

**NDP-S019a WPG 35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise**

Vote	Votes Cast
<b>Support</b>	106 (80 with no comments)
<b>Conditional Support</b>	52 (1 with no comments)
<b>Reject</b>	180 (101 with no comments)
<b>No Opinion</b>	12 (9 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

Table NDP-S019a

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

Post Code	NDP-S019a Votes	NDP-S019a Comments
AB, AS, AY	Support	Ideal site for development with current infrastructure
AB, AS, AY	Support	Reluctantly!
AB, AS, AY	Support	The smaller number of dwellings would fit in better
AD, AE	Support	It will make it a viable community
AD, AE	Support	Will make good community with services
AF, AG, AP	Support	This development combined with NDP-SO14 makes a natural extension to Chelston Rise. It includes a variety of housing types and provides for the possibility of some kind of village shop in the Parish.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	A reasonable extension of proposed housing in a contained area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Prefer this option rather than the 70 homes this option would retain more of a village life
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Provided the housing to be built is of a better quality and good looking
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	Subject from final approval from Parish
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This would be high density housing so I would support this reluctantly. Would there be adequate parking?
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	This would be the maximum development for this area.
AQ, AW	Support	A nice sized estate.
AQ, AW	Support	Good
AQ, AW	Support	Like the design as similar to what is currently there
AQ, AW	Support	So long as this number is not increased.
AR, AT	Support	In conjunction with NDP-S014

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Support	Keeping the existing housing style and layout is important. Increased traffic volume through Caldecott is a major concern and measures to reduce speeding are vital.
AR, AT	Support	This would in effect mirror the current site and would create affordable housing. This area has proved popular with families and I think more families and young people should be encouraged.
AU	Support	As long as the house style is the same as now
AU	Support	I agree that there needs to be more accommodation and think that it would be better in one designated area, however I don't wish to see properties crammed so close together just for developers financial gain.
AU	Support	I support this proposal as it will not spoil Chelston Rise as it will built the same
AU	Support	in line with existing housing and should have sufficient parking for the 70+cars that will be required by the occupants.
AU	Support	Keep in the style and character of Chelston Rise. This proposal is the maximum number that should be considered
AU	Support	Matches existing style of houses (unique). sustainable - increase in vehicles on roads not overwhelming.
AU	Support	This proposition sounds good. However would like to see No's 43, 45 and 47 retained as well as the improvements to drainage, and the roads. I am also in support of a local shop
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Fewer houses
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF LESS
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF NO MORE THAN 30
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If the number of houses were reduced to around 20, then perhaps it could be considered
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Number of dwellings reduced by at least half
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Number reduced and traffic calming through Caldecott
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Affordable housing is a necessity in this area
AD, AE	Conditional Support	housing materials need to be considered as I feel the brickwork in Chelston Rise is rather unattractive.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If limited to 20 & over 10 years
AD, AE	Conditional Support	The construction needs to be different from the existing as the "RAF style" houses are old fashioned - use of stone style brick would make it more attractive
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	35 houses is an over development of Chelston Rise. I would support 10-15 houses on the old school site continued as a Crescent in the same style
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	As shown this is overdevelopment. I would support maximum of 22 properties with individual parking and garaging facilities. See notes to plab B below.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	I would find a much smaller development of a few houses acceptable, but this is far too many as it would increase the housing by more than 50%. This land is previously undeveloped & should largely remain so.
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	It will all depend on the final design.

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Less density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Lesser Density
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduce number of dwellings to about 15, otherwise a rapid influx of residence into the village will occur and the pub would be too crowded, don't go thinking you can build another pub because that's just not what this village is about. However a BIGGER pub, well now your convincing me...but in all seriousness if this were to happen I would like to see a smaller expansion first, then observe the effect on the village and allow this to determine future expansion.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Do not need 35, dwellings,15-20 would be better
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Facilities ie a pub, shop would probably have to be considered at Chelston Rise, there would be a significant increase in people using the pub and due to its distance and remoteness from Chelston rise it is inevitable that residents would drink and drive.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Facilities ie a pub, shop would probably have to be considered at Chelston Rise, there would be a significant increase in people using the pub and due to its distance and remoteness from Chelston rise it is inevitable that residents would drink and drive.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Fewer dwellings taking into account local need for affordable housing
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I would support 35 as long as the additional 70 below are not allowed.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if it was cut down to 20 other wise too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	The roads and access seem unsuitable for so many users.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Facilities needed first - pathway to village - doctors etc
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I don't see this as excessive provided the contractor implements highways improvements and awards the parish benefits
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Improvement in the road, this development could generate approximately 50 additional vehicles which the current road would struggle to accommodate.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	No objections to housing development on this site but feel that 20-25 houses would be more appropriate.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Over development of site. More low cost homes
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	speed reduction methods on all roads in chelveston needed

