

Questionnaire comments
Comments made on specific questions in survey

Question 1 - shop / café

| Number | Comment |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1023 | Depends on site;depends on continuation of the very good butchery and stores |
| 1074 | No café |
| 1164 | Previous information sheet relating to a village shop it states the possibility of a farm shop. It is hoped that this idea would not hinder the butchers who already offer and excellent service |
| 1165 | Any future development of a village stores post office or café should not have a detrimental effect on the butcher shop which provides excellent facilities!! |
| 1213 | I would prefer to see the second shop created by the school not on Morgans Field |
| 1212 | I would like to see a second shop situated in the proposed development by Richard Stoddart but not the HoV proposal on Morgans Field |
| 1240 | Ant future develoment should not compromise or threaten the viability of the butchers/general store |
| 1242 | I am strongly opposed to another shop as I do not consider there is sufficient trade for two shops and this could result in the village being left without a shop at all. Rather than have another shop it would be better to encourage support of the one we have which provides an excellent service and has not failed to open in the worst of weathers. Please consider very carefully before risking the continuation of this service which many of us rely on. |
| 1280 | The exisiting shop gives a great service but it is a private business and a second community shop would offer longer term security |
| 1286 | Shop/café not viable and would have detrimental impact on existing butchers/store. |
| 1291 | Doubts but no objections (to additional shop) A shop staffed by volunteers! Where are they coming from? Would prefer the 'SGG' to become the 'village green' with a riverside pathway |
| 1294 | If there are to be a shop/cafe/houses in Cradley they ought to be near the school. They will have easy access from the main road without the need for motr cars to drive through the village. The Worcester - Ledbury bus stops nearby so making it safer than walking along the narrow lanes. They will be convenient for parents to stop off for a coffe or do some shopping when dropping off or picking up their children from school. If on site parking was provided it would alleviate the necessity for parents to park on the the road outside the school. It would also have a less negative effect on the butchers being that side of the village. |
| 1342 | I don't feel the community can support 2 shops. I can walk to Blue Ginger and the Red Lion. Funds and plans should be made available for community shop. It will be needed should the butchery close. |
| 1345 | A shop should be at the opposite end of the village to the existing butchers ie opposite the school, neart the A4103 and certainly not on the flood plain. |
| 1349 | The Cradley butchers is very relevant at this moment in time but 5-10 years down the road? Who knows what Pete will have decided and done? |
| 1356 | Q1.The wording of this question has a bias by naming the current store. I only want another shop in the village if it is community owned. |
| 1364 | Support the butchers! |
| 1387 | Any shop needs to be near the school, not in the old school area. I am concerned that a community shop would, if successful, herald the demise of the Cradley butchery. |
| 1378 | The concept of a shop / café is attractive but needs further work to establish whether there is genuine demand |
| 1379 | I think a second shop/café would be nice ion the furthest spot away from the butchers so there is no direct competition with them. Why use PC money to pay for it when Church Stile Farm are willing to pay for it all. We want to comply with new house numbers anyway so let them pay for it all. |
| 1384 | I am in favour of a community shop |
| 1407 | I cannot see the point in spending money for another shop when there is a perfectly adequate one in the vilage (Pete's butchers shop).If there is to be one it should be sited neat the school, Buryfields and the Leys. |
| 1441 | My no vote is simply based on the fact it will be difficult if not impossible for both shops to survive |
| 1408 | I feel other areas should be explored with regard to the development of shop and housing plans.(i.e.Mobile Shop), and lets not forget we have a thriving shop in the village already. |
| 1512 | Any hope of a full time post office? |
| 1788 | I would only support the building of an extra shop if it was located near the 'new' school in order to miminise the impact of more traffic on the narrow lanes of 'old' Cradley. |
| 1717 | Any village stores must be self financing and not reliant on village fundraising. |
| 1718 | My response re: the shop specifically relates to a fear that a second shop could lose us the butchery, which in my opinion is a major village asset. |

