

[NDP-S006](#) Knight 8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	126 (96 with no comments)
Conditional Support	59 (2 with no comments)
Reject	152 (102 with no comments)
No Opinion	13 (13 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

Table NDP-S006

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

Post Code	NDP-S006 Votes	NDP-S006 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Infill
AB, AS, AY	Support	VERY GOOD MIX
AB, AS, AY	Support	With reservations it will be a genuine case of infill
AB, AS, AY	Support	With the change to the plot size this would be good 'in-fill' in the village.
AD, AE	Support	Infill of village
AD, AE	Support	Natural infill
AD, AE	Support	Would support as long as it includes provision of off road parking, widening and traffic flow improvement to Sawyers crescent/st. Georges row.
AF, AG, AP	Support	I always did dislike the gap in the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Infil of this area would be good.
AF, AG, AP	Support	This is infill area so would probably be ok but would need to be stone or built to a high spec to be in keeping
AF, AG, AP	Support	Yes, this would provide additional housing within the village and on a smaller scale.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As proposed on brownfield land
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	It would link Pretoria cottages to the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	more houses in village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Perfectly reasonable proposal as long as a public footpath is maintained and adequate off road parking is included.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Reasonable development as long as off road parking is adequate.
AQ, AW	Support	Good

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AQ, AW	Support	I support the infill
AQ, AW	Support	If houses are similar to Raunds Road this will create a good link. Should be similar sized plots not too many
AQ, AW	Support	This seems to be a form of in-filling.
AR, AT	Support	I would want restrictions to prevent garden development.
AR, AT	Support	Infill site connecting one set of houses to another.
AR, AT	Support	Infill site within the village boundaries, joining the village.
AR, AT	Support	This does not affect any current dwelling and would not alter the dynamic of the village in any way.
AR, AT	Support	This is a natural infill. It would connect the village making the dwellings along the Raunds Road a complete and natural line. It must have suitable and safe access.
AU	Support	Developers propose to keep with existing buildings & would not spoil views of current residents
AU	Support	I support this as it would be in filling in the existing village as long as it was of similar build to existing houses
AU	Support	In keeping with existing dwellings & would bridge the divide between the main village & those on the outskirts to create a better community with no impediment/impact on views
AU	Support	smaller development
AU	Support	This seems a suitable place to increase the village capacity and it seems the proposer has given thought to the highways issues and the type of housing needed in the parish. The site in my view would be able to cope with the quantity of development proposed without looking cramped and over developed
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Access to the dwellings need to be considered as Raunds Road is a very busy road and Sawyers Crescent would have to be widened at the very least.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I would find it acceptable to build 4 or 5 dwellings along Sawyers Crescent but do not think it would be suitable to also build along the Raunds Road. That is currently open countryside; additionally it hosts a Public Footpath, an important amenity that should be preserved as part of the village open space.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF 3 BEDROOM HOUSES OR 2 BEDROOM BUNGALOWS
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If fewer houses were built
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If it meant Sawyers Crescent would be wider
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	if the properties were mainly bungalows and they were not cramped 8 to 10 properties seem too many, perhaps 6 to 8 would be better
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	More effective traffic calming through Chelveston as currently not effective at all.

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Once again access and parking would need to be looked at in some detail before this should be considered. As the footpath would need to be moved this too would need to be considered.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Properties to match surrounding house types Improve footpath Follow existing build and garden lines
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Properties to match surrounding house types Improve footpath Follow existing building and garden lines
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Road access
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Traffic issues
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If road is widened & no of houses is reduced to 5
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Widening and traffic flow improvement to Sawyers Crescent/St. George's Row as well as the provision of off road parking a necessity
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	6 properties only with double garages, further off road parking and direct access to B663 for 3 properties only. As proposed this looks like overdevelopment.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	A development that is better suited for a later date than proposed
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Access issues need to be sorted and some land needs to be given over to widening Sawyer's Crescent
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Again, widen Sawyers and this could work, extending the rows of current houses is the sort of expansion the village needs as that space is not hugely important. The footpath would have to run down the side of the houses (I think this is indicated in green) so its all good! Just don't go building too much on the other side of the Raunds road, as the open field view is what makes the village a beautiful place to live.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If it has to be done 2030/35 then I would support it
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Natural infil to Raunds Road, houses to Sawyers Crescent would create traffic issues

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Natural infil, especially to Raunds Road, but building additional houses in Sawyers Crescent would create problems as road is very narrow
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduce the land and the number of properties. 8-10 is too many.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Restrictions for back garden building enforced. Improved road (St Georges Row) access and improved parking for the existing houses in St Georges Row opposite proposed site
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The houses would need to follow the roadways on Raunds Road and Sawyers Crescent. This would be in line with houses on Raunds Road.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	There should be a reduced number of dwellings in the mid size range only 6-8(max). Access from the Raunds Road only and better improved footpath access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	4 dwellings only
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Half of these
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if affordable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If the plan was for fewer dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	No road access onto Raunds Road utility road at rear of houses exiting onto Sawyers Crescent.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only allow 6-8 properties
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Ten looks too squashed in that area, would only support 8
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is reduced to 5. 3 on raunds road and 2 on sawyers crescent
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings is reduced to 5. 3 on raunds road and 2 on sawyers crescent
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	4-6 dwellings and their widening of Sawyers Crescent. A carpark for the existing houses in Sawyers Crescent.

