

NDP-S015 Craythorn 1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	155 (136 with no comments)
Conditional Support	15 (2 with no comments)
Reject	163 (93 with no comments)
No Opinion	17 (17 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S015

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

Post Code	NDP-S015 Votes	NDP-S015 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	1 dwelling acceptable and will not affect anyone else
AB, AS, AY	Support	Acceptable development
AB, AS, AY	Support	It must blend well.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Not affecting anyone No impact on the village
AD, AE	Support	No excess traffic. Behind other properties
AF, AG, AP	Support	I can see this being a really nice house and I think it would make a great addition to the village.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Tucked away out of sight
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	I see no reason to object.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Looks OK.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	No problem.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	One house is ok, although again would this set a precedent for more being built on that field in the future?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	One house only.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	No problems.
AQ, AW	Support	One additional dwelling would have no detrimental impact on the village.
AQ, AW	Support	This would not be too imposing
AU	Support	As long as the buildings do not impede on surrounding properties then this proposal is suitable.
AU	Support	No flooding, I like the idea of smaller developments here and there

NDP-S015 Craythorn 1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane

AU	Support	Only if in keeping with houses around
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	As long as proper access is sorted out
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	But where is the access going to be.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Providing only one unit was built and access was available.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Again property to be in keeping with surrounding buildings and construction traffic accounted for
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	more details on access
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Access to Water Lane only.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Only as a single development
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	the relative access to 1xdwelling is sympathetic and interfaces with existing access in Water Lane. The footpath access should not be impacted.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If one dwelling
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If there were no plans for further development
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Would need to rethink access
AU	Conditional Support	If it is only one fairly sized dwelling keeping to the rest of the properties
AU	Conditional Support	My only concern on this proposition is access to the property but otherwise feel that this would fit in with the village
AD, AE	Conditional Support	
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Access issues Future unknown intentions for the development of this plot Unsustainable development for the size of plot Its a sort of back infill development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Surely this is backland development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The plot is too big for one house so I think the numbers will change. There are access issues
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No thank you Mr Craythorn
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As for previous propositions where a field is involved
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Completely wrong in every respect. Just because some land is owned, it does not mean it can be built on. This proposal fails in every material planning sense.....and the Landowner should be advised accordingly.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No on green field site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not entirely happy with the idea of building a property that has virtually no access to it.

NDP-S015	Craythorn	1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This seems too large a site for one dwelling
AD, AE	Reject	This would be a floodgate to develop the whole field.
AD, AE	Reject	Entrance to the site is an issue
AD, AE	Reject	Poor access to site
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access issues
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Concerns for access through water yard - surface is struggling to cope with current traffic. Also concerns regarding size of plot Vs no of proposed dwelling? would more be proposed if this one gets through? probably - which would be such a shame.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I do not believe the applicant will just want one house, compared with the JST site, its larger and he is a smart man, don't trust the application!!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It is still not clear if the owner has access. The lane leading to the field is not wide enough to take large vehicles. He would need permission from other landowners ro develop.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No proper access Extremely unlikely that it would be just one dwelling and even more unlikely that Craythorn would live there!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is no acceptable access to this paddock, which is tucked behind another cottage. It is backland development on a greenfield site & totally inappropriate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is open to possible future development intentions, plus noise disturbance to residents in the location. Also poor access, how will construction vehicles get onto land and there will be issues from workers cars/vans parking on a road which is narrow and some vehicles travel fast along road
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Unsuitable access to site
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The access to this site just is not suitable, and not in keeping with the village building houses behind other houses .
AF, AG, AP	Reject	being on higher land to dwelling would tower over other houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I don't like back land development where the property can't easily be accessed from the road.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Maintaining the integrity of all of Duchy Field is I believe important.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This particular ara of the village should remain undeveloped. This is not infill, just out into open green space.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Unsuitable access to this proposition.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Concerned about access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Concerned that more than one dwelling will be built. The access is not good

NDP-S015 Craythorn 1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	i cannot see this work if development takes place on dutchy field
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses in village now
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The site could be upgraded to include more houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is like a back land development
AQ, AW	Reject	No way unless included with site behind
AQ, AW	Reject	Access for construction traffic would have a negative impact on the adjoining land.
AQ, AW	Reject	Backland development, infringing on neighbouring properties
AQ, AW	Reject	Building even one house would have implications on further development around the property by setting a precedent for further development
AQ, AW	Reject	From my home I can view this, it will spoil the views. This is a big plot for 1 house and my suspicions are that more could be built.
AQ, AW	Reject	No access Would dominate high land Not convinced land would be used for just one property
AQ, AW	Reject	Not in line with outline of village. Ruin rural aspect. Concern site is too big for one house. Could lead to more
AQ, AW	Reject	Opens up possibility for further development as infill in adjacent field to the north. Access issues
AQ, AW	Reject	Problematic access. Obstruction of a public right of way.
AQ, AW	Reject	See no reason why development should be allowed this far outside the village boundary, access is poor and believe it would be an aspiration to gain access from Duchy Field, if developed, to deveopment further which would then be difficult to resist.
AQ, AW	Reject	The site is behind an existing development and is not infill
AQ, AW	Reject	This is not infill & access to the land is inappropriate for a dwelling, nor does it fit in with the current boundary of dwellings
AQ, AW	Reject	This will spoil everyone's view. To have a 'random' house in a field? It's not in keeping to the village.
AQ, AW	Reject	We see this as an opportunity for the owner to build more than 1 house should Duchy field gain approval
AQ, AW	Reject	Would dominate over houses along Water Lane
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	Back development with access problems.

NDP-S015 Craythorn 1 dwelling accessed from Water Lane

AR, AT	Reject	Backland development on agricultural ground in open countryside.
AR, AT	Reject	No backfill
AR, AT	Reject	Not needed.
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	Poor access for vehicles and also public footpath runs up access route and across field
AR, AT	Reject	This does not achieve anything. One dwelling in the middle of a field does not represent an inclusive development.
AR, AT	Reject	unappealing and will restrict current views
AR, AT	Reject	Usable farm land being destroyed.
AR, AT	Reject	Although the proposal for a low impact building is reassuring the location with regards access and its location to the field (Carr) adjacent means it is unsuited to development currently.
AR, AT	Reject	House in middle of field behind other properties possibly then may encourage further building in fields and open lands.
AU	Reject	Building in the middle of the field makes me think that more houses will be built around it. It does not seem to add anything to local environ.
AU	Reject	Going out into important open spaces
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	To many building. It is suppose to be a small village.
AU	Reject	Too many houses already
AU	Reject	Use of open field
AU	Reject	Uses a field.
AU	Reject	Would not look right and access would not be good