

**NDP-S008 Keith Carr 12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road**

Vote	Votes Cast
<b>Support</b>	74 (63 with no comments)
<b>Conditional Support</b>	29 (0 with no comments)
<b>Reject</b>	232 (133 with no comments)
<b>No Opinion</b>	15 (15 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

**Table NDP-S008**[Extracted from NDP-RESULTS/v2.0](#)

Post Code	NDP-S008 Votes	NDP-S008 Comments
AD, AE	Support	This infill, facing properties that have been recently given planning
AF, AG, AP	Support	I support this as it is not going ahead for another 16 + years and the traffic the houses cause will be on the Raunds Road and hopefully they wouldn't come down Sawyers Crescent and Water Lane.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	6 to 8.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Reasonable development as long as parking is adequate to preserve access along this busy road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This is fine as long as adequate off road parking is required to ensure that a busy through road continues to have clear passage.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	This development would have the effect to slow incoming traffic from Raunds. At present properties on one side even with the speed restriction does not seem to slow down the traffic.
AR, AT	Support	it would be in keeping with the village and the houses opposite
AR, AT	Support	This would be the 'next step' in Chelveston housing.
AU	Support	Good to see that highways issues are considered during this process and I believe that this would again be a good site to gain housing that would benefit the parish
AU	Support	I support this build as it will have starter homes for young people in the area. So long as there was no more building behind these.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I think if this area was developed it may potentially slow traffic coming into the village although I think 12 -16 houses are too many
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If fewer houses were built
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	This number of houses are not needed at present, but possible consideration for 2026 onwards perhaps

**NDP-S008 Keith Carr 12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road**

AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Traffic calming
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	An earlier proposal which incorporated a new road still appeals to me.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Maximum of 12 only
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No bungalows!
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Numbers reduced
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduce the number of houses to maybe 4-5 and add them onto the end of the Britain Close/Raund Road houses (bottom left corner of the red box with 12-16 in)so the field view from the current Raunds Road houses is not obscured significantly.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduced numbers
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings should be reduced to 10-12 max. The road access is permitted. The Raunds Road/The Green/B645 layout and safe pedestrian crossings should be introduced.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The properties would need to be set back and a footway be provided and overall there would need to be fewer properties. An access drive to the proposed properties in Britten Close would also be needed along the side of the ditch. But no through road to Kimbolton Road.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Again I agree with comments in the proposal regarding road safety. Might agree if this was properly addressed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Lower number of properties - possibly 8 - 12
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only one entrance to the side?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Will this extend the village too much? One road into complex is good
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Maybe another 12 dwellings will be needed in twenty years from now
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If the number of dwellings was reduced to 6-8 therefore reducing the amount of land being built on

**NDP-S008 Keith Carr 12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road**

AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less properties- 8 - 10 would be acceptable
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	May be 8-10 houses as plots should be of decent size as others around there. Think this should be developed on as suggested. Not too soon.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Maybe more housing will be needed in 2035
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Slightly too many houses, maybe 10 nice size houses with good size gardens and drives.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	This proposal significantly "closes in" Raunds road - not a welcome feature. A significant reduction in the number of dwellings and the exact type is needed to make a more informed judgement.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	A smaller development of 6 - 8 houses.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Affordable housing but option of road development to by-pass village centre?
AR, AT	Conditional Support	With consideration of access and no further buildings within the plots once built.
AU	Conditional Support	A suitable mix of houses would need to be placed on this site and as the timescale is in the future a consultation nearer the time would be needed. Careful consideration must be taken to ensure that all open areas of the village are not built on so losing the country feel
AU	Conditional Support	I believe the number of properties is too many. Perhaps half as many would be better. The road is fast and busy at this point what will be done to make it safe?
AU	Conditional Support	smaller development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Again extra traffic, spoiling the open field views. Access onto the Raunds Road. Don't want to be looking at more houses.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Another green field development which has a 'high' risk of further housing if approved by the village when plans are submitted. Fronts very busy Raunds Road with H&S issues for traffic
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Chelveston to link Raunds Must not lose village boundary
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I believe this would lead to more of the field being developed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I feel this is not 'in-fill' coupled with the other proposals is not required

<a href="#">NDP-S008</a>	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Loss of green space Changes the character of the village Potential future development behind this in the future Too many houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No more dwelling
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No way would most likely result in much larger housing scheme linking up with Kimbolton Rd
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not on green fields. Major access problems. Will open up a development between Raunds Road and Kimbolton Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Quite simply, I do NOT want a row of houses to look out on, we did not pay a premium to live in a village with open views for nothing.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Spoil village also destroying agricultural land when we need to grow more crops,
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The traffic using Raunds Road is getting heavier all the time & with the building going on in Raunds it is going to increase even more, without more houses on Raunds Road
AB, AS, AY	Reject	There is no need to extend the village any further outwards, there is enough land within the existing village settlement boundaries to accommodate an appropriate amount of dwellings for the next twenty years.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is a step too far! and will only satisfy greed!!!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	TO BIG TO EARLY.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	TO EARLY FOR THAT SIDE OF ROAD
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Traffic implications, visual approach to village impaired.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Unnecessary extension of village and changes feel of village by losing large attractive green area.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We enjoy looking at the wind turbines not a sprawling OAP's village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We would lose the open approach to the village. There would be increase in traffic. Fantastic views and open countryside would be lost. When these houses are built then the rest of the field would be developed and yet another housing estate for Chelveston. We do not need big houses.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would ruin the approach from Raunds
AD, AE	Reject	excess traffic and speeding on Raunds Road. Views across countryside spoilt
AD, AE	Reject	This would just open up a large scale development and again ruin the visual aspect of the village

