

**NDP-S018b Mommersteeg 2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane**

Vote	Votes Cast
<b>Support</b>	145 (116 with no comments)
<b>Conditional Support</b>	28 (1 with no comments)
<b>Reject</b>	162 (97 with no comments)
<b>No Opinion</b>	15 (12 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

**Table NDP-S018b**[Extracted from NDP-RESULTS/v2.0](#)

Post Code	NDP-S018b Vote	NDP-S018b Comment
AB, AS, AY	Support	This is a great location to live view across the paddock
AB, AS, AY	Support	Low level housing needed for older people who wish to downsize , freeing up housing for younger people with families
AB, AS, AY	Support	This will be an asset to the village.
AB, AS, AY	Support	Would tie in nicely with the Duchy proposal
AB, AS, AY	Support	Houses and bungalow
AD, AE	Support	Bungalows, not semi bungalows probably more in keeping.
AF, AG, AP	Support	Coupled with the farm development you would have an entire new residential street round there which would be nice. As long as the conker tree stays, that is essential to the development of future generations!
AF, AG, AP	Support	No objection
AF, AG, AP	Support	Provision of bungalows adds to the variety of housing available in the village, and retains the open framework for views.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Seems an obvious infill if Duchy site goes ahead Planners to ensure high standard design and materials
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	To be inkeeping with Duchy proposals long term.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Would prefer 2 bungalows
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	As before - seems a reasonable proposal to support
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Don't feel this would impact too much on existing homes
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	2 bungalows would be more in keeping with the area

<a href="#">NDP-S018b</a>	Mommersteeg	2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane
AQ, AW	Support	A nice size development away from the main road.
AQ, AW	Support	Two would be better than four
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	In keeping with surrounding developments.
AQ, AW	Support	Same as previous
AU	Support	Because they would be set off the main road through the village.
AU	Support	bungalows will be less obtrusive and would be good for retired people in the village.
AU	Support	Good use of in fill, lining the road and in open fields
AU	Support	In keeping with the existing properties in village
AU	Support	Infill proposal.
AU	Support	Not obtrusive - away from main road
AU	Support	Not obtrusive & away from the road
AU	Support	Only if detailed as this will be in keeping with existing buildings and give existing space of other buildings no compromise.
AU	Support	This and 18a cover both building phases 2016-2025 and 2026-2035
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I would support phase 2 but I think for phase 1 it would be as shame to lose this part of the field to housing
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	I would support this for 2 bungalows only
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If built in keeping with the village
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If only two detached bungalows
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	If four semi-detached bungalows
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Two properties
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Would prefer four semi-detached bungalows
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	Good infill for the village Covenant should be included to restrict additional building behind the current proposal
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I think this proposal needs to be reviewed when the developments in the NDP-S018A and NDP-S001 have been realised. The impact of more housing is then able to be reviewed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	have concnrs-as with soo1 regarding width and current condition of bidwell lane. any development of this site should be conditional to road improvements
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Improvement of Bidwell Lane access

**NDP-S018b Mommersteeg 2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane**

AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If bungalows
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	2 bungalows only
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If house numbers were reduced to two
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Two bungalows, not four.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	A maximum of 2 bungalows, in stone and generous green gardens not concreted / paved with garages in keeping with houses.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Alterations to Bidwell Lane
AR, AT	Conditional Support	No access from Bidwell Lane as road cannot cope with any more traffic
AR, AT	Conditional Support	2 bungalows in keeping with area and size of other properties/gardens along the road.
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	2 bungalows.
AU	Conditional Support	As long as in keeping surroundings
AU	Conditional Support	I would support two bungalows not 4
AU	Conditional Support	Two detached bungalows.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Spoil view of church.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As already stated building on farm field land which could lead to further houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Caldecott would lose open spaces. Five to seven new houses (including houses from SO18a) in this small space would not benefit Caldecott and produce too much traffic. Fourteen more residents cars plus their visitors would be too much traffic for the area.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	IT GOES WITH THE PROPERTY.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Keep the same as it is
AB, AS, AY	Reject	no development on greenfield sites
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not affordable housing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	My reasons for saying no this is purely a personal reason - [reason removed] but I also like the road as it is now with the lovely trees and the open field that the sheep graze in - just because it is a patch of land doesn't mean it has to be built on.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This site & NDP-S018a would be a large development for Caldecott
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. It is important that open countryside is protected from inappropriate development.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	TO CLOSE TO TREES