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1719 | Shop is desirable providing it does not conflict with other issues above - ie not in strategic gap and not as part of large housing development. |
| 1720 | Q1-this is a biased question on the form and should not have included mention of the existing shop. |
| 1721 | Q1-this is a loaded question and should not have been linked to the existing shop. |
| 1737 | 1.I believe most people would want more facilities in the village including a shop/café however they would need to be sustainable and therefore a community one - possibly including the Butchers. |
| 1765 | Maintaining the existing shops a good thing! If either of these disappears, some other facility would be welcome. |
| 1780 | Any second shop should serve Buryfields ie be at opposite end of village to butchers. Any café needs to be far enough away from Blue Ginger |
| 1809 | No new shop is required whilst the butchers shop is still open and viable |
| 1822 | Another shop(which would fail) would only weaken our last remaining shop / butcher facility. Café would not be used and would eventually be abandoned(for conversion) when volunteers get bored. |
| 1823 | If the post office could not be a viable business, why should another shop be successful? Also why take business from the butchers? This might lead to it closing down. |
| 1862 | Post off ice requirement in village centrally |
| 1908 | If a shop is decided on the obvious place is near the school, sports ground and houses where people do not have cars. The shop should not encroach on facilities we already have ie Pete and Lynne our good butchers. |
| 2189 | It seems unfair to the butchery to open a shop in competition, althoug a café / meeting place would be nice and it might be open when the butchery is closed. Question of whether volunteers would be continue to be available to man the shop/café. |
| 2185 | As someone who lives 2 miles from the centre of Cradley village I feel it would be presumptuous of me to advocate any scheme which those who live in the village dislike. I am unlikely to do more shopping in the village as it would inevitably involve me in driving a car and I could almost as easily go to Leigh Sinton or Malvern. |
| 2223 | In response to Q 1 - I would like a community owned shop and café on community owned land as proposed by Heart of the Village, a community led project. This is very different to just 'a second shop'. |
| 2326 | I feel we should support the butchery and general stores as they provide an excellent service to the village and beyond |
| 1026 | Stoddards Field is suitable |
| 1027 | The correct place is top of Buryfields near the houses and the school |
| 1902 | Q1 does not seem objective as it names the Butchers but not any other local amenities such as Blue Ginger gallery and café and Crumpton Hill Farm shop. The butchers used to be a butchers - has it changed to a general store also in title? |
| 1903 | The wording of Q1 is likely to prejudice people as it makes specific reference to a business that people use. It seems also beyond the remit of council whether a shop / enterprise is 'allowed' to exist or not. |
| 1940 | Yes for community shop and café |
| 1943 | Community shop and café |
| 1998 | Please support Crumpton Hill farm shop (+possible café)+ other rural businesses |
| 2355 | I object to the provision of a shop as a sweetener for any developer in the village being granted permission to build housing. Surely this isn't legal! I also feel strongly that Cradley will benefit enormously from a village shop and cafe to help bring a stronger sense of community back to the village. With no pub, or post office (and currently shop), the village bit by bit is losing the amenities which make it an attractive place for people to choose to live. In the absence of a shop in the old part of the village, my parents for example, will no longer consider moving here when they downsize. I a m sure they are not alone in reconsidering Cradley as an appealing place to live. |
| 3472 | I would only want provision for another shop should there be a question that our current excellent shop is about to close. |

Question 2 - sports pitches and car parking

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1030 | I support sports pitches on field north of Cradley school |
| 1364 | There are 2 parks already which hardly get used why waste money and time building a sports facilities? Logic??? Children of today lack respect. They wee + throw mud over all existing park facilities. Plus all the neighbours complain about the noise. |
| 1811 | The sports pitches should not be allowed to include lighting |
| 1902 | Sports pitches with toilet facilities and car parking |
| | |

Question 3 - Strategic Gap (including comments specific to Morgans Field)

