

**NDP-S021**     **Stuart Carr**     **50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

Vote	Votes Cast
<b>Support</b>	41 (31 with no comments)
<b>Conditional Support</b>	46 (1 with no comments)
<b>Reject</b>	251 (121 with no comments)
<b>No Opinion</b>	12 (10 with no comments)
<b>Total</b>	<b>350</b>

**Table NDP-S021**[Extracted from NDP-RESULTS/v2.0](#)

Post Code	NDP-S021V	NDP-S021C
AB, AS, AY	Support	I can see no other use for this land.
AB, AS, AY	Support	I think stone cottage would look ok
AB, AS, AY	Support	We do not need a new village hall, grants in place for refurbishment of existing Hall. Heritage!!
AD, AE	Support	This offers everything new housing, facilities. This could bring the village alive and a better community feel
AD, AE	Support	This proposed development offers the extra facilities as well as housing I feel myself an family could benefit from.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	More houses in the centre of the village would be good as would the extra facilities
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Support	no problem except for access-will this be via water lane?
AR, AT	Support	A well thought out building scheme which would offer extra amenities to the village.
AR, AT	Support	natural development from centre of village. No need for further village hall and not ribbon development development
AR, AT	Support	This site sits well next to the existing village of Chelveston. The village hall and play areas would be a valuable facility for the village.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Fewer houses
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	I FEEL IT IS TO BIG TO EARLY
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	If there were less houses & I don't see that we need a new village hall when the existing one has grants to do it up & what would happen to it.
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	No need for village hall, unsure why the proposal was just re-submitted as is from previous refusal
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Number of houses reduced by at least half
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Provision of playground
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	Provision of playground/recreational area
AB, AS, AY	Conditional Support	There is no need for a new village hall

<a href="#">NDP-S021</a>	<b>Stuart Carr</b>	<b>50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space</b>
AD, AE	Conditional Support	50 houses is too much - 25/30 more acceptable. I like the idea of a village green and play area to improve community relations. The house need to look attractive on approach from Higham.
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Fewer properties
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Only if the no of dwellings is reduced to 25
AD, AE	Conditional Support	Remove through road to Duchy Close Reduce/cap houses at 25 Remove 2 bed cheap housing Keep village green & hall
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	1. A large Village Green was gifted to the Village and put hard up against the houses in Duchy Close to protect their outlook. 2. The New Village Hall idea was ditched. 3. No access off the Higham Road - access should be School House Corner 4. The total number of houses was 25 now and 25 after 2035
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Fewer houses, and provided recreation land was provided. Do we need a new village hall?
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No need for the village hall, get rid of it
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	No Village Hall - recreation land yes, hopefully more families to buy
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Numbers reduced
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	Reduced numbers
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	The number of dwellings was reduced by 20%. The access to the development is considerate to walkers who use the footpaths on B645. There is an installation of road safety speed limits and pedestrian crossings
AF, AG, AP	Conditional Support	This is the big one, if this is done well this could be the only development the village needs, if the streets weren't narrow and the houses of similar build to duchy this would be great. Like I said any more than this and the village would be expanding far too rapidly. But this development would breathe a whole new life into the village. I would say 20-30 dwellings of similar type to duchy close or mallows grange in stanwick would be the perfect number. Again, new pub:no , BIGGER pub: YES. This larger pub (in accompanment to this dwelling development) would be a huge attraction for the village and the new village hall would have to be modern and large so village events, fetes can occur. A new Chelveston...but not too big. As long as everyone knows everyone.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	50 houses too many
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I think that 25 houses would be nearer the mark.