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Support some development but not on the scale proposed should complement exist not almost double the size.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The size of the application is too big, a smaller plot with 10 dwellings would be more in line with the preferred growth of the village.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	There are a number of proposals for this area and 35 houses seems to be too great a number
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Feel that current that would mean smaller plot sizes and house squeezed together. If house had same/similar plot sizes to rest of Chelston Rise then a possibility of supporting 20 homes.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	I do not object to this development but I do not feel there is a need for a footpath along the roadside through Caldecott onto Chelveston. There are no local facilities in either village that would benefit this development so what is the point of a footpath?
AR, AT	Conditional Support	No more than 30 houses. Also traffic calming measures to be implemented. Since Chelston Rise became occupied the volume of traffic and speeding traffic has undoubtedly increased It would again with more dwellings being occupied.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Prefer 20-25 dwellings to be in keeping with existing density of Chelston - consider small shop in addition
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Would support but not with the added footpath into Caldecott on into Chelveston. There are no facilities in either of the villages to need a footpath.
AU	Conditional Support	Buildings must be in keeping with the current properties retaining nos 43, 45 & 47 & optimise upstairs better in the end terraced
AU	Conditional Support	Far too many houses for the area and they need to be of a similar build and design as existing housing so it doesn't make the estate look over developed and crowded. Careful consideration needs to be given to visitors parking to the houses
AU	Conditional Support	Far too many houses for the site and needs to be scaled down and made similar to the houses already present at chelston rise
AU	Conditional Support	Fewer houses, improved playing area, protection of more green space for dog exercise, and introductions of footpaths between the site and caldecott/old airfield site.
AU	Conditional Support	I would support a <u>maximum</u> of TEN houses to continue the 'horseshoe' shape of the crescent, but leave the field as it is so build on old school foundations but leave the field as many of us walk dogs etc
AU	Conditional Support	if 18 properties 2015-2020 and 17 2020 to 2035
AU	Conditional Support	Maximum 15 houses built in the same style as houses already there and a grass area kept for exercising the dogs on the estate (large area)
AU	Conditional Support	Only 20 houses
AU	Conditional Support	Only 20 houses to be built

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Conditional Support	Smaller development 5 - 10 homes in the same style as are currently there
AU	Conditional Support	They reduce the number of houses. 35 houses will take away the whole feel of the estate. the kids play on the fields and the playground already in situ. would you be prepared to put in another tarmac playground??? it is ideal for the kids for skating/skateboarding and learning to ride bikes etc
AU	Conditional Support	This did not involve knocking down any existing homes on the site. A small number of 5 bed units were included, say 2 or 3 - mainly because I would like to buy one.
AU	Conditional Support	Too many houses! it will take away the open feel. i would agree if there weren't as many houses. i would consider moving if they got the go ahead on the above proposal
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	35 houses would create 70 plus new residents cars all of which would go through Caldecott. Caldecott does not have the capacity for this. It would overwhelm the current housing Chelston Rise is a nice small development with open countryside and that is why people have moved there, increasing the housing by 35 would ruin this.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Currently an unacceptable proposal as it fall within the open countryside designation. WPG have been formally advised they will not get planning permissions (even for one dwelling) as long as the site is considered within the open countryside.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I don't consider this is a good place to build more homes which will ultimately suffer from the effects of the biomass plant & HGV traffic etc
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It's too many houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No - it's too many I would be concerned about extra traffic and infrastructure generally
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not enough school and doctors in area to service these houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large development. Chelston Rise would start to dwarf Chelveston Village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses Traffic through Caldecott Will spoil the character of Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	What 70 new homes I don't think so

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AD, AE	Reject	Development too big for village. Creates a separate estate type development.
AD, AE	Reject	Too big a development for the village. Creates a separate development, verging on estate.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses will bring about further unwelcome changes to the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Allocation of dwelling is established within the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	As we desperately need more houses nationally this would seem to be a waste of an opportunity
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I feel this is too many properties in an area which has 50 dwellings already. Also its potential would/could expand into other large scale developments seen as 'acceptable'
AF, AG, AP	Reject	The only place that I believe is suitable is the land where the school was situated, which would only take 6-8 houses. Also the road is only a 'C' class road which would not be suitable for an extra 60-70 vehicles. It does not have any facilities either
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is enough development at Chelston Rise and do people really want to look at 'ugly turbines'??
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large a development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many for such a small community in one go.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties - the site would become too large and induce more traffic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	totally out of character with the village
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	Caldecott is complete at present.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Chelston Rise is a small friendly community and does not need to be expanded. It will only make for a larger village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No infrastructure to support existing development let alone anymore.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Not within the existing boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads inadequate for extra traffic.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads not adequate.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To large deveopment increasing traffic and taking away open space.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big an increase

