

[NDP-S018a](#) **Mommersteeg** **3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road**

Vote	Votes Cast
<b>Support</b>	144 (110 with no comments)
<b>Conditional Support</b>	20 (1 with no comments)
<b>Reject</b>	171 (103 with no comments)
<b>No Opinion</b>	15 (13 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

Table NDP-S018a

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

Post Code	NDP-S018a Votes	NDP-S018a Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	I feel this is still 'in-fill' in the village
AB, AS, AY	Support	If we must accept expansion! it must be sympathetic to the surroundings and not just to make a buck!
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a great location to live view across the paddock
AB, AS, AY	Support	To be built in stone
AB, AS, AY	Support	They have a lot of land
AD, AE	Support	I think this is well planned and offers a good addition to the village
AD, AE	Support	to be built to keep in character of village. Will join Caldecott with the church
AF, AG, AP	Support	Another small development that simply extends a current row of housing, keeping Chelveston at a similar size with similar housing.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Consideration has been given to the type of property and materials to be used so as to blend in with existing properties.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Good infill within the village
AF, AG, AP	Support	It's basically in-fill so no objection
AF, AG, AP	Support	The location of these properties would blend with the current location, still maintaining a well used footpath and church access.
AF, AG, AP	Support	With the other developments providing smaller and more affordable housing this would provide the balance in some more substantial houses, as long as the footpath is maintained.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Attractive additions to village if done as proposed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would add to Caldecott. Sounds attractive.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would prefer 2 houses and 1 bungalow option

<a href="#">NDP-S018a</a>	<b>Mommersteeg</b>	<b>3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road</b>
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	It will link Caldecott towards Chelveston church and hall
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would not appear out of place in given location
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would prefer to see 2 houses and one bungalow ,but three houses would also be in keeping
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Doesn't appear to affect many others
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Looks like a reasonable proposal.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This completes a reasonable development for this area.
AQ, AW	Support	Again this would be a good area to develop due to linking Caldecott together. Also the houses proposed are sensible with nice gardens - a good family home and in keeping with current houses.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	In keeping with proposed developments surrounding.
AQ, AW	Support	Preferably with the bungalow.
AQ, AW	Support	Three properties with paddocks would be desirable as there is a lack of this type of residence
AR, AT	Support	Too many houses being proposed within Caldecott. The development of Duchy Farm at present is sufficient within the area.
AR, AT	Support	We don't like to argue
AU	Support	Good use of in fill,lining the road and not in open fields
AU	Support	In keeping with the existing properties in village
AU	Support	Infill proposal.
AU	Support	This and 18b cover both phases 2016-2025 and 2025-2035
AU	Support	Will link Caldecott together and improve the village
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IT GOES WITH THE PROPERTY.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Houses an bungalow
AD, AE	Conditional Support	as above
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would like to see smaller properties.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If two houses and one bungalow built
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	One house might be acceptable but 3 is too many in this area
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Would prefer two houses & one bungalow

**NDP-S018a Mommersteeg 3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road**

AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	more detailed investigation in traffic increase in view of other developments in the area
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Needs to be looked at in conjunction with other developments to review traffic impact
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	2 properties only should be permitted with double garages and further off road parking.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Three houses only. I dislike bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings - max 3
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Three bungalows. The village has not got many large detached bungalows.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	bidwell lane needs major work doing to it to cope
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I would support the building of 1 house or bungalows adjacent to Church House where the access is safer. More properties on a greenfield site with access close to the bend I would not support.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I feel 2 houses and a bungalow would enable a mix of residents. Affordable Housing
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Would prefer similarly affordable housing as per proposal changes under NDP-S001 at top of page 3 here in
AU	Conditional Support	as long as the end result is in keeping with the surrounding area.
AU	Conditional Support	Three detached houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Again not affordable housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As already stated building on farm field land which could lead to further houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	To keep as a village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Does not provide a mix of housing for the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	it would be a shame to lose this field to housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It would be filling in open countryside and Caldecott would become less attractive
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Keep the same as it is at this time
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Loss of large visible green area changing feel of village whilst travelling through.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	My reasons for saying no this is purely a personal reason - [reason removed]
AB, AS, AY	Reject	no development on greenfield sites
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No further development wanted in Caldecott Removes green space
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	THE PADDOCK GOES WITH HOUSE
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site & NDP-S018b would be a large development for Caldecott