<a href="#">NDP-S021</a>	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	I would support this proposal if the whole package is tied into one contract to ensure that we do not get the houses without the additional facilities. I would also prefer fewer, larger houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	if cut down to 20 & affordable
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	If the large Chelston Rise development did not go ahead I would support this, I think on the whole the plan is good but combine this and another 35 or 70 house development and it would overwhelm the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	Looks overcrowded. Would rather see fewer better/larger houses.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	50 houses in this area represents a 33% increase in the village housing. The idea of using this area for housing and the proposed facilities is good. The number of houses proposed should be reduced. There should be no access via Duchy Close to avoid the establishment of a rat run.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	I feel that the proposed development is far too big and would impact hugely on the village. I welcome the proposal for a recreational facility, something sadly missing from the village at present. I also feel that a new village hall would be a welcome asset. The existing facility is rather small and in need of updating. However, my main concern is the proposed access which I understand to be via Duchy Close which already struggles to cope with the traffic for existing residents. Most of the houses on Duchy Close have insufficient parking space and consequently residents are forced to park second and even third cars on the road. This renders the road to a virtual single carriageway and makes life very difficult for guests visiting residents, delivery trucks, refuse collection etc. Increasing traffic using the close would make life intolerable. Unless more sensible access can be found this proposal must be rejected.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	If facilities - doctors school, shop in place before development.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Less houses - village cannot support the increase in population without - doctors - school shop etc
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	No through rd from duchy close. average speed camera on main rd & two pelican crossings
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Smaller development.
AQ, AW	Conditional Support	Smaller no. of houses
AR, AT	Conditional Support	But need to see detailed plans before i decide.
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Provided strict controls were in place for extra facilities for village
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Reduce number of houses to 30 Relocate 'green' community facilities community facilities closer to Duchy Close No requirement for 'village hall'
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Reduce the number of houses. Do we need another village hall. Does the village need recreation land

**NDP-S021**     **Stuart Carr**     **50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AR, AT	Conditional Support	Reduction of houses to 20 Move green play area closer to Duchy Close No requirement for village hall/community centre
AR, AT	Conditional Support	Up to 20 dwellings
AU	Conditional Support	25 HOUSES (OPEN MARKET AND RETIREMENT BUNGALOWS)
AU	Conditional Support	25 HOUSES (OPEN MARKET AND RETIREMENT BUNGALOWS)
AU	Conditional Support	If less houses were built as not to spoil views for residents & a village hall would be great for the community
AU	Conditional Support	If the number were reduced
AU	Conditional Support	It is a lovely idea but wouldn't want that many houses. Village hall would be acceptable for the community.
AU	Conditional Support	Too many dwellings but village hall would be good for community
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Conditional Support	
AB, AS, AY	Reject	An ill conceived proposal which is out of keeping with the village.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Far too many dwellings + access could be dangerous on the hill
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Increases the size of the village by too much
AB, AS, AY	Reject	It is again too many houses - Chelveston is meant to be a VILLAGE after all. Also why do we need a village hall.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Not on green field. Totally change the layout of the village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	NOT TILL 2020
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Over development of village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This is a quite unrealistic proposition. We will not need this number of dwellings, all in one place, for decades.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	This will be the beginning of the end of our village, as this will be turning the village into a small town. Also I like the old village hall
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too big a development for Chelveston Removes green space and spoils the character of the village We don't need all these houses or another village hall Access issues and too high an impact on Duchy Close This is just money grabbing
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too big for the village
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too big outside my overall max number. Would take up to 5 yrs to complete, result in even more traffic problems & H&S issues for road access (in/out). Shop not sustainable, already have village hall