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many houses for this tiny village
AQ, AW	Reject	Do we want to urbanise the airfield with a hugh housing estate?
AQ, AW	Reject	Far to many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	Infrastructure cannot sustain this type of development, i.e. roads, drains etc.
AQ, AW	Reject	Scale of proposed development is too great this is not infill but almost a doubling of the existing community at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	There are more than enough houses at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	This plan imposes too much on green space and is a large plan for a small area
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large!
AQ, AW	Reject	Too much growth
AQ, AW	Reject	Too remote a site for large development. Leave as it is.
AR, AT	Reject	Greenfield site
AR, AT	Reject	Already issues with using Bidwell Lane as a rat run
AR, AT	Reject	Chelston Rise is not close enough to Chelveston or Caldecott to benefit from any developments
AR, AT	Reject	Definitely do not want the village expanding by this much!
AR, AT	Reject	Far too big a development for the area and would completely change the character of the village
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses. In appropriate.
AR, AT	Reject	Its absolutely ridiculous that in the last 10 years caldecott has been the victim of many propositions, people live here for a reason and they do not need it ruined by this amount of houses. The traffic would increase. It would no longer be a pleasant and quiet place to live with pretty views, because there would be new build ugly houses everywhere and a huge amount of people.
AR, AT	Reject	money making scam that will create havoc in the form of massivetrafficinvasion into caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	no requirment for these houses.they would add no benefit to the existing village and add to the traffic and change the area unnecessarily
AR, AT	Reject	Outrageous size of development in a rural setting
AR, AT	Reject	overdevelopment

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AR, AT	Reject	We are only just getting used to these houses being occupied. The traffic increase is awful I think. 5-10 more houses in the future would be acceptable but not at the moment.
AU	Reject	Absolutely NOT - At present there are 50 houses in Chelston Rise, putting in 35 would increase the development by 70%. I am not a NIMBY, and putting say 9 houses, on the footprint of where the American School, would be an option I would have no problem . If this amount of houses were put in it, with an average 2 cars per household, plus visitors, delivery and service vehicles, Chelston Rise could see an extra 350-400 traffic movements per day. The infrastructure of the mains water and sewage system, and already poor internet service would not cope
AU	Reject	BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD FOR THIS ONE. IF THE ENTIRE SITE HAD AN ADDITIONAL 12 HOUSES ONLY. THERE'S NO NEED FOR A SHOP OR ANY ADDITIONAL ACCESS PATH.PLEASE DO NOT CONSIDER ANY PROPOSAL OF THIS SCALE AS IT WOULD GREATLY DESTROY THE CHARACTER OF THE CURRENT SITE. ANY ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE IDENTICAL TO CURRENT HOUSES. 12 MAXIMUM
AU	Reject	Further housing not wanted. Would ruin the rural, friendly atmosphere of the estate. Would increase local congestion, noise pollution and air pollution.
AU	Reject	I moved for a village & rural living Building would ruin the views & countryside. I don't want to be living in a town again
AU	Reject	I would rather 5-10 houses
AU	Reject	Lovely estate, will ruin it
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No need for this development. People moved here to get away from estates and all this being built in Rushden, Higham. The local infrastructure would not take such an influx and is not needed. WPG just want to make as much money - and RUN
AU	Reject	The development would upset and destroy the quiet and rural feeling the estate has; there would also be an increase in congestion on local roads and through caldecott; the development is not wanted by chelston rise residents. The plans of the developer appeared unclear at the proposal meeting, with the possibility they could link up adjoining land owned by other developers. They also could not answer basic questions on the proposed plans. The developers want to introduce amenities such as a shop etc, these are again not wanted. Residents have moved here to get away from urban life.
AU	Reject	this is a greenfield site, and should remain unaltered.if the proposal was for a maximum of 10 housesbuilt in the same style of the existing houses i would support that
AU	Reject	This proposal does nothing to enhance either Chelston Rise or Caldecott. The area is not suitable for such a large development of this nature & the suggested 'sweeteners' as proposed by William Pears Group is of no consequence to the householders at Chelston Rise. There is no need or requirement for a children's play area. Furthermore how many affordable homes do they propose to build

<a href="#">NDP-S019a</a>	WPG	35 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	Too large and nothing in keeping with existing development. Most residents on Chelston Rise live here specifically because it is very rural
AU	Reject	Too many houses - would swamp the existing residents and additional traffic with no facilities
AU	Reject	Too many houses for the size of space and it would mean knocking down some of the houses already there
AU	Reject	Too many houses would mean Chelston Rise would become distant & lose its community feel. Many privately owned houses have taken parts of green areas so residents cannot enjoy green walkways
AU	Reject	Too many houses would probably mean that Chelston Rise would become distant & lose the community feel it has built up over the past 3 years. Several privately owned houses have already 'pinched' green walkways so other residents are unable to enjoy
AU	Reject	We moved to area for village location. Building on this land would ruin any views, quietness or countryside feel it would be like living in a town.
AU	Reject	Would like to keep the countryside views and space for our children to play.
AU	Reject	Would rather a smaller development
AB, AS, AY	No Opinion	Too many dwellings
AQ, AW	No Opinion	The village cannot sustain this amount of new houses. It is not just about people making money. I would hope anyway
AU	No Opinion	Not allowed to object, due to covenants in my deeds that prevent me from objecting.