

[NDP-S014](#) Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	104 (71 with no comments)
Conditional Support	18 (1 with no comments)
Reject	217 (124 with no comments)
No Opinion	11 (8 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S014

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

Post Code	NDP-S014 Votes	NDP-S014 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I don;t feel that would really have any impact on the houses the other side, so would therefore support this.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Not affecting Chelston Rise too much
AB, AS, AY	Support	Such development is needed.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Need affordable housing prefer 6
AD, AE	Support	Affordable housing is a necessity for any area
AD, AE	Support	Only for housing
AD, AE	Support	Only if used for houses as described
AD, AE	Support	I accept this because it is a brown fill site adjoining new houses
AF, AG, AP	Support	Affordable houses needed
AF, AG, AP	Support	This type of development needed in village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Expansion is key
AF, AG, AP	Support	If we agree to expansion of Chelston Rise it is difficult to turn this down.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Provided the the mews development is done as specified - ie distinct from Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Support	This development and NDP-SO19a makes a natural addition to Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Support	this development would allow the village population and origin to be maintained, with the small/managed introduction of affordable housing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Affordable dwellings are necessary for younger people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	More affordable houses needed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Not detrimental to anyone else's properties
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This wouldn't be in the way of existing homes and wouldn't ruin views etc

NDP-S014	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	There would be a need for the youngsters/or older villagers to down size
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	We do need some of this type of dwellings
AQ, AW	Support	A good sized rural style development with affordable homes.
AQ, AW	Support	A reasonably sized development for the area.
AQ, AW	Support	An extension of current buildings.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	If Chelston Rise is to be developed then this land should be also
AQ, AW	Support	Making it easier for first time buyers to step on to the property ladder and being able to afford ones own house
AQ, AW	Support	The size of this application would be in keeping with my preferred growth of the area.
AQ, AW	Support	This would provide housing for young families who could take advantage of the Children's play facilities that already exist in Chelston Rise.
AR, AT	Support	Apparently
AU	Support	Better than a traveller site
AU	Support	The description sounds as if these dwellings will not change the look of the surrounding area too much
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	details of type of affordable dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If incorporated into Chelston Rise development
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF IT WAS WITH CHELSTON RISE
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	In conjunction with William Pears Group 35 dwelling proposal.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Support 2 or 3 dwellings only
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Less Desity
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Lesser Density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The plan should be changed to provide fewer properties. The plot isn't large enough.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	But 4 not 6
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer houses in this sort of plot. Squeezing 6-8 houses here would be far worse than say two quality houses in such a prominent position.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Two houses of good size for this prominent position.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Provided WPG secure planning I don't see any objection. Without this I think the plot is too remote for the build. It sits too far from existing properties
AR, AT	Conditional Support	4 houses maximum with improved access to the road.

NDP-S014 Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

AR, AT	Conditional Support	If developed in conjunction with Chelston Rise for exit and entrances then no need for extra access on dangerous corner
AR, AT	Conditional Support	If included in Chelston Rise development using their entrances thus saving an entrance on a dangerous bend
AU	Conditional Support	I think this site is not big enough for the number of dwellings proposed and would be better suited being incorporated into chelston rise
AU	Conditional Support	If this was part of the chelston rise estate and of a similar design then would be more happy with the proposal
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Housing density too high Increased traffic levels through Caldecott Loss of green space It will spoil the character of Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like this site as it is building in open countryside
AB, AS, AY	Reject	no development on greenfield site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not a suitable location for 6-8 properties, situated near a sharp bend
AB, AS, AY	Reject	On its own, this is an attempt to build in the open countryside, which, in accordance with the NPPF, should be resited. However; if WPG ever get permissions to develop the Chelston Rise complex, then a carefully thought out plan, that fits in with the WPG plan, could work. This applicant has recently been advised that planning permissions will not be considered as the site falls into the open countryside category
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Poor access to a large development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This small site is too remote
AD, AE	Reject	overall plot does not tie in with the village.
AD, AE	Reject	Overall plot seems to be out on a limb as I have voted against the William Pears proposals.
AD, AE	Reject	The proposition suggests 6-8 affordable dwellings, but in fact these will only be 2 or 3 affordable dwellings.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many properties which would eventually lead to the land between the proposed properties and existing being filled (35 + 70)
AD, AE	Reject	Too many properties. This would lead to a future conurbation.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	`Affordable` suggests social housing which may put stress on already over-subscribed local facilities.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	appearance is too many buildings for the size of the land
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Because it will bring Chelveston Rise too close to Caldecott

NDP-S014	Allen	6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Because it will open up the William Pears Group aspirational sites
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The site would become too crowded
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is inappropriate for undeveloped land & is a small housing estate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would alter the housing type of the village and would encourage future expansions in that area which would eventually lead to two sets of contrasting house types and ultimately populations living next to each other.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would not 'tie in' with current development, it is too far away.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many new buildings
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Totally inappropriate place for residential development.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	as a stand alone development this would over ride 6-8 houses isolated from surrounding s+ rest of village i also object if it is tacked on to so19a+so19b assuch a large development inappropriate for size of the village .not sure how it meets local needs etc.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Cannot see necessity for this proposition if William Pears proposal for 35 houses goes ahead. Could lead to a "Them and us" situation!
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a unique housing estate and does not need to become a town on its own
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I reject this application, affordable dwellings....static caravans comes to mind. A way of the land owner getting around his previous rejection of planning application on this parcel if land...
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I reject this application, affordable dwellings....static caravans comes to mind. A way of the land owner getting around his previous rejection of planning application on this parcel if land...
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Not within existing boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Road access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Road access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would only add to the expansion of the village and is for personal gain and does not enhance the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too far our of Caldecott
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development of Chelston Rise taken in conjunction with NDP-S019a and too isolated in the absence of S019a
AQ, AW	Reject	Access & overcrowding of site - needs to be included in Chelston Rise not on its own