<a href="#">NDP-S021</a>	<b>Stuart Carr</b>	<b>50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space</b>
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Too many houses for the village. We do not need a second village hall. Having a large housing estate will totally change the feel and look of the village. This would give us at least 100 more residents cars.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Traffic implications, too large, visual approach to village impaired.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Way too many
AB, AS, AY	Reject	We have a village hall which serves the purpose well. This development would be large for the road network.
AB, AS, AY	Reject	With no requirement for such a big increase in the village it is rejected outright
AB, AS, AY	Reject	Would entirely ruin the look of the village, such a large development is too big for the size of the village
AD, AE	Reject	Relative to the size of the village this development is too big and changes the character of the village - increases village by 30%. There are also access and traffic flow issues arising from this plan. Not sure there is currently a need for a new village hall.
AD, AE	Reject	Site too large for the village.
AD, AE	Reject	Too large development for the village
AD, AE	Reject	Too large for this village and a new village hall should not be used to sway decision.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many dwellings relative to the current size of the village. Negative impact on character of village. Road not suitable for the volume of traffic generated. Not convinced of the need for a new village hall.
AD, AE	Reject	Too many houses. Keep Chelveston a small village
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Extends the village and is not to my mind classified as infill. Potential black spot for cars entering and leaving the new site
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Far too big for Chelveston at this stage.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I strongly oppose the building of a village hall on this site. If it were to be hired for parties, weddings etc due the noise would be heard all around the village and parties could be a nightmare . We have a very good village hall. Also who would pay for it's upkeep.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	I understood the house attached to the present village hall provided funds from rent for the upkeep of the hall. How would a new one be funded? Totally unsuitable place when there is an adequate building now.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	In a village the size of Chelveston a build of this size is totally unacceptable
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Insufficient access, too many houses.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It would change the whole nature of the village, both actually & visually. It is on a greenfield site, which once developed could easily lead to even more development on the adjacent site. It is in effect a housing estate.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	It's too big and will obviously be phase 1 of a bigger plan. Would prefer the village hall to stay where it is as it links Chelveston to Caldecott
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is far too much.

**NDP-S021 Stuart Carr 50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AF, AG, AP	Reject	This is overdevelopment with inadequate access to the B645. The provision of a village hall and other financial contribution is nothing short of bribery in order to secure support for this proposal.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This will have enormous impact on the village, including increased traffic through residential areas. I would consider leaving the village is this was allowed.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would change the character of the village. If our existing village hall is having an upgrade we do not need the sweetener offered.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	This would severely impact current residents on Duchy Close with no room to improve roads, the increase in traffic would endanger villagers and reduce house prices
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too big. Not wanted. Want a village not a town!
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large, no need for village hall, we already have one currently being improved. Could later lead to further back development. Would detract from he 'feel' of the village.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too large, would alter the village completely.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Too much impact on Duchy Close
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We really dont need this amount of houses. chelveston wont look like large areas are built on .
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We already have a village hall! No one wants a housing estate on the field - far too many houses for a small village without facilities. Problems with flooding in Water Lane
AF, AG, AP	Reject	We do not need mass housing in the village. In previous discussions people of this village have said no to this sort of development.
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would change the village completely
AF, AG, AP	Reject	Would change village and not in a good way
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	1. Too big (80% increase) a development on the edge of the village with lose of rural aspect 2. Four new exits onto B645 already designated a Red Route - potential safety issue 3. No need for another village hall
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Do not need this amount, would spoil the village
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Far too big a development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	I see this development further into the future and not needed yet with all the other sites I have endorsed.

**NDP-S021**     **Stuart Carr**     **50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	No need for extra village hall. 50 houses would spoil rural aspects of Chelveston Safety issues from B645 ad entrances/exits to this development/
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	The village needs some housing not an entire town
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	this would not be good for the village (shades of Duchy Close). as it would greatly increase the size of a small village. Could also lead to further planning requests for the remaining part of the field at a later date.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	This would represent far too much change to a village where the landscape has already undergone so much change due to the wind turbines
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To many houses in this area. What is proposal for exisiting village hall.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	To many houses, dangerous access point halfway up a hill that is very busy and fast despite speed notification light.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big a development
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big for the village. Nice to see green fields as one approaches Chelveston.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too big, too many houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too big. Too many houses. No need for a 2nd village hall.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many do not need this amount
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses

