellings & no access issues were foreseen
AU	Conditional Support	So long as they keep with the rest of the houses & don't cause any unnecessary disruption for residents
AB, AS, AY	Reject	A ridiculous proposal in my view
AB, AS, AY	Reject	BACK FILL GARDEN GRABING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Does not make sense to demolish current home
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Existing house is not out of place. Too much traffic on an already blind spot for other drivers. Would also cause lots of disturbance to neighbours during development and look out of place within that side of the village.

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AB, AS, AY	Reject	GREEDY GARDEN GRABBING.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like backfill/garden development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not practical
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Only interested in making money not the village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	over development on a small site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Site too small
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Why demolish a perfectly good house to allow access to erect further dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would not support back infill development
AD, AE	Reject	I do not believe in garden backfill
AD, AE	Reject	I do not feel this offers the village anything extra!
AD, AE	Reject	Sawyers Crescent is already a rat-run, it does not need more traffic. Widening the road would only increase traffic flow further.
AD, AE	Reject	Strongly reject this as it will build houses overlooking other houses back gardens
AD, AE	Reject	The current house is perfectly acceptable and the change would make Sawyers Crescent worse for traffic not better
AD, AE	Reject	The proposed site is higher than surrounding properties and would impact views, light and traffic in the area may consider one dwelling to replace existing.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access to this plot very poor.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Don't want to see from my house
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Greed. Land is too small.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I don't consider this enormously beneficial. More of a personal ambition rather than a whole village benefit to be included in the plan.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would be a pity to demolish a perfectly habitable property to build in the garden, which would mean more traffic upnSt Georges Row/Sawyers Crescent
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Over development of existing plot.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Over development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	these dwellings will not follow the road around. being built in john & brends garden with only one near the road is going to look completely out of place with the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is a personal proposal. Not essential to village development.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is building on backland & as well as being inappropriate it would damage the visual amenity of Goldcrest's neighbours. Building on a garden because it is too big is not appropriate as it was probably a major reason for buying the house in the first place!

NDP-S005	Eldred	3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Very poor access through Sawyers Crescent - on bend
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No need for this as it is not for village enhancement only for personal gain
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems and parking.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems & parking
AQ, AW	Reject	Access
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Current house and gardens are lovely, Why knock it down and build more? Road is too small to access, already a problem down there
AQ, AW	Reject	Dislike houses behind current houses Concern over traffic on Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Reject	Doesn't look very pleasing, existing houses will be looking on to houses that don't need to be there. Money grabbing!!
AQ, AW	Reject	I disagree with pulling down a perfectly sound building when there is no need. Also access via Sawers Crescent dangerous
AQ, AW	Reject	I do not agree with back garden development
AQ, AW	Reject	Infringing on neighbouring properties
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic concerns
AQ, AW	Reject	Why demolish a perfectly good, large family home?
AQ, AW	Reject	Why pull down a perfectly good home to squeeze too many properties in?
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.
AR, AT	Reject	i cannot vote on area that doesnt affect me but my vote will affect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	not needed. access and any of the layouts are unappealing.
AR, AT	Reject	Not practical on such a narrow existing road and exiting on a bend
AR, AT	Reject	overdevelopment
AR, AT	Reject	Road too narrow.
AR, AT	Reject	The houses are too close to existing residential properties.
AR, AT	Reject	This development would affect the aspect of current dwellings. I am also taking into consideration the development by Ray Knight which I think is much more appropriate. It is not (in my opinion)feasible to have two developments next to each other with a combined number of 14 new dwellings

NDP-S005 Eildred 3-4 Dwellings at Goldcrest, St Georges Row

AU	Reject	Already enough houses
AU	Reject	Becoming to busy, leave as a small village.
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	This is garden grabbing and I don't believe this would be in keeping with the area and cause more problems on the bend of the road