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1022 | Although Morgans Field is reasonably centrally situated for a café / recreation area, I am doubtful that the people of Cradley would give it sufficient support to make it viable. |
| 1026 | Morgans Field is totally unsuitable:- a) it floods despite assurances that floods will not affect site; b) remote from centres of housing; c) pedestrian routes are dangerous - totally unsuitable |
| 1027 | It seems Morgans Field is totally unsuitable. Difficulty walking to it completely the wrong place |
| 1030 | I support Heart of the Village @ Morgans Field |
| 1031 | re Q3 I want the strategic gap kept free from HOUSING development, but I support the Heart of the Village shop/cafe on Morgan's Field. |
| 1033 | It is not clear what the strategic gap is. On making further enquiries I have understood, however, the phrasing of the question biases answers against the proposal for a "heart of the village" which I absolutely support. This questionnaire is not fair in this regard. It is misleading to the community and does not allow for a fair discussion over the heart of the village proposal. |
| 1290 | I would like Morgans Field to become a landscaped park without a shop or café |
| 1302 | If the Strategic Green Gap is between the doctors surgery and the church then my response to q 3 is yes. |
| 1342 | An oak shelter for picnics, car park and walk on Morgan's Field would introduce a new amenity. |
| 1344 | Please leave the Gap! |
| 1345 | The Strategic Gap must remain |
| 1356 | Q3. I regard this question as invalid as you have not defined the strategic gap and you will not be able to use the result |
| 1358 | I strongly support the plans put forward by The Heart of the village. It could greatly enhance the quality of life for many people in the village for years to come. |
| 1359 | I strongly support the Heart of the Village's plan for a new shop and cafe on Morgan's Field. |
| 1366 | I do not support the proposed development nr Kingsbridge. Most people would use their cars for access, as it is removed from BOTH sides of the village, via the narrow roads of Finchers Corner and the village. |
| 1391 | Heart of Village I deem this a fair weather project and as such non viable |
| 1438 | I support the Heart of the Village plan which I believe is in the Strategic Gap but would not want other development in that area |
| 1439 | Yes to shop development no to houses |
| 1460 | No building should take place on Morgan's field as this could open the way for building in the strategic gap. Building on Morgan's field would mean more traffic along the narrow lanes and would be even more dangerous for pedestrians. |
| 1461 | No building on Morgan's Field Keep traffic out of the village |
| 1496 | I believe that the Heart of the Village is a good idea and would help to unite the two halves of the community and provide a useful service / facility. |
| 1497 | In full support of Heart of Village project |
| 1709 | The proposed shop / café on the field at the end of the lane from the church to bridge seems good for the community, if the bus service stops there for the folk who cannot walk that far. However is this part of the Strategic Gap? I do not want the building of this to be linked to a private housing development plan. |
| 1720 | Q3-except for Community shop and café and related Community development. |
| 1721 | Q3-except for Community 2nd shop and café and related Community development. |
| 1737 | 3.As there is no proposal -yes free of development is desirable however such an answer would be wrong depending on what proposal was on the table. |
| 1738 | The only new shop / café should be the heart of the village (Morgan Field). The AONB should be kept free of development. The conservation area should be kept free of further development |
| 1739 | The only new shop / café should be the heart of the village (Morgan Field). The AONB should be kept free of development. The conservation area should be kept free of further development |
| 1744 | Don't agree with housing development of Strategic Gap but am happy with the Heart of the Village project on Morgan's field as a site for Village shop and centre. |
| 1745 | Don't want housing on Strategic Green Gap but happy with Heart of Village project on Morgans Field. |
| 1758 | I am happy for development on the Strategic Gap as long as it relates to 'green', community amenities - such as the proposed Heart of the Village. The views of the Malvern Hills as well as the local environment should be protected and housing development avoided. |
| 1765 | Kingsbridge not an ideal area for development. Narrow lanes not good for increased traffic. |
| 1796 | I feel strongly that developments joining two parts of the village would spoil the atmosphere of the village. |