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	A sensible location to infill within the village but more details of potential access required.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings (6?)
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Good access is needed before any builds can go ahead.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I feel that 10 houses would be too many, would be happier with 5 - 7.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If the number of dwellings was reduced to 5 therefore taking up less land.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Public foot path
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Re the concern raised over traffic implications of this proposal. Subject to road safety and access being suitable to council planning
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Reduce number and build on Raunds Road only.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Sawyers Crescent needs substantial widening/improving.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Sawyers Crescent too narrow for more traffic
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Sawyers Crescent would have to become one way & more residents parking provided
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Support if houses only along Raunds Road and not down Sawyers Crescent
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Widening of Sawyers Crescent and access off Raunds Road. Building after 2025
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Would support if houses built only along Raunds Road and not down Sawyers Crescent
AR, AT	Conditional Support	8 dwellings of affordable housing in keeping with rest of the houses/homes along Raunds Road, joining the village together.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Again would prefer to see mainly affordable housing favouring younger tenants

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Houses in Raunds Road only, none in Sawyers
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Smaller number of properties or access from the Raunds Road as I feel Sawyers Crescent unsuitable for more parking/driveways
AU	Conditional Support	I think that this would be a suitable place to develop but a mix of houses would be appropriate including some smaller houses and bungalows but ensuring as always that there is adequate parking for owners and there visitors
AU	Conditional Support	if the numbers were reduced
AR, AT	Conditional Support	
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Can't support green field dev Sawyers Crescent is a 'rat run' with constant parked vehicles & risk of having an RTA
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I believe this lead to more of the field being developed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I can't support any of these green field developments. They nearly always lead to more houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Loss of green space Spoils the character of the village Too much development making the village too large
AB, AS, AY	Reject	More traffic on the Raunds Road. Access to Raunds. Just because we have open fields doesn't mean we have to build on them
AB, AS, AY	Reject	My personal reasons are that we bought our house because of the open countryside around us - we do not want neighbours! Also concerns still over how much of the field will be took up - there seems to be a "grey area" on around a quarter of the plot which no one has said what is going to be done with that.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwellings thank you
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not on green fields. Major access problems
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is building in open countryside. Raunds Road already has too much traffic. If this part of the field is built on then they will build on the rest and we will lose more countryside and have another housing estate.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AD, AE	Reject	Excess traffic on an already busy Raunds Road and Sawyers Crescent. The view when coming through the centre of the village towards Raunds will be ruined.
AD, AE	Reject	The road is already quite busy with the flow of traffic on Sawyers Crescent so this would make it unbearable if access is from that road.
AD, AE	Reject	The view from my house is directly opposite this site it would spoil, also major concern as to traffic for construction on Sawyers Crescent
AD, AE	Reject	This would destroy the open aspect of the village and again traffic for Sawyers Crescent would increase, 8 - 10 houses in the area is not feasible and would increase traffic access on the road
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I feel this a key site within the village, and needs careful thought. It could provide play are or other facilities.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would completely change the view of the village as you enter it from Raunds. It is too big a development for the village & is not appropriate on greenfield land.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Sawyers Crescent is too tight. Major road infrastructure is needed
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The feeling of open space between developments in the village is an important part of its character. The proposal would 'close' an open space and I lack confidence that back development permission would not be sought at a later date.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The roads and infrastructure are poor in this area and increased housing to this extent will impact all in the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We dont need more traffic on sawyers crescent as the road is very narrow now cars are parked on one side
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Already enough houses in Chelveston.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would only add to the traffic on a totally unsuitable road that has become a 'rat run'
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To big and will have poor access.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will create access problems and parking
AQ, AW	Reject	Access to site
AQ, AW	Reject	I am opposed to developing what is currently open land with no existing building. The village does not need to increase so much as to warrant this.
AQ, AW	Reject	I feel this would be stretching the boundaries of the village.

<a href="#">NDP-S006</a>	<b>Knight</b>	<b>8-10 Dwellings Raunds Road/Sawyers Crescent</b>
AQ, AW	Reject	I think he has made enough out of selling land and houses in Chelveston already
AQ, AW	Reject	Losing this open space would damage the rural feel of the village. Having open spaces either side of the road into the village enhances the character of Chelveston.
AQ, AW	Reject	There are no existing houses in this area so cannot be classed as in-fill.
AQ, AW	Reject	To many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	totally ruin views and character of village. Over development. Concerns over access onto B645 and Sawyers Crescent too narrow
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	It would block existing open views for current residents
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 doesn't affect me but my vote will affect others more local to it.
AR, AT	Reject	This is usable farm land there is no need to get rid of it.
AU	Reject	Going into the open countryside
AU	Reject	It will spoil views & cause unnecessary traffic
AU	Reject	It would take away too much farm land
AU	Reject	Nice small village as it
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more houses - otherwise it will become a town.
AU	Reject	this is too dangerous for access onto the road
AU	Reject	to many houses, filling up what appears to be the last bit of land with no houses on it
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field with no prior building use.