<a href="#">NDP-S008</a>	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses for the village and the road. This would change the character of the village. Any houses here would need to compliment those on the opposite side of the road.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses which would negatively affect the character of the village and for the road in its current form.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many properties in a small area. If all of these proposals go ahead the village will change completely leading to the need for more local amenities and further change
AD, AE	Reject	Would like to keep open field as people enter the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	As other Raunds road development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I like the open aspect along Raunds Road. To build houses would give a much larger fell to our village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No further development to the east of the B663 should be permitted. Such development could only have a significantly detrimental impact on traffic through the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Overdevelopment of village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The 10% figure that Chelveston has to meet is covered with the JST site and Ray Knights site next to Hall Farm, plus a few others such as NDP-S005/NDP-S002
AF, AG, AP	Reject	this could open up additional development in the back fields
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This proposal is for a significant block of housing that I feel would detract from the character of the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too much development to village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would change the whole look of the village as you enter from Raunds & is far too big for the village & inappropriate on a greenfield site.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would this be where it ends or just the start of a bigger plan.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to road either through the layby or the chelveston to raunds road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	If planning is approved I feel it would open the flood gates for Keith Carr apply for additional planning in the future on the land to the rear of this plot, thus saturating the village with houses I also feel that it would have a detrimental effect on the residents that currently live opposite. ie: overlooked
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	If planning is approved I feel it would open the flood gates for Keith Carr apply for additional planning in the future on the land to the rear of this plot, thus saturating the village with houses I also feel that it would have a detrimental effect on the residents that currently live opposite. ie: overlooked

<a href="#">NDP-S008</a>	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No, far too much impact on opposite houses and on their environment
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Opens up potential to develop out to Kimbolton Rd
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Outside village boundary Extends village into arable land
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Proposed development in the arable land and will have an impact on the local area. It seems to be outside the village boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Ruin the view for Raunds rd residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Spoils outlook for other houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The houses currently down Raunds rd have views across the fields which would be ruined by this development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is a further expansion of the village and should be kept as it is. This would only lead to a further development application at a later date
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would lead 1. to loss of rural aspect for existing homes on Raunds Road opposite proposed development 2. increased traffic taken in conjunction with development behind Darsdale Home and S006 leading to further traffic issues at the Green
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big and could lead to further development.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big an increase
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses for Chelveston. Could be traffic problems.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development of open countryside
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Tunnel effect as you enter the village from Raunds
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will ruin the environment for those opposite - purely a financial motive not thinking of those people or the village
AQ, AW	Reject	Concerns over traffic.

<a href="#">NDP-S008</a>	Keith Carr	12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road
AQ, AW	Reject	Extends village boundary into open countryside
AQ, AW	Reject	Extends village into countryside
AQ, AW	Reject	I think this would spoil the entrance to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	Loss of views not infill
AQ, AW	Reject	No houses are currently have access to this side of Raunds Road and it would be dangerous to get access for this proposed estate.
AQ, AW	Reject	Open field should remain such.
AQ, AW	Reject	Overdevelopment - ruin character of village. Concerns about traffic onto B645
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	Spoil the entrance to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	This would stretch the boundaries of the village.
AQ, AW	Reject	To many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would alter village too much
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses for the site location
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses proposed and I feel that this sort of linear ribbon development would inevitably risk Chelveston becoming part of the proposed developmentsfor Raunds and we would lose our village identity.
AQ, AW	Reject	Would alter village too much
AQ, AW	Reject	Would completely change the character of the Raunds road, and a start to further development towards Raunds.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Do not need this if Raymond Knight (NDP-S006) is approved and that is my preference
AR, AT	Reject	Outside the village envelope
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	There is open countryside that would be lost and people moved there for that view. Not a view of houses.
AR, AT	Reject	This originates a new area of development. It is not an infill as with NDP-S006. It would spoil existing views and the current rural aspect.
AR, AT	Reject	unappealing and would spoil existing views
AU	Reject	Clearly encroaching into important countryside again, too many houses for the area in one hit.Again this would increase the traffic around the village, we have enough of Carr Brothers lorries on these country lanes
AU	Reject	concerned over access

**NDP-S008 Keith Carr 12-16 Dwellings Raunds Road**

AU	Reject	Farm land
AU	Reject	Large development on a bad road. This would affect traffic & possibly be a danger to pedestrians & drivers
AU	Reject	Large development on main. Danger to local & other road users
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	Taking the views from the current houses of the beautiful views
AU	Reject	The field is peaceful & a lovely view - you would cause huge traffic & encourage a busier neighborhood - we like it quiet
AU	Reject	Too many dwellings in one go. Will spoil views, etc
AU	Reject	Too much infill and houses already
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field.
AU	Reject	Would like to keep a nice small village.