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1802 | The strategic gap should allow for community development, ie heart of the village shop etc, but not housing. |
| 1803 | I wholly support the Heart of the Village community development, which will be in the Strategic Gap. |
| 1810 | Any form of development including the Heart of Village should not be allowed at Morgans Field due to the prohibitive constraints at the site. |
| 1811 | Development in Morgans Field of any kind should be prohibited due to the constraints on the site. |
| 1868 | Where is strategic gap? I would like to see the Heart of the Village in Morgans Field |
| 1869 | Where is strategic gap? I would like to see the Heart of the Village in Morgans Field |
| 1885 | I like the Heart of the Village which will have land for people to meet and play. |
| 1884 | I feel that the green gap is divisive, as a no mans land between East / West Cradley. The Heart of the Village proposals seem to unite the village appropriately, with a community amenity that is sensitive and practical. Does development in Q 3 (strategic Gap) mean 'dwellings'? This should be clarified. |
| 1902 | I support the Heart of the Village proposal especially if it has covered / sheltered outdoor space to cope with the weather. |
| 1903 | Normally smaller developments, but if a development that included community facilities / amenities in the strategic gap I would support a larger development |
| 1940 | Only for a community project - not housing and not commercial. The Gap would be of greater value if it could be used by all villagers in perpetuity. |
| 1942 | I find it bizarre that we are not being asked about the community led HoV project. This has no links with property developments and any profit made goes back to the community. Perfect project to be considered by an NDP, I would have thought. |
| 1943 | I am happy for community development in the 'gap' - but where is the gap and why is there no map? |
| 1998 | Is there such a gap between Malvern and Storridge. |
| 2223 | In response to q 3 - I am opposed to a large amount of residential development on the strategic gap - however , I am not opposed to a small amount of housing in return for the rest of the land being turned over to the community on a long lease as proposed by the Green Farm project. |
| 2250 | If there has to be a shop (I personally will continue to use the butchers) then on Morgans Field only. Can't see the point in a café why not do as Mathon do, on a Friday coffee and chat for 1 1/2 hours! |
| 2274 | Heart of the Village plan is a complete waste. We already have these facilities, they are underused. The planners of this foolish scheme are in cloud cuckoo land re the financial and volunteer input needed. |
| 2289 | My concern about closing the strategic green gap is that this narrow road with no passing places for much of its length will be hazardous and not fit for purpose, if there were to be housing developments and this a subsequent increase of cars using the road |
| 2352 | I support the Heart of the Village proposal in Morgan's Field. |
| 0 | We should work hard to maintain the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Conservation area. The Strategic gap is a way of stopping development sprawl. The Heart of the Village proposition is a win win sustainable solution for a new village facility. (No questionnaire received.) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Question 4 / 5 - housing development

| | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | |
| 1063 | I fail to understand why the pressure to build has to be born solely by Cradley |
| 1072 | I do not want to see any more housing developments in Cradley:- roads cannot cope with amount of traffic. It would cause chaos at the main road junction |
| 1198 | I hope that the outline planning permission for 60 houses above Pixiefield can now be scaled down if not removed as I understand there are plenty of other houses already planned. |
| 1281 | Housing development should be proportionate to the village area ie up to 59 off Pixiefields is not proportionate. Perhaps the proposed development near Buryfields is better |
| 1330 | My answer to Q 5 is whatever is appropriate for our infrastructure - roads, drainage etc our school and our doctors surgery. I would favour housing on the edge of the village ie the Stoddard development but all the above would need answers. |
| 1344 | As regards houses and a shop I believe Stoddards Field to be the most sensible place. |
| 1349 | We need to consider future generations in Cradley - so some more low priced housing in East, combined with a drop in café /social centre / shop. (Historically schools erect portacabins to accommodate the extra children with a view to building extensions when the budget allows. |

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1350 | Am in favour of Stoddart plan near the school - if we are to have an area of more than 10 houses. |