<a href="#">NDP-S021</a>	Stuart Carr	50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses being built in such a short time frame. The promise of a new village hall is a very clever ploy to obtain approval for this application, so the parish should not be swayed into approving the application because of this. Chelveston already has a village hall in beautiful surroundings and should be preserved at all costs. Chelveston does not have the facilities to support the needs of this quantity of houses and would realistically be unable to provide them by 2018. Approving this development is the first step in chelveston becoming a town, which I strongly oppose as I chose to live in a small village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too many houses being built in such a short time frame. The promise of a new village hall is a very clever ploy to obtain approval for this application, so the parish should not be swayed into approving the application because of this. Chelveston already has a village hall in beautiful surroundings and should be preserved at all costs. Chelveston does not have the facilities to support the needs of this quantity of houses and would realistically be unable to provide them by 2018. Approving this development is the first step in chelveston becoming a town, which I strongly oppose as I chose to live in a small village.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	too many! and don't need another hall, recreation land or market. Access will be a problem
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	Too much development will make the village sprawl
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	We do not need a new village hall. Too many houses.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	Reject	wrong place. Traffic problems. Too many houses and we do not need another village hall
AQ, AW	Reject	As I live at the top of Duchy Close, this development would spoil my views, peace and quiet and also devalue my home. The development will expand the village far too much and create a big housing development of which we do not want to live in. The facilities proposed are not required. We have a beautiful village hall. No need for a park!
AQ, AW	Reject	Bad
AQ, AW	Reject	Chelveston does not need a large housing estate. It does not need a new village hall; and with less children than in the 1980's a recreation field is debateable. Access will be dangerous. It will detract from the appearance of the whole village.

**NDP-S021**     **Stuart Carr**     **50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AQ, AW	Reject	Completely not in keeping with the existing village we don't need the sweeteners, we have a village hall. No access should be through the existing Duchy Close. It would join Chelveston to Caldecott making a single string village rather than the character of village we currently have. It is abundantly clear that further development is anticipated by the access road to nowhere adjacent to the paddock in NDP-S015. Too large a development almost increasing village by a third.
AQ, AW	Reject	Don't need new village hall. Access is dangerous into B645 and Duchy Close already car clogged. Ruin rural village atmosphere - develop village by 30%. Water services are already poor. This is effectively another village. Could lead to rest of field being developed. Do not need a shop or village green or play area. Local schools could not cope with this number of new homes.
AQ, AW	Reject	Duchy Close has a problem with parking already, to extend it would only add to the problem. We do not need a village hall, the one we have is OK. a development of this size would change the village for the worse.
AQ, AW	Reject	For this plan to work the route via Duchy Close would need to be widened. Also it would set a precedence for the field to be filled in a future neighbourhood plan. Neither of these are acceptable
AQ, AW	Reject	I do not wish to see the village increase in size with a large development. This would increase the village by a third without all the other proposals as well. Also why do we need another Village Hall when we have one just across the road which currently has funding for renovation.
AQ, AW	Reject	I feel this would be too many houses. If access was through Duchy Close this would significantly increase the through put of traffic. If access was on the main road this could be dangerous
AQ, AW	Reject	I moved here for the lovely views, and the quiet village feel. Having this development will and traffic, spoil the village views, and most importantly ruin a village feel, because it will be too big.
AQ, AW	Reject	Increase of traffic through Duchy Close.
AQ, AW	Reject	Much too big. We already have a village hall which is being up-dated, and the traffic flow would be excessive.
AQ, AW	Reject	Not suitable for lots of reasons, access - scale - water drainage if built on and would change village dramatically Has never been suitable, is not suitable now and will never be.
AQ, AW	Reject	Ridiculous. Access is dangerous. Will seem like a separate village 'stuck' on the outside. Opening Duchy Close would be better. We do not need another village hall
AQ, AW	Reject	The size of this development would completely change the character of the village. Electricity, water and other services would not be able to cope. Additional development in the location would increase the risk of flooding for downstream residences.
AQ, AW	Reject	the village cannot sustain this amount of new houses

