

## NDP survey responses - initial analysis.

### 1. How do you want Cradley and Storrige to develop?

Responses overlap – some responded to all, others only to preferred option. In general responses indicate preference to keep village as respondents consider it is now.

- Dormitory village least popular
- Awareness of practical difficulties in creating self contained village and encouraging new business / employment though this is a popular aspiration
- Concerns over commitment to sustain existing services / facilities
- Traffic management and transport links should be sustained / developed
- Commitment to maintain present ‘character’ of village – and perhaps develop ‘heart’ of village.

*Further consideration – what do we consider to be the key factors in the ‘character’ we want to retain or the ‘heart’ to be developed?*

### 2. Settlement boundary

- Considerable confusion over where the boundary is and reasons for current position.
- Most comments – for and against change! – linked to dispersal of development across village.

*Further consideration – as a minimum, provide rationale for the settlement boundary and address perceived / actual idiosyncracies.*

### 3. Housing development options

- Low cost housing is a priority for c. 50%
- Clear majority against estate development.
- Development should be dispersed, gradual, and in sympathy with existing buildings.

*Further consideration – is it realistic to meet new build requirements through infill / conversion? Could this be linked to timeline for development?*

### 4. Specific policies.

- Improved broadband for business development (c 25% of responses)
- Develop and improve access and parking to social / community spaces (village hall / church)
- Develop play areas / sports facilities

*Further consideration – what can be done re broadband? How can village hall and church access and usage be developed? What practical ideas are there for play / sports eg – outdoor gym.....?tennis court? croquet lawn?*

### 5. Protecting environment.

100% response and all but one considered this important (graded 4+). 66 out of 80 gave this highest rating.

*Further consideration – not surprisingly, this needs to underpin planning policy – explore how to do this in practice.*

## 6. Facilities

Very high response and comment levels and relatively clear consensus on questions – in order of significance:-

- Retain surgery and dispensary (95%+)
- Keep PO facility
- Designate area for community use.

Despite high consensus in responses, comments vary and reflect issues raised elsewhere – poses issues for detailed exploration which need to be explicitly linked with housing development plans. A focus on issues raised here might also clarify what it is that people value and wish to preserve in terms of character and environment of the village.

### a) *Whether to / how to develop existing village community areas, specifically*

- *Village hall and church*
- *Legion and surgery*
- *School site*
- *Existing play areas*

### b) *Develop a new 'heart of village' site.*

- *Is this a practical option?*
- *Would it be dependent on an estate investment?*
- *Would advantages of this outweigh resistance to estate development?*

## 7. Highway network.

Responses indicate general concern about state of roads and pedestrian safety – though split views on what would improve matters.

- Pavements most popular but may not be practical.
- High level of concern over pedestrian safety on Bosbury Road.
- Majority against gated access

*Further consideration – practical improvements to safety on Bosbury Road; explore reasons for aversion to gated access.*

## 8. General comments

Tend to repeat issues raised in other comments but some additional issues:-

- *What about Storridge?*
- *Address drainage / parking in all plans*
- *Importance of design / style of developments.*