



# Chelveston-cum-Caldecott Parish Council

## Northamptonshire

### Neighbourhood Development Plan



## Outcome of Aspirational Development Sites Submission NDP-S020b – CRE – Residential and Employment Opportunities

### 1 Introduction

Following consultation with residents on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2014 (Meeting: [NDP-C002](#)<sup>1</sup>) and subsequent [question/answer](#)<sup>2</sup> exchanges, you submitted a revised proposition [NDP-S020b](#)<sup>3</sup> to be considered by residents in the poll held from 6<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> March 2014.

Your proposition was included in the booklet distributed to all households ([NDP-PROPS](#)<sup>4</sup>). Each registered elector on the latest electoral roll (Dated: 21<sup>st</sup> February 2014) received personalised, security coded, voting papers (Example: [NDP-VOTE](#)<sup>5</sup>).

Turnout in the poll was **82%** of households and **80%** of voters. There were no spoilt ballot papers. Over 2,300 detailed comments were made by residents. These included comments on the individual propositions and details of their wishes for the future of the Village. The complete results of the poll have been published ([NDP-RESULTS](#)<sup>6</sup>).

The Working Party has analysed the results, and has discussed them in depth to assess which of the proposals should go forward as “preferred options” into the development plan. The full recommendation made to the Parish Council has been published ([NDP-0180](#)<sup>7</sup>). This recommendation was discussed and approved at the Parish Council meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2014 and forms the basis of the decision made regarding the suitability of your proposition to go forward as a preferred option.

### 2 Basis of the analysis

As part of the poll, we asked the Village what level of development they might be prepared to accept in each settlement. The results have been analysed using the methodology published in ([NDP-RESULTS/Q6](#)<sup>8</sup>)

**Table 1 - Q6 – Additional properties residents might accept in each settlement**

	2014 Baseline	New properties by 2026	New Properties by 2035	Maximum Potential Growth
Caldecott	21 <sup>9</sup>	1-5	1-5	48%
Chelston Rise	50	6-10	0	20%
Chelveston	149 <sup>10</sup>	6-10	6-10	18%
<b>Parish Total</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>13-25</b>	<b>8-20</b>	<b>20%</b>

This gives a clear view that the Parish is prepared to expand at a sustainable rate of around 1% per annum over the next 20 years. For the last 20 years we have had a “restricted in-fill” status and have grown by 26 properties, approximately 18% growth, all by in-fill between existing properties. These sites are now all full, and to allow for any growth we need to accept developments on new sites in each settlement.

In the Call for Aspirational Sites ([NDP-0078](#)<sup>11</sup>), we made it clear that the Parish Council was under no obligation to adopt a particular submission as a preferred site. We also made it clear that **for proposed sites to be included in the plan, they must enjoy wide support from residents** and be **supported by policy**. The results of the poll have been used to assess the level of support received.

## Neighbourhood Development Plan – Outcome of Aspirational Site Submission

The Working Party has published the criteria used for the analysis ([NDP-0177](#)<sup>12</sup>). These criteria show how the results of the popular vote have been assessed, and the emerging policy considerations that have been formulated after analysing comments

### 3 Poll results for your proposition

Table 2 – Results for NDP-S020b – for detail see [NDP-S020b/votes](#)<sup>13</sup>

Vote	Votes Cast	% of voters
Support	28 (22 with no comments)	8.0%
Conditional Support	20 (0 with no comments)	5.7%
Reject	290 (146 with no comments)	82.9%
No Opinion	12 (10 with no comments)	3.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>100%</b>

Your proposition received **8% full support** from the whole Parish, which was a clear **minority** of all voters. **6%** of voters gave the proposition *conditional* support. Even if the concerns of these conditional voters were addressed, you would still not be able to secure a clear majority from the whole electorate.

Your proposition only received **11% full support** from Caldecott voters. From Chelston Rise voters, there was **4% full support**. The proposition was rejected by **87%** of Caldecott voters and **90%** of Chelston Rise voters. This represents a clear **majority** rejection from the nearest neighbours.

Many of the rejections focussed on the potential impact on the emerging community of such a large development, and the impact of additional traffic throughout the whole Village.

