

NDP-S019b WPG 70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	13 (10 with no comments)
Conditional Support	12 (0 with no comments)
Reject	317 (158 with no comments)
No Opinion	8 (7 with no comments)
Total	350

Table NDP-S019b[Extracted from NDP-RESULTS/v2.0](#)

Post Code	NDP-S019b Votes	NDP-S019b Comments
AD, AE	Support	Do not mind 35 or 70 houses
AD, AE	Support	Do not mind which
AF, AG, AP	Support	As we desperately need more houses nationally this would seem to be a waste of an opportunity
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	IF NO MORE THAN 30
AD, AE	Conditional Support	If limited to 20 & over 10 years
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	There were only 35 houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Guarantee of a single dwelling
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Too many dwellings that don't appear to compliment existing ratio
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Too many!
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	35 houses seems to be too many for this area and this proposal is for twice that quantity.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Over development of site
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Speed reduction needed in village
AU	Conditional Support	A ridiculous number of houses for the site and they need to be os same style and build as is already on the estate.
AU	Conditional Support	A silly amount of houses proposed for this site and believe they should be the same style and build as those already at chelston rise

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	70 houses would create 140 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 70 would ruin this.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not enough school and doctors in area to service these houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It's too many houses
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	No - it's too many I would be concerned about extra traffic and infrastructure generally
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses Traffic through Caldecott Will spoil the character of Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Far too high a density, more than double the amount of existing properties. The entire character of Chelston Rise would be changed forever. Currently, the applicant is aware planning permissions will not be granted as the site is considered to be in the open countryside.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I feel the additional 35 houses is far more than the % expansion for the village over the 20 year period.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Rather see smaller number of houses
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Ridiculous number of houses proposed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This would make village too big
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This would over develop the site
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large a development. Would be larger than Chelveston Village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too large, not keeping with existing community.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many
AB, AS, AY	Reject	too many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many extra properties in a short time.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many new properties proposed
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many!

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many Caldecott could not support such numbers - roads etc
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too much growth too fast
AB, AS, AY	Reject	What 70 new homes not 35 no thank you
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses will bring about further unwelcome changes to the village
AD, AE	Reject	No too many properties, would spoil 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	The local roads are not fit for purpose to take a large development of this style
AD, AE	Reject	too much traffic on local country roads
AF, AG, AP	Reject	35 + 8 new houses is enough. This is too many houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	70 is too many houses to be sustainable and would be too much growth.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Allocation of dwellings is established within the village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties - the site would become too large and induce more traffic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Building this many houses in one area will upset the layout of the neighbouring estate and the two would contrast largely. Also this many new residence in the village is too much of a rapid expansion, small gradual developments around the village is what I prefer to see.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Doubling the size is inappropriate
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many for such a small community in one go.
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	This is total overdevelopment. What are they trying to do. Is it to get this rejected in the hope of falling back on plan A. In effect they are trying to create a whole new village whilst putting in very little.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This many additional houses would be detrimental to the village community
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This proposal is way above 10% set by the authorities
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would impact the traffic using a road leading to Caldecott which does not have a defined footpath for walkers. The road is seen as a speeding opportunity already. This will only increase this.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would more than double the housing on the site & is inappropriate & totally out of character for the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	To many houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large a development
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many houses
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many new buildings

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too many properties.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too much density
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Yet again this proposal is way above the 10% set by the authorities. If approved there would be an extra 120/140 vehicles on top of the ones ref NDP-S019a 'C' type road, poor facilities, e.g. bus route etc. NDP-S019a and NDP-S019b would create a small town, which is not needed as Raunds, Rushden and Higham are meeting the extra demand in this area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No infrastructure to support existing development let alone anymore.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Roads inadequate for extra traffic.
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	Far too dense a project for the type of countryside in which it would sit. How to create an urban jungle in one money-grabbing move.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too large, would overwhelm the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too many dwellings
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too many houses (more than double reasonable).
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too many houses for the site and have indicated support for lesser number
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I have supported the application for 35 properties, 70 is far too many as there are no facilities for all these extra people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I have supported the application for 35 properties, 70 is far too many as there are no facilities for all these extra people
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Much too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No! This would definitely have a town feel about it and developers seem to be cramming too many homes into this space

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Over development of land within existing boundary
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Road 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	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	Too many houses for this tiny village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many dwellings
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 size of present community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	will overcrowd the area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Would over-run Caldecott. Far too many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	70 is too many
AQ, AW	Reject	Do we want to urbanise the airfield with a hugh housing estate?
AQ, AW	Reject	There are more than enough houses at Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Far to many houses.
AQ, AW	Reject	Far too big for the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	Far too many houses.!!!
AQ, AW	Reject	Fine too large a development over doubling the existing. Support some development but not on the scale proposed should complement exist not over double the size.