**NDP-S018a Mommersteeg 3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road**

AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site is clearly in the open countryside and as such, according to the NPPF, any attempt to build on it should be strongly resisted unless material planning reasons dictate otherwise. Whilst I accept the Caldecott Road has an existing linear style of development, there is no sound material planning reason to extend that build line all the way to the Carr Barns. The current open space created by the break in the build form is an amenity that should be protected.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much development in Caldecott already
AD, AE	Reject	Spoil view of church
AD, AE	Reject	This is a development too far by destroying a beautiful field with views of the church
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would spoil the open vista of this part of the village which contributes to it's overall feel.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	don't see this as being of benefit to the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Feel this would be too much and would impact on neighbouring homes
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Proximity to the church
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The fields are beautiful and the footpath is a quiet, peaceful place to walk and run; it should not be disturbed or built on
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This is creating a cluster of houses , possible overlooking of the church. It will also interfere with the public footpath
AQ, AW	Reject	Adding to many to area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Changes the character of village in that it would join the string of properties on Caldecott Road into the main village, rather than leaving the valuable green space.
AQ, AW	Reject	I am opposed to building on land that currently does not have any dwellings or buildings available for conversion.
AQ, AW	Reject	It would appear to impose substantially on green space
AQ, AW	Reject	Land is open field and rural, not suitable for development (especially when phase 2 also taken into account).
AQ, AW	Reject	Makes corner too crowded & spoils only open view of church area
AQ, AW	Reject	Over development of rural location. Spoil the views and feel of Caldecott
AQ, AW	Reject	Public foot paths
AQ, AW	Reject	Same as above
AQ, AW	Reject	The development is too large.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is detrimental to the village. What makes our village a beautiful spot is our church and the surrounding views. The houses would spoil this
AQ, AW	Reject	This will change the character of this area of the village

**NDP-S018a Mommersteeg 3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road**

AQ, AW	Reject	This would have a negative impact on the green space which affords beautiful, peaceful views from the church and from the road.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change to village
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses are being proposed for the size of the village. Drainage and water supplies may not be adequate.
AQ, AW	Reject	Would add to traffic along Caldecott Road
AR, AT	Reject	I think this would just destroy the appearance of the village
AR, AT	Reject	it would change the village unnecessarily and not add anything at all.
AR, AT	Reject	sounds like a money making proposal rather than for the good of the village !!
AR, AT	Reject	The developments currently happening in Bidwell Lane are enough for this part of Caldecott. This corner and front facing to Caldecott Road is totally rural and any building would detract from this and spoil the view of the church. The footpath would have to be relocated - this has happened before to accommodate a tennis court. Whilst walking or driving this is one of the nicest aspects of the village and I do not want to see it spoilt.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land and open countryside. This development would change the whole feel of the village and should not be permitted.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land and this development would spoil the village look.
AR, AT	Reject	This would completely spoil the rural space on the corner of Caldecott Road and Bidwell Lane. The driveways would go directly onto the Caldecott Road and would completely change the rural aspect of this part of Caldecott. I do not think that Caldecott needs any more detached houses at this stage. This sort of dwelling does not offer affordable housing. Peter is talking about moving the footpath again to accommodate a space to ensure a view of the church. I do wonder if this is in anticipation of further possible dwellings in the future ie: an access that would go further into the field near to the Duchy's Barn on Bidwell Lane.
AR, AT	Reject	too many houses in the village with the conversion of Duchy Farm
AR, AT	Reject	Why does there need to be more houses there? If people want to live in the village they should move to houses that are already there. I grew up in caldecott and it would be a shame to lose all the land that is there to new houses and residents that would not be able to see the true beauty of the village because their houses will have ruined that.
AU	Reject	Access to caldecott road is on a tight bend , if other properties are confirmed on bidwell lane it will make that busy corner.
AU	Reject	I am against this type of house as it is not the sort of house people in this area could afford. We need 2 bedroom starter homes.

**NDP-S018a Mommersteeg 3 detached dwellings Caldecott Road**

AU	Reject	I believe that this proposal would be destroying the idyllic village of Caldecott as it will fill in open areas that attract people to the area and with the barn conversions already approved would make the area look like an estate.
AU	Reject	I believe that with the already agreed development close by this would make this open part of the parish to look over developed
AU	Reject	I do not want to see the village crammed to the roadside with residential or other properties. I want to see the beauty of the land.
AU	Reject	I like the landscape and building here would take some of the characteristic from the village
AU	Reject	I think it is too many - although only 3, Caldecott is small and 3 houses is a fair amount when it is small & has enough traffic as it is
AU	Reject	It would become too crowded in the village
AU	Reject	Main road - also green area enjoyed by livestock, villagers & visitors
AU	Reject	No more buildings
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more infilling
AU	Reject	This is clearly an open green space, encroaching into the open countryside
AU	Reject	This would just make the road a corridor with buildings on one side and close in the environ.
AU	Reject	To be built on main road which at present is a green field, home to livestock which are enjoyed by both villagers & visitors
AU	Reject	Want it to remain a small quiet village.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	I have insufficient knowledge of this area to make a valid judgement due to short residency in the village.
AQ, AW	No Opinion	No views