| 1356 | Q5. I don't feel qualified to specify the number of houses but feel forced to choose either a, b, or c to avoid voting for "estate" type development |
| 1366 | A development at Stoddard's, which I support, would fulfil some housing provision, and is next to the school, The Leys and Buryfields, (close for a shop etc) and if the road to the A4103 is widened would have good access. |
| 1385 | I favour community projects, not development |
| 1391 | Preferably none. |
| 1502 | Future housing should cater for first time buyers |
| 1503 | No more big houses. Smaller houses for first time buyers |
| 1544 | That any development is of a traditional design. Not like the some of the awful development that has been allowed |
| 1720 | I do not want to see Stoddard's fields developed. Q5-I don't want to see further development as there has been a large increase in population in the recent past and more is already in the pipeline |
| 1721 | Q5-no further development as there has already been sufficient. I do not want to see Stoddards Field developed. |
| 1737 | 4. Again most people will say yes to this however as no proposal is offered it is not a fair question . 5. As above. |
| 1740 | Nationally there will soon be an extreme shortage of housing especially affordable housing. By restricting development too far there is a danger of moving all young people away from village living and creating just an elderly community. I appreciate the need for controlling where we build. |
| 1741 | New houses are needed now, especially affordable homes, we must encourage & enable young people to stay in and new families to come the village. Suitable sites are available within the village. |
| 1765 | Small developments fine. Presumably this is assuming the large Pixiefields development already approved? Some growth in population, especially at the lower end of the age-range, a very good thing. Avoid becoming an area of unbroken residential development without facilities. |
| 1776 | In my opinion Richard Stoddards proposed development is the best for the village |
| 1777 | Of the proposals recently submitted I prefer the Stoddard plan, but with less houses and more landscaped parking because parking outside the school is dangerous and will lead to accidents |
| 1786 | My preferred option regarding further development is for no further development (assuming Cradley has already reached its housing allocation under the Herefordshire Core Strategy.) Given that the sentence in bold type in the introduction says ' as a result we don't have to have any further housing' it is disappointing this option is not available in the questionnaire. |
| 1787 | My preferred option re development is for no further development assuming that we have already reached its housing allocation as the front of this questionnaire suggests. It is a shame that a 'no' option is not available in question 5. |
| 1700 | Any proposed housing should include more affordable homes for local residents - developments not more than 30 houses. |
| 1701 | My preferred development of the current sites is opposite the school |
| 1801 | I would like to see more affordable housing in particular rented as shared ownership is still too expensive for some people. The need would have to be proven. |
| 1804 | Whilst the PC cannot support commercial ventures, surely the PC has a responsibility to refute misleading information eg Stoddards offering village shop, Post Office, café, restaurant and shop!! |
| 1854 | I think the proposed plans put forward by the Stoddard family are very sound and would vote for them |
| 1855 | I support the Stoddard family development proposal |
| 1909 | We have gracefully accepted a lot of planning in Cradley and believe that what is left should be preserved. We accept that the selected infill must happen, but if the village is not protected we will become urban, which takes away the reason for people wanting to live in our beautiful village. The narrow village roads will be a nightmare. |
| 2190 | Q4 is ambiguous. There is no option for zero development and no limit to the number of developments of whatever size. <i>Zero development indicated by this respondent</i> |
| 2199 | Low-cost starter homes only |
| 2223 | In response to Q4 - I would like the NDP group to identify sites that are appropriate for residential development within the community along with the buildign capacity for the site. |
| 2275 | There will inevitably be some more in fill houses, so the last thing Cradley wants is an estate of new houses to add to its problems |
| 2291 | Please support 'Church Stile Farm' proposal |
| 2292 | Controlled and proportionate development should be considered. Church Stile Farm site is the best for purpose site for housing, community amenity, shop/café and village green. Please support this option |
