

[NDP-S017](#) Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	119 (92 with no comments)
Conditional Support	36 (2 with no comments)
Reject	180 (109 with no comments)
No Opinion	15 (15 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S017

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

Post Code	NDP-S017 Votes	NDP-S017 Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	As long as they are not exclusive should be affordable
AB, AS, AY	Support	I support this as the impact is low on the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	The only proposal I am able to give my full support to. All the benefits make sense whilst those against appear weak and without foundation
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a good idea to have some smaller buildings in the village.
AB, AS, AY	Support	This proposal has benefits which I feel most villagers support & cannot result in more development later
AB, AS, AY	Support	This seems a reasonable scheme with a reasonable number/type of dwellings proposed
AB, AS, AY	Support	Very sensible use of surplus gardens. Unobtrusive. No impact on traffic in the village
AD, AE	Support	Adds housing for elderly who want to stay
AD, AE	Support	As long as they are affordable
AD, AE	Support	I do have concerns about more traffic on Raunds Road, particularly in the Britten Close turning with children crossing the roads for school buses.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good infill of available land
AF, AG, AP	Support	I have always said that we need a spread of housing types. This development seems to address this.
AF, AG, AP	Support	This would give an acceptable opportunity for the village to maintain a good mix of ages and ethnic origins in village
AF, AG, AP	Support	Would provide additional housing without detracting from the nature of the village. Provides additional style of housing enabling current village residents to downsize.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Because I think there is a demand for small bungalows
AQ, AW	Support	No problems.
AQ, AW	Support	Sensible re-use of land within the existing village boundary.

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AQ, AW	Support	This in-fill is in keeping with the character of the village.
AQ, AW	Support	With ageing population I think the bungalows would be a sensible addition
AR, AT	Support	Would add a good mix of properties to the village with little impact on surrounding properties.
AR, AT	Support	Would add a variation of properties to the village without affecting surrounding properties.
AU	Support	I like the idea of smaller varied developments
AU	Support	I support this proposition as I feel we need a mix of homes some for young people and some for older residents
AU	Support	Ideal location for retirement bungalows
AU	Support	in fill use of existing garden
AU	Support	It is fair to build retirement bungalows. Keep them looking the same as the rest of the road!
AU	Support	This does not affect the village boundary.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Access would need to be from the side of number one Britten Close and not from between numbers two and three. Possible objections due to 'back-fill'
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	But access not from Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	fewer properties
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Only if access from Kimbolton Road - no alteration to Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Proposing two new access roads off Britten Close is unrealistic and not likely to get Highways support. Six dwellings would increase vehicle movements on the Close significantly. If a new access road was created off the Raunds Road, serving all six properties, then that could be acceptable.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If no of houses reduced to 3
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I am not in favour of properties being built in back gardens behind existing properties where the access is as described, I would support if there was better access, not from Britten Close.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would only support this proposition if the proposed bungalows were "Back to back" with the remaining Britten Close properties and if access was from Kimbolton Road or Raunds Road. I would not support this as a "back land" development accessed from Britten Close.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	4 in conjunction with proposed development of field in Raunds Rd, and access was from Raunds Rd, not Britten Close.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	6 is too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Britten Close is a very quiet cul-de-sac. Access to 6 bungalows would need road structure from Raunds Road or Kimbolton Road to gain access

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings commensurate with local need and only if traffic implications minimal and safe
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer than 6 bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Maximum 2 bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	No access off Kimbolton Road
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	OK if the trees stop in position.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Only bungalows as view aspect and would like to see more info on access before forming an opinion
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Would prefer to see access from either Raunds Rd or Kimbolton Road to prevent building houses behind houses with potential isolation. Access to the proposed six bungalows needs to be carefully considered.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	3 bungalows only
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	3-4 properties maximum
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	An additional 6 houses in this area seems to be too many. 3 might be more appropriate
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The land being built on is too vast, a reduction of new builds and land taken up needs to be reconsidered
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	unobtrusive, but perhaps four houses would be more appropriate.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	give retired people easier access to surrounding towns eg:buses.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Maximum of 3. I am unsure where the access would be.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	possibly only 3 bungalows
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Possibly two dwellings. Three too many
AU	Conditional Support	Full details on access etc.
AU	Conditional Support	Loss of green land & woodlands. However would these be specifically for the elderly & available to other village residents.
AU	Conditional Support	Loss of green land. Would be specifically for elderly & would they be affordable to older village residents - rent?
AU	Conditional Support	MAXIMUM OF 4 BUNGALOWS
AU	Conditional Support	Re quality of after build when maintained ie: upkeep of social care
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AB, AS, AY	Reject	Do not support back infill development Cash grabbing Unsuitable access Spoils the character of these houses and the neighbourhood
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Don't feel it is the sort of housing which the village needs
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I do not like backfilling/garden development. I think this is a case of making money and then leaving the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO NO NO BACK FILL GARDEN GRABBING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO NO NO MOVE IT IS GARDEN GRABBING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I take into consideration how their neighbours feel. I do not believe in people profiteering from their land at the detriment of their fellow residents. this is unacceptable.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The land proposed to be built on was classed as fallow land by the builders so should never be built on, there would be potentially be quite an increase in the flow of traffic trying to get out of Britten Close which at peak times is bad enough now, it would be far safer if approved, for the proposed site to have access onto Raunds Road over Keith Carr's land at NDP-S008
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is a ridiculous idea to completely destroy the look of Britten Close by knocking down garages to accommodate another 6 properties and a new road. What about the services and overcrowding of vehicles on an already small road. The whole balance would be destroyed.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Traffic accidents Raunds Rd/Britten Close
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Two more access points from Britten Close which would double traffic access to a cul de sac
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Why do the village want 6 Bungalows don't think so what about the traffic flows, by the time the Bungalows are built Mr Bagley will be long gone
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would be far to overcrowded. Nice cul-de-sac as it is. Think they are being greedy!! Move if the gardens are too big. Let someone else have the luxury of a nice big garden. Not acceptable! More traffic in a nice quiet area
AD, AE	Reject	Garden backfill & also the exit from Britten Close to the Raunds Road
AD, AE	Reject	I do not feel this offers anything extra to the village.
AD, AE	Reject	Plan is not clear re access to dwellings. It also would mean an excessive number of properties accessing a small cul de sac.
AD, AE	Reject	Plan unclear as far as access goes. Excessive number of properties accessing a small cul de sac.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many dwellings already. Keep Chelveston a small village
AD, AE	Reject	Will be houses with no house frontage for access and services with traffic turning out from dangerous junction with Raunds Road. How can they be guaranteed as retirement homes

