

[NDP-S020a](#) CRE Additional Renewable Energy Facilities

Vote	Votes Cast
Support	44 (35 with no comments)
Conditional Support	22 (1 with no comments)
Reject	272 (145 with no comments)
No Opinion	12 (11 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

Table NDP-S020a

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

Post Code	NDP-S020a Votes	NDP-S020a Comments
AF, AG, AP	Support	Enough damage
AF, AG, AP	Support	I think renewable energy is the way forward
AR, AT	Support	Land at moment not fit for arable farming more of a brown field site
AR, AT	Support	Re-use of Brown Field site
AU	Support	Adequate access away from the surrounding villages must be provided.
AU	Support	However concern over trucks + traffic volume.
AU	Support	I support renewable energy not houses
AU	Support	New entrance ie Kimbolton Rd
AU	Support	Provided the development does not infringe on Chelston Rise more than now
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Consideration must be given to the amount of traffic using the local roads. There has been an increase in the amount of lorries using Raunds Road recently
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	No energy production from waste materials
AD, AE	Conditional Support	I would like to see an artist's perspective in order to clearly see the impact on the landscape, and a larger view of the potential benefits for the area.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Providing an alternative traffic route was arranged - too much traffic in a small village would cause problems
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	As long as the noise is similar to the current situation and the traffic flow down the runway isn't unbearable this would be fine. Also I don't want to see any huge warehouses or energy developments from the village, as we already have the wind turbines to fill our skyline! (Big "fan" of them by the way, pun intended.)
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Limited additional renewable energy facilities would be appropriate but the site is already at its limit traffic wise
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The current renewable options (wind and solar) have become part of the landscape, that any additional services should be reduced to give the least amount of growth of existing renewable technologies.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Improve the surrounding road network.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	No waste facilities just solar park.

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Further development did not have any visual impact from surrounding villages, cause noise, smells or traffic issues. Suggest restrictions to solar arrays only
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	PV and wind ok I reject the other parts ref waste
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The proposals for this area are currently unclear so it is difficult to comment. Generally, the installation of renewable energy hardware is acceptable. A few more turbines are not a problem. Will there be more traffic? Are facilities adequate?
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	The proposed developments for this site are far too vague for me to feel comfortable in supporting it. In particular I would need reassurance about the nature of any proposed waste applications. However, I agree in principle that the area should be designated as a renewable energy park, provided that all planning regulations are strictly adhered to.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	There is no information on what is planned for this site so we have no idea what we would be agreeing to. As a result I cannot support this application as it stands.
AU	Conditional Support	As long as there was <u>no</u> waste processing and the road was re-surfaced and decent fencing erected
AU	Conditional Support	Entrance via Kimbolton Road
AU	Conditional Support	I would support this proposition providing it does not create an eyesore or take away the beauty of the countryside - the reason why I purchased my own property!!
AU	Conditional Support	If there were time limits on work..... i believe it would create more jobs, especially for the locals
AU	Conditional Support	If this did not mean constant traffic to & from the site once it was built.
AU	Conditional Support	if this was spread over a longer time - up to 2035
AU	Conditional Support	No changes, just need more information
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Air pollution would potentially increase for us all and I think they have been allowed to develop enough, have they thought of having a visitor centre
AB, AS, AY	Reject	BEST KEPT FOR GRASSING
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Environment and traffic issues
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Greed only!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I am not sure about this one at all
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I cannot vote for something that does not give a proper detail of what the land owner wants to do
AB, AS, AY	Reject	I did not want the wind turbines and renewable energy plant there in the first place so I am certainly against any further developments
AB, AS, AY	Reject	No detail means that options are wide open and uncontrolled Excessive increase in traffic volumes Detrimental impact on Chelston Rise
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NO NO IT SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN BUILT ON IN THE FIRST PLACE.

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We have enough turbines and solar panels already
AB, AS, AY	Reject	All because of windmills No thank you
AB, AS, AY	Reject	As above
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Enough already!!!!
AB, AS, AY	Reject	The area is in danger of becoming an industrial enterprise zone open to almost anything in the name of environmental considerations.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	There is enough development of this site already
AB, AS, AY	Reject	These proposals should be strongly resisted from the very start. The entire CRE site has been built 'piecemeal'. Whilst that is not illegal, it is a clear and cynical attempt to abuse the planning system and avoid the need for an Environment Impact Assessment.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many dwellings will happen
AB, AS, AY	Reject	With the current renewable energy park initiatives I can't understand how this can be a desirable housing location for the majority seeking houses and can't support it
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would not want possible smells or landscape to be spoilt or the vast increase in lorries.
AD, AE	Reject	Enough is enough
AD, AE	Reject	Enough is enough
AD, AE	Reject	No the old airfield has already been ruined, conservation would be more suitable for this already spoiled part of Chelveston-cum-Caldecott
AD, AE	Reject	The possible haulage of waste could wreck the quietness of the village & possible smell be invasive
AD, AE	Reject	The windfarm is bad enough - the CRE group are ignorant and have no concern for the village - this would increase traffic to the area
AD, AE	Reject	We have a wind farm and solar panels which have ruined our landscape, created more traffic noise and smells. We do not need anymore
AD, AE	Reject	Chelveston already supports adequate renewable energy installations. This would dominate the village.
AD, AE	Reject	There are already sufficient renewable energy installations. Would dominate village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It's all motherhood statements not a proposal.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There are already enough wind turbines that have a visual impact (nuisance) on the local residents of Chelston Rise, Caldecott and Chelveston which is totally against the environmental protection act, again the 'C' class road is not suitable for the extra traffic that would be involved
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This application is not specific enough. There is no detail for consideration they will do what they want anyway.