NDP-S014 Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

AQ, AW	Reject	Affordable suggests for young families, yet the village does not have the facilities to attract families regardless of the housing types available. Families have moved away from the village due to lack of facilities!
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad site for houses on a bend in the road.
AQ, AW	Reject	Development opens up possibility of further building between this site and existing Chelston Rise properties which I oppose
AQ, AW	Reject	Has no connection to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	Inappropriate position for this type of development
AQ, AW	Reject	Isolated. No fit with village
AQ, AW	Reject	No fit with village
AQ, AW	Reject	Not suitable location for low cost dwellings owing to high cost of transport
AQ, AW	Reject	One cannot build 'affordable dwellings' when gallons of petrol are needed to travel to work, school, doctors etc.
AQ, AW	Reject	To small a developement in an isolated position, would chnage the character of approach to Chelston Rise.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too remote a site for development (sociall affordable or otherwise
AQ, AW	Reject	Why should someone who has nothing to do with out village benefit from this project? 2-3 affordable - what are the others?
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground and should not be used as residential. Not necessary as Chelston Rise is prime for increase in houses.
AR, AT	Reject	I believe such a scale of development would not be in keeping with the surrounding area/villages and may over time cause the amalgamation of the village, which due to size I would not like
AR, AT	Reject	I do not live in Chelveston but feel those living around the developments may be affected
AR, AT	Reject	must not go ahead .it does not meet any of the original or present criteria!!
AR, AT	Reject	no more development in Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Reject	out of character to area and insufficient size to accommodate
AR, AT	Reject	Plot too crowded
AR, AT	Reject	Plot too smallfor 6-8 homes that would be in keeping with current family (plots)
AR, AT	Reject	Poor access on a bend. This could create a dangerous situation with vehicles moving onto a busy road.
AR, AT	Reject	The chelston rise complex already gives rise to high volumes of traffic to caldecott. it would add nothing to the village but would take away green space

NDP-S014 Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

AR, AT	Reject	The entrance to this could be dangerous as it is straight onto a bend and an ever increasing busy road. 6-8 houses are proposed. It is too many in relation to the existing number of houses in Caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	There is no need to add more houses to this area. The view coming out of Caldecott would be spoilt by that large amount of affordable housing. Also, if the housing is affordable, then surely the people who will want to live there would not be able to run a car all the time just to go to the shop, or to do anything.
AR, AT	Reject	this is agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	This very small site has been classed as agricultural ground in open countryside and should not be developed for residential use.
AU	Reject	Affordable dwellings' is a very vague description which doesn't give enough information for me to support it.
AU	Reject	Already been turned down once
AU	Reject	Area very small, area directly on bend of road with cars hitting blind spots. No pedestrian walkways.
AU	Reject	Because I support "some" building on the old school grounds and the above would not fit in with the surroundings
AU	Reject	Chelston Rise is almost a village in itself, with a good community feel but has room for a few carefully designed/built houses that are affordable to newcomers & existing tenants. No more as the 'green' areas are most enjoyable
AU	Reject	Dangerous entrance & plot it too small for 8 houses
AU	Reject	IN MY OPINION, THE CURRENT PLAN IS NOT SUITABLE. PERHAPS TWO HOUSES WOULD BE BETTER. I CANNOT SEE THE SITE BEING PRACTICAL FOR MORE THAN THAT AND STILL RETAINING THE CHARACTER OF THE VILLAGE.
AU	Reject	It is too small and would become too crowded with traffic
AU	Reject	It would ruin the view we have from our window.
AU	Reject	Land size will not support development proposed. Green field site - natural habitat.
AU	Reject	No - sewage and poor access which is not suitable to highway standards
AU	Reject	Not in keeping with the local area, unsafe access point, development isn't wanted in the area, would increase congestion on local roads. Would involve over development of a very small piece of land.
AU	Reject	Poor access as on bend of road
AU	Reject	Previously rejected - no difference!!
AU	Reject	Sufficient development in chelston rise, once a nature reserve never been occupied.
AU	Reject	That area is small & will encourage more traffic & unnecessary housing. I do not want properties n this area

NDP-S014 Allen 6-8 Mews Dwellings around a courtyard

AU	Reject	The bend is far too dangerous to have extra houses put in that site. cars speed along this road as it is, and you very often hear screeching of brakes as it is, so with a junction being there, would make it more dangerous
AU	Reject	There is no need for this as plenty of dwellings will e available in Higham, Rushden, Raunds, etc. This is purely to make money and will bring nothing to the locality. The entrance would be on a bend. No services, etc.
AU	Reject	this area is not suitable for this number of properties
AU	Reject	this is a very tight corner on a very busy road access would be open to accidents , with multiple cars & delivery lorries try to gain access the houses- no suitable drainage on site
AU	Reject	This is not enough room for this amount of housing and the entrance is on a blind bend
AU	Reject	Too many dwellings out of character with the area. A dangerous and fast bending road not good for access
AU	Reject	Too small an area for 6-8 houses. plus the entrance is on a dangerous bend in the road the traffic already speeds along here, so it is just an accident waiting to happen
AU	Reject	Very bad access point, increased congestion, increased noise pollution, land too small for plan proposed. Applicant has made application for travellers site in the past.
AU	Reject	Village & green areas would be lost. good sense of community would also possibly be lost
AU	Reject	We do not support low cost housing as this may attract undesirable residents.
AU	Reject	We have lovely views don't need houses spoiling it
AU	Reject	Would effect the wildlife
AU	Reject	Would like it to remain safe and small.
AB, AS, AY	No Opinion	Chelston Rise proposition more than covers the housing requirements for the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No Opinion	No view
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.