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access Issues
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Access issues
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again building houses behind other houses in gardens is not in keeping with the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Again too many
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Back land development, not enough thought put into cars and access and too many assumptions about the types of people who would buy these proposed properties.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I cannot see why gardens need to have houses built on them, unless there is a really good reason. Having a large garden really is not sufficient reason. It is inappropriate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	In my opinion this would cause issues for neighbours due to increased traffic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Out of context, access not clear.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There will be traffic issues for residents in this small close
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too cramped. Poor access
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to layby
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Access to the chelveston & raunds road& also the layby
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Again too big for Britten Close.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I don't think this is as good a development as many others proposed in that it would reduce the value of the three existing houses unreasonably and create cramped accommodation for the new houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Ridiculous increase of traffic in Britten Close
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	this is backland development for personal gain and not village enhancement
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would affect the cul-de-sac far too much, too much traffic and far too much impact on existing residents
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Unnecessary over development of current sites and financially motivated
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Would spoil existing houses and create cramped accommodation - nobody would be happy.
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Behind current houses Traffic concerns

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

AQ, AW	Reject	Britain Close is a small development already and does not need another development within. Any need for retirement bungalows can be met elsewhere. Completely out of character with existing development. Access issues.
AQ, AW	Reject	Britten Close is a lovely quiet cul-de-sac. This is too much and seems unnecessary. Smaller houses are available for residents to move to in the village. They are lovely big houses with generous plots which should remain. Any family would love to purchase one of these.
AQ, AW	Reject	I am against back garden development.
AQ, AW	Reject	I don't want people developing their back gardens
AQ, AW	Reject	It just should not be about individuals making money
AQ, AW	Reject	Not in line with Britten Close. Isolated development? Traffic issues. 12 + cars in Britten Close
AQ, AW	Reject	The access is completely inadequate, the reason I believe why the gardens were so big to begin with.
AQ, AW	Reject	There is no reason why you should put a house in a garden. I personally would love a big garden. If the garden is too much for the owners, then move and sell to a family which will appreciate a good size garden.
AQ, AW	Reject	There should be a mixture of housing within a village and there will always be a demand for housing with larger garden requirements which should not be lost to the village
AQ, AW	Reject	This is not right for old people, access is a problem. Concerns access could come off the layby if other scheme approved. Security issues of houses behind other houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	This would not be in keeping with this small development. Are retirement homes needed in Chelveston, a village with no public transport or facilities.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too dense
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic concerns
AQ, AW	Reject	Will double the traffic in Britten Close
AR, AT	Reject	Access problematic
AR, AT	Reject	It would make the existing houses unappealing having bungalows in existing green space.
AR, AT	Reject	Britten Close would have been developed initially with more houses. There is no need to change it now. I cannot understand why someone would buy a house with a large garden with a view to building on it. This is unfair to existing residents. Additionally, I do not think Britten Close could accommodate more through vehicles. This would increase the noise to existing residents. 6 dwellings are too many for this area. Also, are dwellings required for retired people? It is a bit remote at the back of Britten Close. Retired (older) people need to be nearer to facilities.
AR, AT	Reject	No backfill. Roadside development only.
AR, AT	Reject	Over development

NDP-S017 Bagley/Coote/Woolhead - 6 Bungalows accessed off Britten Close

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	There are enough houses in Britten Close. Why were these houses not built when Britten Close was originally designed? I can only assume it was not deemed the correct thing to do. I do not like the idea of houses behind houses and cannot see how this development would enhance the village as a whole. Also, what about the access through Britten Close? This would make this cul-de-sac much busier. To me this development just does not work or benefit anyone other than the current residents making a financial gain.
AU	Reject	Again taking away our countryside, open spaces, creating more cars + busier villages.
AU	Reject	Again to many, in an already built up area
AU	Reject	As mentioned before, I feel the JST proposal would enhance the village more, and would be enough of an increase in dwellings for Chelveston
AU	Reject	As the Shaws they would have to demolish some buildings to achieve
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more houses and not enough parking already.
AU	Reject	The plan shows access will be an issue without demolishing existing buildings.
AU	Reject	This is another garden grabbing development and should not be allowed as it would ruin the area in my opinion. There are better sites to develop and this would make the area look over developed
AU	Reject	This is garden grabbing and believe it would have an adverse effect on the surrounding dwellings. I also do not appreciate the fact that fliers were put through all residents doors asking for their approval. In my opinion this is inappropriate and under hand.