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AQ, AW	Reject	I feel that this is far too large a development in an area with other proposed developments. It would completely alter the nature of the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	NDP-S019A proposition of 35 dwellings will be more suitable for the traffic flow on the roadway than the 70 dwellings as proposed on NDP-S019B
AQ, AW	Reject	No facilities - school - doctors - shop - roads to support this many people
AQ, AW	Reject	The village cannot sustain this amount of new houses. It is not just about people making money. I would hope anyway
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 only 50 houses in Chelston Rise. This development would increase its size by 140% which totally changes the character of the area.
AQ, AW	Reject	This plan imposes too much on green space and is a large plan for a small area
AQ, AW	Reject	This will change the whole concept of a village local infrastructure not sustainable.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a development
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large!
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses for the plot of land, will look cramped in.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses. Would generate too much traffic which would impact upon Caldecott and Chelveston as people travel through going to/from work/shops etc.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too much growth
AQ, AW	Reject	Would have negative impact on Caldecott and Chelveston
AQ, AW	Reject	Would prefer to see the smaller development.
AR, AT	Reject	Greenfield site
AR, AT	Reject	Absolutely no requirement for these at all. It would no longer be a village and the traffic would be horrendous.
AR, AT	Reject	Again far too large a development. This kind of development would deeply sadden me.
AR, AT	Reject	Already issues with using Bidwell Lane as a rat run
AR, AT	Reject	Completely unsuitable for the site.
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses, would ruin the village completely.
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses proposed and density of building out of character with existing

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
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. I completely oppose this proposition.
AR, AT	Reject	How could the village cope with the increase of this size? We have no shops, no PO etc Every house would need at least one car and most would need 2 or more . This is a village not a town
AR, AT	Reject	I feel this development is too big. It would spoil the close, community feel of Chelston Rise. There would be a large increase in traffic coming through the village of Caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	Not needed
AR, AT	Reject	Outrageous size of development and additional traffic. Another great money making scheme from large developers and land owners
AR, AT	Reject	Over development
AR, AT	Reject	Money making scam that will create havoc in the form of massive traffic invasion into caldecott.
AR, AT	Reject	Too crowded not in keeping with rest of area. 1.5 times houses that are already there for half plot size
AR, AT	Reject	Too many dwellings proposed
AR, AT	Reject	Too many dwellings proposed. Existing road not suitable for such an increase in vehicles arising from so many more houses.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many houses. Would spoil the close, community feel of the development.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many proposed on site
AU	Reject	I would rather 5-10 houses
AU	Reject	70 houses would spoil a lovely place.
AU	Reject	Absolutely NOT - At present there are 50 houses in Chelston Rise, putting in 70 would increase the development by 120% - this is pure greed on the developers part and not needed.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 600 traffic movements per day. The infrastructure of the mains water and sewage system, and already poor internet service would not cope. This proposal equates to a density of approximately 14 dwellings per acre, clearly at the higher end of residential development for a rural location
AU	Reject	Too many houses - would swamp the existing residents and additional traffic with no facilities
AU	Reject	Chelston Rise & Caldecott has for a great many years been a small community & the residents pay a premium in rents/taxes to enjoy these
AU	Reject	Far to many houses in a small place
AU	Reject	Far too many

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	Far too many houses for such a small area!
AU	Reject	Far too many houses. more than doubling in area. Less that 1/2 the size. The area floods and this amount of houses would be a disaster
AU	Reject	Feel this would be too many houses for the area.
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	i moved here for the space and safeness for the children. this is completely taking away the whole feel of the estate. i would definately move if this proposal went ahead. it is totally taking away the whole reason we moved here
AU	Reject	I think 70 houses would spoil Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	I think these plans will be too crowded and not fit with the existing estate
AU	Reject	I think this site would be overcrowded with 70 more homes (more than double the existing number). I feel that the site's quiet, family oriented nature & general safety (especially for young children on roads) would be compromised.
AU	Reject	Insufficent space
AU	Reject	Loss of rural area. Excessive traffic, loss of community closeness, loss of natural wildlife, noise, pollution - already from lorries etc. Village not large enough for excessive traffic.
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	We moved to area for village location. Building on this land would ruin any views, quiteness or countryside feel it would be like living in a town. A local shop.
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. A local shop would be nice
AU	Reject	I would support a MAXIMUM 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 - As long as they match the outsides of the current houses. They must not stick out
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 going on in rushden negates any need to develop a greenfield site
AU	Reject	The proposal will seriously affect the unique nature of the setting. Too many cars. Too cramped.

NDP-S019b	WPG	70 Dwellings - Chelston Rise
AU	Reject	There is not enough room for 70 dwellings and there would be no size garden and you would be looking over your neighbours and the modern design would not be in keeping with Chelston Rise.
AU	Reject	This even bigger proposal is totally out of the question. The natural beauty of this peaceful area will be spoilt beyond recognition, the increase in traffic will be enormous & the local infrastructure has no services to accommodate non car users.
AU	Reject	This would turn us from a rural estate to a village. Huge increase in congestion and further damage to local roads. Increase in noise pollution. Ruin the rural setting the estate has. Further demand on local utilities, would involve major disruption.
AU	Reject	To many houses and to many cars
AU	Reject	Too many houses and not in keeping with the shape of the estate
AU	Reject	Too many houses for size of land. Would increase congestion on local roads.
AU	Reject	Too many houses in too small a space. it takes away the fields and tarmac playground which the kids on the estate have got used to. we also already have drainage/sewage problems with the pipes being too small, so another 70 houses would cause even more problems
AU	Reject	Too many properties! NO
AU	Reject	Village has been small community for many years. Premium rents paid to enjoy
AU	Reject	Will definitely ruin it & be far too much traffic
AU	Reject	Would double the size of Chelston Rise and Caldecott and be completely out of keeping with the area.
AU	Reject	Would like to keep this area quiet. Would have al the cars here our children wouldn`t be safe.
AU	Reject	Would rather a smaller development
AU	No Opinion	Not allowed to object, due to covenants in my deeds that prevent me from objecting.