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AF, AG, AP	Reject	When the turbines become redundant I would hope the site would return to its previous greenfield village amenity. This proposal is tantamount to giving CRE to do whatever they want to, which is totally unreasonable & unrealistic
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would create another Goosey Lodge, Wymington industrial estate with smoke being emitted 24 hours a day.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would create another Goosey Lodge, Wymington with emissions 24 hours a day
AF, AG, AP	Reject	not needed not proven to be effective
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Additional devastation to an ever changing area of the countryside
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Feel as though I would be 'signing a blank cheque' very uneasy about supporting something so vague
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I strongly object to any more development of this nature.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I would need to know the specifics
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No more renewable energy or waste!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	No plans given Could be anything Has no respect for village views
AF, AG, AP	Reject	There is poor infrastructure for the existing development. There have been no positive outcomes from the existing development with no visitor centre or anything to encourage villagers to support such a campaign
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We have enough renewable energy facilities without adding more traffic through poor infrastructure
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Worried about impact on the village and surrounding area
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	A blot on the landscape. the obnoxious ones already up should NEVER of been put up. A WASTE OF TIME
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Dangerous traffic levels would be needed to support this on tiny village roads. Couple this with an influx of people and some accidents, possibly fatal are bound to happen.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Deplore loss of green space to enjoy Loss of habitat for nature birds and animals Owners have already shown complete disregard for residents views!
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Don't want to see anymore wind turbines.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I love walking on the air field- or I used to , it's covered with litter now busy with lorries thundering down the road. The turbines are okay but the solar panels are an eye-soar. , further development will change the atmosphere further.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	It's already overdeveloped, losing the desolate feel

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Regret loss of habitat. Owners CRE have shown no regard for existing residents.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	There is enough there already and it will only increase traffic.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	We do not know if these applicatins are efficient
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Spoilt enough already
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big already
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I am not convinced that residents wishes would be duly considered despite assurances
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I firmly reject this as I feel that the village hasn't been considered, they are big construction and don't believe the safety has been considered this is a big NO NO
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	this will only lead to the wedge being driven in what is already becoming a peace meal development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many lorries and movement of traffic
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	We do not need to develop any more land for energy renewal in the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Enough traffic, enough on the site
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	He has made enough money out of destroying our village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No benefit to community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No benefit to the community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No justifiacion. CRE has no interest in the community only money.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Our views are completely and habitually overridden by vested interests in government so it would be foolish to signal even the slightest acceptance of this venture.
AQ, AW	Reject	Eye sore.

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AQ, AW	Reject	I think this group has done enough damage to the village already
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses
AQ, AW	Reject	Already enough disruption of the countryside and effect on the wildlife and environment
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Do not want any further development on former airfield site
AQ, AW	Reject	Don't want any further development on airfield site
AQ, AW	Reject	Further waste processing is not acceptable. Less intrusive renewable energy, such as solar panels may be a consideration I would be willing to entertain further.
AQ, AW	Reject	Haven't the proprietors already done enough damage to the neighbouring villages and countryside.
AQ, AW	Reject	I do not think this would be appropriate as we already have windmills and solar panels .
AQ, AW	Reject	Increased industrial traffic passing through the surrounding villages. Other potential disruption (eg sound and smell) from the waste operations.
AQ, AW	Reject	No are details given.
AQ, AW	Reject	Over development of the site. Wind turbines, solar panels, biofuel enough. Contrary to rural location
AQ, AW	Reject	The development at Chelveston airfield will be never ending if this is built. Too much traffic already interrupting the open countryside
AQ, AW	Reject	There is no need for this sort of expansion in a village. I don't think this village is ready for this sort of growth with extra traffic etc.. If we don't stop this how much more will be added.
AQ, AW	Reject	This is more than I would want
AQ, AW	Reject	This is not an industrial area!!
AQ, AW	Reject	This is too imposing on surrounding areas, it is intrusive and would take up green space and will deplete wildlife.
AQ, AW	Reject	This renewable energy park seems to be running away with itself. Enough is enough. This company has little regard for the surrounding villages. To them it's about profit and they view Chelveston-cum-Caldecott as easy targets. Waste processing is not wanted for the noise and smell.
AQ, AW	Reject	This will lead to further increased road traffic and would have a no long term benefit to either Caldecott or Chelveston
AQ, AW	Reject	Traffic travelling through villages unwanted and dangerous
AR, AT	Reject	Requirement and the impact to the current village from the associated traffic would be unavoidable
AR, AT	Reject	Do not want any type of waste processing plant near the village. Have had experience of living close to the bio mass site at Knotting. 24 hours of light pollution and strong unpleasant odours for most of the summer months.
AR, AT	Reject	Existing roads would not cope with more expansion
AR, AT	Reject	I do not want any further development especially a waste bio plant which causes 24 hours of light pollution and unpleasant odours throughout the year.