| 2293 | Housing and a shop next to the village school makes sense to me?! |

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2294 | Village green, shop, post office,café housing meeting centre for community on my land please at Church Stile Farm. |
| 2344 | As we don't have to agree to any further housing being built, and as the majority of Cradley people object to such a thing (NIMBYs or not!) why on earth are you considering doing so? This is a lovely village why spoil it? |
| 2203 | Any future developments should be of mixed size and affordability. |
| | |
| | Wider issues |
| | |
| | Infrastructure (roads, surgery, school etc) |
| | |
| 1074 | We badly need a new villahge hall where proper things can be held parking old boys hall not good enough we need a few bus shelters kids getting soaked wet. We don't need a football pitch. Something done about speed. |
| 1241 | Any housing development should only be approved if the village infrastructure can support the additional increase in population in terms of roads, sewage, schooling etc |
| 1276 | The village needs a community centre large enough for functions with car parking and bus shelters |
| 1277 | The village needs to develop as one not east and west why the divide? We also need a large community centre + room built as post office / shop / café? Bishops Frome have had two village centres built Cradley a much larger community nothing. The Old Boys school is not suitable for large functions also the road and parking facilities are not adequate. With the future developments ongoing we need a lot more bus shelters not gated entrances. What a silly idea they are useless additions to any country village and serve no purpose. |
| 1286 | Need existing services improved to accept major housing developments e.g.Doctors/Schools/Sewerage/Drainage and Road access. |
| 1364 | Sort out the roads, tidy the village |
| 1365 | Why don't you clean up Cradley, before wasting time + money developing it when many people won't use it. |
| 1374 | It's a small village and cannot take more housing as doctors will be overrun and other services may also be adversely affected. |
| 1375 | Cradley is fine as it is now. Any further increase in housing / people will only make it more difficult for our doctors and other services |
| 1378 | The infrastructure of the village is already stretched so any additional development must be on condition the developers fund improvements to the surgery / sewage / school. |
| 1391 | School, surgery, lanes, essential facilities couldn't cope |
| 1434 | Hoping to slow down the inevitable power of the council. |
| 1435 | Hoping to slow down the inevitable power of the council. |
| 1442 | Provision of a relocated GP surgery with adequate car parking and patient facilities will become an important issue to be addressed in due course |
| 1488 | There needs to be a total rethink on the use of the church. Turn it back into the building it was originally meant to be - a centre for the village - meeting place - village hall etc. Discard the pews, replace with chairs and use for a multitude of village activities. See Bedworth church, Worcester St John's Church (I don't know the name of the church in St Johns Worcs) It is my understanding that the nave is owned and maintained by the community - not the Church of England. |
| 1502 | The doctors and school cannot cope with any further numbers. |
| 1503 | Infrastructure can't cope with any large developments |
| 1507 | I felt this did not adequately address many of the issues that are currently discussed - adequacy of school places / drainage services / transport and road safety in context of planning further development in the village |
| 1513 | Feel the village could benefit from a licensed affordable restaurant . Pub (in village itself rather than in Stiffords Bridge) |
| 1738 | The Cradley surgery has advised the parish council that it cannot cope with any increase in housing. |
| 1739 | The Cradley surgery has advised the parish council that it cannot cope with any increase in housing. |
| 1744 | Still have issues with the Settlement Boundary where it cuts a domestic curtiledge |
| 1745 | Also want changes to settlement boundary as per our representations to Parish Council so that no homes are partly or wholly excluded as at present |
| 1788 | A proper car park could be placed in the vicinity of the new school - more space there, with no resultant disruption of the ancient village of Cradley - conservation area not to be disturbed. |
| 1805 | Church Hall seem to be advertisign noutside of Cradley and are thinking of buying the orchard for a car park. I don't like the commmercialisation or the proposal. |
| 1845 | Existing roads need resurfacing prior to any new developments. Road infrastructure needs to be developed prior to new shop proposals. Speeding through the village should be addressed. |
| | |