**NDP-S021 Stuart Carr 50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AQ, AW	Reject	This development is extending the existing perimeter of the village and enclosing existing housing. The village hall is not required as we already have one. Some people live in housing on the edge for that reason alone, and do not want to be boxed in!
AQ, AW	Reject	This many houses in one location is excessive and not supported by my family. Additional housing on Duchy Close would increase traffic on and already busy street. The land owner didn't satisfy residents' concerns over parking. The additional access from the B645 is also a concern.
AQ, AW	Reject	This would be too imposing on Duchy Close, it would be a danger to the estate/main road with movement going into and out of the new buildings. It would take up too much of the green space
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would drastically alter village Extra traffic on Duchy Close
AQ, AW	Reject	Too big a change - would drastically alter village Extra traffic on Duchy Close
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large scale, new village hall not required. Extends development boundary of village. This is not infill.
AQ, AW	Reject	Too large!!
AQ, AW	Reject	Too many houses. No plans for the adjacent road which is already dangerous. Increased number of vehicles passing through Duchy Close would provide a danger to the children living in Duchy Close. Views out the back of Duchy Close which enhance the quality of life of residents would be lost.
AQ, AW	Reject	Unincrease pressure on local roads and services.afe onto B645 or into Duchy Close road not suitable for extention. ? not neede. Village Hall not needed. ? rural landscapes.
AQ, AW	Reject	We do not need all these houses We do not need a new village hall or recreation field
AR, AT	Reject	A housing estate would not be in keeping with the character of the village. A precedent would be set for further development - potentially 100 + houses on the remaining land.
AR, AT	Reject	Agricultural land
AR, AT	Reject	Changes, size look and feel of the village. Village already has a hall for use by the community.
AR, AT	Reject	Completely away from current feel and look of the village
AR, AT	Reject	Far too many houses - this is a village. Do not turn it into a small town
AR, AT	Reject	No major developments
AR, AT	Reject	No village hall required it would change the nature of the village and block existing views unappealing.
AR, AT	Reject	Although this may not affect me it would affect others and they may not want development. Therefore it would be inappropriate for me to make a decision that would/wouldn't affect/relate to me.

**NDP-S021 Stuart Carr 50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AR, AT	Reject	The village hall should stay the same, people know and love it the way it is, there is memories that would be lost and history within the building. and as for that amount of houses, there is no need for 50 more houses.
AR, AT	Reject	This proposition would mean I feel, that Chelveston and Caldecott would each lose their separate entities as a village.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many dwellings relative to the size of Chelveston. It would give Chelveston the look of a housing estate rather than a village. The access is also straight onto a very busy red route. Also do not need a new village hall. The current one is being upgraded.
AR, AT	Reject	Too many proposed dwellings. The access is onto a red route and is dangerous. It could also double in size in the future once dwellings have been established.
AU	Reject	Absolutely NOT - we have a lovely traditional village hall. This is a 200% increase of dwellings
AU	Reject	Already have a village hall, to many house
AU	Reject	Far to big a development for the parish that is not needed and would make an already dangerous road even worse. I cant see any way that this development should get accepted
AU	Reject	Farm land very important to us all
AU	Reject	I reject this as it would be nearly join Chelveston to Caldecott and the access is ridiculous on that blind bend on the busy b645
AU	Reject	Local infrastructure cannot take and does not need such an influx in one go - local roads cannot take all the new motor movements. This would change the village too much
AU	Reject	No more houses
AU	Reject	No need for this number of dwellings, this would change the dynamics of environment.
AU	Reject	The new village hall may be a nice idea but there's too many dwelling proposed
AU	Reject	There are far too many houses wanted on this area. It isn't big enough & will cause too much traffic & noise. We like it quiet & rural
AU	Reject	This no of proposed houses is going to make Caldecott no longer a hamlet and will become a small town
AU	Reject	This in my opinion is a ridiculous proposition that would destroy the village causing numerous problems including traffic and parking especially taking into consideration the darsdale development that will be getting built in the near future.
AU	Reject	This would increase the village size and traffic on a red route. It would also spoil the landscape
AU	Reject	Too large a development
AU	Reject	Too many houses - a village!!
AU	Reject	Too many houses - this is a village not a town
AU	Reject	Too many houses and we already have a village hall
AU	Reject	Too many residences

**NDP-S021    Stuart Carr    50 dwellings, community centre, village amenity space**

AU	Reject	Use of open field. it will completely overwhelm the village
AU	Reject	Uses field. Too many houses in a small area. No requirement for village hall.
AU	Reject	Will create too many cars and take away our countryside.
AH, AJ, AL, AN, AX, RA	No Opinion	We do not need a large housing estate such as this, or a new village hall
AU	No Opinion	No changes, just need more information