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AR, AT	Reject	I do not want any further industrial development in the village. It is too close to residential housing.
AR, AT	Reject	In my opinion CRE has ruined this village, enough is enough
AR, AT	Reject	It would ruin the landscape/natural beauty of the area.
AR, AT	Reject	Land designated as agricultural/rural land not an industrial park
AR, AT	Reject	No and absolutely no to more waste processing.
AR, AT	Reject	no more changes, there has been enough already with the turbines, solar panels, etc
AR, AT	Reject	No where enough detail. A large development (and this could be a large development) would change the dynamics of the village completely.
AR, AT	Reject	Over development
AR, AT	Reject	This area of land has already been adapted enough.
AR, AT	Reject	this is countryside not an industrial park!! it just another money making scam.
AR, AT	Reject	Already wind and solar renewable energy as well as food waster recycling centre.
AR, AT	Reject	I think we've had more than 'our share' of industrial development
AU	Reject	THE RECENT CHANGES HAVE ALREADY RUINED THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA. I WOULD NEVER HAD CONSIDERED BUYING IN THIS AREA IF I HAD KNOWN ABOUT THE PROSPECTIVE CHANGES. PLEASE DO NOT AGREE TO ANY ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO THIS SITE.
AU	Reject	A beautyfull landscape is being ruind by windfarms
AU	Reject	Already enough energy on site. Too many vehicles all day long
AU	Reject	Already large enough Would increase traffic and noise to the village
AU	Reject	As no specific plans creates an unacceptable level of uncertainty. Detrimental impact on the area.
AU	Reject	I am against this expansion of the digestate site as ths would mean there would be hundreds of lorries up and down the narrow country roads. It would be murder and the roads would not stand the heavy traffic
AU	Reject	I believe that this site has more than enough development already and would not support any further development.
AU	Reject	I do not want buildings on that field. We have wind turbines which we did not want. Any more buildings will ruin the clear views everyone here loves. No buildings at all
AU	Reject	I feel the landscape has been spoilt enough by existing windmills
AU	Reject	Increased traffic of speeding/noisy/cars/lorries. Danger to all
AU	Reject	It would be such a shame to ruin the coutryside even more than it already has been, it would no longer be a small village, surely it would be too much growth? It is also too near the turbines?
AU	Reject	Love the walks across countryside.
AU	Reject	No amenities, submission too late and will become too industrial

<a href="#">NDP-S020a</a>	CRE	Additional Renewable Energy Facilities
AU	Reject	No No No No This is not a well established energy park it is in its infancy! Anaerobic an bio fuel absolutely stinks - I like to spend time in my garden, go an look at BioGen at Twinwoods, Bedfordia. I am not against country smells - these are certainly not. The land here is enjoyed by hundreds of dog walkers, cyclists and walkers, I think there is enough development already. Airfields have historically been known as nature reserves, primarily because they have always been sectioned off. How many more lorries and vans do we need going up and down this road and surrounding country lanes, in addition to the 40 tonne artics already transiting in and out of Carr Brothers
AU	Reject	no specific purpose declared on plan to leave permission open will be a mistake
AU	Reject	The claim that the former airfield site is misguided. The proposition would leave residents living next to an industrial park which is not why we bought our home.
AU	Reject	The land and surrounding area has been destroyed enough. No further development needed to site. Too much disruption.
AU	Reject	The roads could not stand all the extra traffic ie HGVs
AU	Reject	The site is big enough as it is
AU	Reject	The traffic this development has built up since opening has increased & the speeding noisy cars are a danger to both health of residents & the tranquility residents have paid to enjoy
AU	Reject	The turbines are an eyesore and you can hear them There is no need or want for further development - no need for industrial units, etc. as the entire area is rural
AU	Reject	There is far to much traffic coming in and out of this site already with disregard to the speed limits.
AU	Reject	This site is already destroyed and has ruined the open landscape. Any more development would be madness
AU	Reject	totally ruins the countryside, and will personally affect our way of life
AU	Reject	We already have the wind farm which we did not want and now solar panels any more would destroy the the reason why we moved to live here plus the impact on the wildlife
AF, AG, AP	No Opinion	I strongly oppose. Chelveston is a residential village. Not a mini industrial one.