| | |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1894 | It would be much appreciated if someone could take up our cause of trying to get a speed restriction on the Malvern Road from Storridge Village Hall to Knights Farm. |
| 1998 | Protect footpaths and safe walking routes through and between villages and to local towns / transport links. Bus links - especially to sports pitch. Storridge settlement boundary please. Improve footpaths in Storridge (especially to village hall). |
| 2008 | BAN of HGV vehicles on the B4220. |
| 2103 | Encourage green technology in future buildiongs eg insulation, solar panels (&on existing houses etc). Support applications for installations of wind turbines. Even near my home! |
| 2182 | If the village is going to increase in size what will be done to the local infrastructure to cope with increased vehicle numbers? Is there an infrastructure improvement plan for Cradley? |
| 2222 | One of the charms of Cradley is its small lanes, which already struggle with all the big cars. I don't think it could cope with too many more in the middle of the village. |
| 2275 | The infrastructure of the village will not withstand any more houses it is already overloaded. 1. Doctors surgery is struggling to cope with numbers. 2. The water is only justy coping with its presetn load. 3. The sewage works cannot cope with what is put down the sewage and in consequence pollutes the brook on most days, luckily discharge is away from most houses. 4 The ground water cannot cope with the rapid runoff from all the non-permeable surfaces and any extra houses with their drives will increase the rate of runoff with additional flooding, it is bad enough in the village already. 5. Certainly the roads cannot cope with the current load of traffic using the village roads let alone with the volume and speed of the traffic on the A 4103. |
| 2290 | I do not see the need for 'village amenities' when we are within the delivery area of several supermarkets. As regards new houses, one has to be mindful of the needs of new generations. |
| 2325 | support structure and services cannot cope with lots more housing eg surgery already stretched. |
| 2327 | A safe route for walkers, disabled presons and cyclists from the church to the school and also from the Bosbury road to the school. Improve road safety at Ridgeway Cross (A4103 and B4220) Road markings and speed control. |
| | |
| | |
| | Questionnaire structure / general comments |
| | |
| 1020 | Keep up the good work! |
| 1030 | Questions too vague, so not much useful information will come from this process. |
| 1032 | For a questionnaire ostensibly designed to be de partis, this appears to be anything but. * All drop down boxes are already filled. Try getting the Scottish independents or Euro-sceptics to accept the same situation when public opinion is hard fought over. * How many people understand what the "strategic green gap" is? In the absence of understanding what, and where it is, most will wish to maintain the status quo. Additionally, define development; putting 50 houses there would be an entirely different proposal to putting a community owned cafe`. If you want to really understand community opinion this is not a good start. |
| 1107 | The wording of the questions is very vague. There is no proper definition of the strategic gap. Q5 should have options for 10 - 20, 20 - 30, above 30. Better question would have been around density of housing or extending the boundaries of the village. Not sure what the point of this questionnaire is. |
| 1303 | I am new to the area, so sorry that I have not had sufficient time to form a valid opinion. |
| 1356 | I am not happy with the questionnaire and consider the questions to be badly constructed. |
| 1357 | Considering the time spent . the communication events and and public meetings, this is a feeble and badly worded questionnaire. And the online wording is different from the hard copy. I really don't see what you aim to achieve with this set of questions |
| 1408 | The Kings Bridge road is already a dangerous one and more traffic will add to this danger. Flooding is also a major concern in this area. The chosen sites for development have remained unspoilt for thousands of years, do we want to ruin and destroy these beautiful fields forever?. |
| 1439 | The questions are too generic and allow for a variety of interpretations. They needed to be more specific. |
| 1518 | This questionnaire is invalid by virtue of the facts that it can be anonymous & extra copies can be obtained leaving it open to abuse. You have not thought this through, as usual. There is also the fact that you can ;'choose' to override the result. |
| 1737 | I did not think the questions put were worthy of the expected /desired questionnaire. I do not believe you can make an informed Assessment of the requirements/wishes of the Parish based on these questions - which suggest an agenda is already set. |