### 4 Policy considerations

- (a) This proposition is clearly a substantial development, and is proposed on land that has not been occupied by permanent structures since the second World War. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – [NDP-0141](#)<sup>14</sup>) is clear that the definition of previously developed land excludes land:

*... land that was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time.*

In the Parish Council's view, this area of the former airfield has become wholly naturalised with the exception of the foundations of the boxer mast and two hangers. There is no evidence of the former Nissen huts which formed the military accommodation.

- (b) As this is a naturalised green field site, accepting this proposition would be unsound as it contravenes Policy 1 of the NNJPU Core Spatial Strategy (CSS - [NDP-0037](#)<sup>15</sup>) which states that:

*In the remaining rural area development will take place on sites within village boundaries, subject to criteria to be set out in development plan documents. Development adjoining village boundaries will only be justified where it involves the re-use of buildings or, in exceptional circumstances, if it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required in order to meet local needs for employment, housing or services. Development will be focussed on those villages that perform a sustainable local service centre role*

In the view of the Parish Council, this proposition meets none of these criteria. There is no established need for additional dwellings at or near Chelston Rise and no amenities and services to support this.

## **Neighbourhood Development Plan – Outcome of Aspirational Site Submission**

- (b) Table 1 shows clearly that there is limited support for additional properties to be developed at Chelston Rise. 6-10 properties would be accepted in the first 10 years of the plan (2015-2025) and none thereafter.

Within the Chelston Rise site, there is previously developed land on the site of the old USAF school and boiler house. The foundations for these are clearly visible from aerial photographs. In the surveys conducted for the previous local plan ([NDP-0109](#)<sup>14</sup>), school (but not the boiler house) was shown as being within the settlement boundary of the estate. The former playing fields and playground were clearly outside these confines. There have never been any structures on that land.

It is the Parish Council's view that all development at or near Chelston Rise can be accommodated on this previously developed land without impacting on the open green spaces on the site or on the old airfield nearby.

- (c) The Working Party has recommended a policy that requires development to be carefully phased in Chelveston-cum-Caldecott ([NDP-0177](#)<sup>12</sup> – paragraph 4a). This will ensure that new families can be properly integrated into Village life, and that increases in traffic volumes can be phased in. Chelston Rise has only recently been re-established as a settlement. In the view of residents and the Parish Council, the settlement should be given further time to become established before additional development is undertaken anywhere near it.

None of the other propositions for housing development in, and around, Chelston Rise have been accepted as preferred options for adoption.

### **5 Decision of the Parish Council**

On the basis of the vote, the Parish Council has decided that there is no popular support for this proposition. There are also no overriding policy considerations that would require us to include the proposition as a *preferred option* in the Neighbourhood Plan.

***On the basis that: (a) the site NDP-S020b received a majority rejection, (b) this would be a development in open countryside contrary to Policy 1 of the CSS and (c) that the proposition would exceed the numbers of new properties that would be accepted in or near Chelston Rise, this proposition is rejected for adoption.***

### **6 Next steps**

The preferred options will be presented to residents at the Annual Parish Assembly on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2014, and be sent to all households as a newsletter shortly afterwards. The Working Party will then develop a draft Neighbourhood Plan for consultation with residents over the summer. The plan will be sent for inspection by an independent examiner in October 2014 and then the revised plan will be proposed for adoption to residents in a formal referendum in May 2015. If a majority of voters support the plan, then it will be formally adopted by East Northamptonshire Council as the Local Plan for this Parish. All planning applications will need to demonstrate conformance with the plan before permission can be granted.

***Issued on behalf of the Parish Council***

***18<sup>th</sup> April 2014***

***Mark H Hunter***  
***Clerk to the Parish Council***

### **NOTES**

<sup>1</sup> <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-C002>

<sup>2</sup> <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/view/NDP-S020>

## Neighbourhood Development Plan – Outcome of Aspirational Site Submission

---

3 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S020b>

4 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-PROPS>

5 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-VOTE>

6 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-RESULTS>

7 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0180>

8 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-RESULTS/Q6>

9 3 additional properties are currently under construction and another 1 has outline permission. 2 properties are currently empty pending redevelopment.

10 5 properties that have been long term vacant and are in the process of being made habitable for re-occupation. 2 other properties have outline permission. These are included in the growth totals.

11 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0078>

12 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0177>

13 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-S020b/votes>

14 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0141>

15 <http://ndp.chelveston.org.uk/NDP-0037>