<a href="#">NDP-S018b</a>	<b>Mommersteeg</b>	<b>2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane</b>
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much development in Caldecott already
AD, AE	Reject	I reject this as it will just join all groups of houses to make one long sprawl of houses
AD, AE	Reject	Spoil view of church.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It's the bungalow situation all over again.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The view through to the Church is worth maintaining
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is not appropriate for the area which is undeveloped land
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Wouldn't want to lose the views of the Church and the rural feel of Bidwell Lane
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Beautiful, quiet field - it is a shame to maim the only decent walking area in the village - in a village like ours a circular walk for dog walkers etc is, in my opinion a must, this will ruin this and decimate the rural ambience
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	I feel wuite strongly that Bidwell Lane should not be over developed
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I have supported this and the other development in this area and I think that would be enough for this area.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Over development of Bidwell Lane is a concern
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Proximity to the church
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The other two developments here would be enough
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Unnecessary considering other buildings planned for same area.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Who on earth would want to look out at Carr`s Barns every day?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Will overcrowd the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	will overcrowd the area & access to road .
AQ, AW	Reject	Adding to many to area.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is detrimental to the village. What makes out village a beautiful spot is our church and the surrounding views. The houses would spoil this
AQ, AW	Reject	I am opposed to building on land that currently does not have any dwellings or buildings available for conversion.

<a href="#">NDP-S018b</a>	<b>Mommersteeg</b>	<b>2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane</b>
AQ, AW	Reject	As with the previous proposal, this area of land should remain green open space to keep the beautiful, peaceful views from the Church and road which epitomise how I think the village should 'feel'.
AQ, AW	Reject	foot paths
AQ, AW	Reject	Land is open field and rural not suitable for development
AQ, AW	Reject	Not in character with the farm area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Not necessary
AQ, AW	Reject	Already 4 houses being built
AQ, AW	Reject	This application relies on Phase 1 and on NDPS001 as it fills in a gap between the 2 proposals. That would bring the number of dwellings in the proposal to 13, too many.
AQ, AW	Reject	This build is imposing on green space
AQ, AW	Reject	This would create a housing estate in a rural location. Overdevelop rural site and spoil a charming view of village church.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change to village
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural ground and should not be used for residential development.
AR, AT	Reject	I do not believe that bungalows are an appropriate style of building for the area. More importantly I do not wish to see development in Caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	I think this would just destroy the appearance 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	Only convert where there is an existing building. Not in open countryside
AR, AT	Reject	Sounds like a money making proposal rather than for the good of the village !!
AR, AT	Reject	That piece of land is simply not big enough for that quantity of houses. It would ruin the view and there would be a lot more people living in a village with no shops to provide anything for them. If the area needs more houses, build them in an area that has no other use than to be used as a building site. This part of land is used for grazing.
AR, AT	Reject	This is a rural greenfield site with established trees and views to the church.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural ground in open countryside and should not be permitted. This development would spoil the whole feel of the village.
AR, AT	Reject	This is agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	This would detract from the rural space down Bidwell Lane. I do not think that Caldecott needs this kind of dwelling over the next few years as it would not be affordable housing.

**NDP-S018b Mommersteeg 2 detached for 4 semi-detached dwellings on Bidwell Lane**

AR, AT	Reject	Too many houses within Caldecott with the present development of Duchy Farm.
AU	Reject	Again, I think four houses is too many for the small rural area
AU	Reject	For the same reasons as previously stated I believe that this proposal will over develop the area and ruin the feel of caldecott
AU	Reject	It would become to crowded in the village
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No more infills
AU	Reject	This is clearly an important open space, and this development would encroach into the open countryside
AU	Reject	This would make the area look over developed and cramped on an already dangerous road
AU	Reject	Want it to remain a small village.
AD, AE	No Opinion	No too many properties on such a small plot
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