| | |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1758 | (A seperate note re. this online questionnaire - the Yes/No answer boxes should have been left blank and not |
| 1764 | A major consdultation process has already been carried out: what was wrong with its conclusions? The results of this questionnaire should not be allowed to override what has already been decided. |
| 2223 | Sadly this whole questionnaire could have given the community so much more information and the opportunity for them to make informed decisions on exciting proposals that could really enhance the future of the village and surrounding area, but due to the presonal opinion of a couple of NDP members and a couple other Parish Councillors this pathetic example of a questionnaire has been released instead. I am thoroughly disgusted with the entire NDP process in Cradley. I am a member of the Heart of the Village team and all we have wanted is the opportunity to ask the community if they would like what we are proposing, and if the idea is supported, for it to bew included within the NDP. The NDP group has been blatantly hostile to our proposal and has obstructed the Heart of the Village at every opportunity. Their insistence that we are 'developers' is ridiculous. Cradley Parish Council seem opposed to all development and appears incapable of understanding that the NDP should be a positive planning document that meets the housing, social and economic needs of the community. |
| 2224 | I have found this questionnaire frustrating to complete because it is vague, simplistic, not reflective of the true complexity behind each of the questions, and it is leading. I do not find it balanced at all and feel that it makes a mockery of the consultation process. I think that the fact that the questions on your web site version of this questionnaire are materially different to the questions on this paper survey makes the whole process null and void. There are three different versions of the meaning of the 'strategic gap' (a map, a written version and Carly Tinkler's definition) and this on its own is confusing. Which one do you mean? Also, you make no distinction between development for community purposes, development for business use or development for housing. I have very different opinions on the use of the Strategic Gap in each these instances but your questionnaire is too simplistic for me to represent my opnion. I have been forced to answer 'No' on Q4 because it is a leading question and , in my opinion, stupidly designed. The decision on housing numbers depends on the site and should be addressed on a case by case basis. I am presuming that by answering no it means that decision will be made as proposals are made rather than there being no restriction ever. The NDP is about more than just housing and I do not see this represented in the NDP process I have witnessed to date. Where are the questions about making provision for businesses in Creadley? Where are the questions about Community Right to Build and Community Right to Buy. There ois one nod to a specific recreation facility (the Sports pitch) but what about other recreational facilities such as those proposed as an adjunct to the Heart of the Village proposal. I am a supporter of the Heart of the Village proposal and am disgusted to see no questions related to this proposal in your questionnaire. You felt fit to include questions specifically about the sprots pitch, why not the Heart of the Village? It is a community-led proposal (just like the sports pitch) rather than a fo-profit, developer-led venture and so should be included in the NDP process. What worries me most about this process is that your apporach and (in this case) your questions are so restricted and leading. I feel that because of your simplistic approach you will not get a truly representatvie answer from any of these questions because the decisions are more complicated than they are being presented. I fear that you wiull, however, use the result of this questionnaire to implement the opinions you have already formulated. I hope you can feel the strength of my cynicism of your process. |
| 1800 | Qs 1 and 2: These projects reflect views expressed during the consultation process, the long-term opinions and hopes of a number of local people. Thus, they should not be included in the actual Plan, but set out in an Appendix, in precisely the same manner as such projects in a number of similar NDPs (ie Bristol, Whitbourne, etc.etc.) |
| 1824 | Additional comments already forwarded to Mary Barnet for distribution to all councillors (dated 14.9.15) |
| 1825 | Additional comments already forwarded to Mary Barnet for distribution to all councillors (dated 14.9.15) |
| 1895 | Found the new councillors info very useful (Derek Scully) |
| | |