

**Cradley Parish Council NDP
Community Consultation Submissions and Responses**

No	Name	Policy reference & Comment	NDP Group Response
1	Pat Edwards	11 recreation East and West Cradley recreation areas should be treated independently and not in aggregate. Wording needs to be added to ensure that this is spelt out for posterity. General Excellent document and well referenced to HUDP. Thank you	Your comment on the independent reference of each recreation ground looks valid and we will check with our planning consultant to assess the merits of inclusion in the final document. Thank you for your support
2	Tom van Vuren	CSNDP3 There are quite a few underused or semi-derelict buildings, which could be re-used or which re-use could be encouraged. For example, the Crown(?) on Bosbury Road which has been an underused eye sore for 20 years. Planning permission was not granted in the past - should this be reviewed? CSNDP8 No building should be allowed in the Green Gap; this includes the proposed Heart of the Village. Once this space has even a single building on it, the case for further development will be significantly strengthened and there will be increased pressure from commercial developers to be allowed to build there. CSNDP7 Further areas of flood risk should be considered, particularly those that regularly flood due to run-off and poor drainage. Some of these points, such as in the corner of Bosbury Road near the surgery or along Cowleigh Road lead to quite dangerous traffic situations	CSNDP3: You have a valid point regarding the encouragement of developing under used buildings. We cover this in the NDP. Unfortunately the Parish Council at the moment do not have the powers to force owners into this plan of action merely support them via the NDP and at the planning stage if the development is of merit CSNDP8: Thank you for taking the time to read and fully understand the NDP references to this particular matter and appreciating the possible future consequences of our planning consultants advice CSNDP7: Your observations on the extra flooding problems caused by run off and flash flooding are valid and we will re visit our flood risk document to ensure that these problems are addressed properly
3	Daniel Whitehouse	Infill Housing Infill housing is a good idea as it does not increase the footprint, however, allows people to benefit from village life. I do, however, feel that this needs to be managed in terms of respect to the neighbours adjoining any proposed building further housing I accept that 10 more properties are required, I also believe that we should not be 'bought' by developers with obvious bribes such as a 'Community Vinyard'. Economy and Facilities for the extra 10 units we should consider livework units to allow other people to have their quality of life at home as well as their place of work, this would also manage the transport issue the village experiences. Communications I am not sure we have pushed BT hard enough for ensuring that we get broadband. For those people who run their businesses from home, this is their life. The Parish Council need to work harder on this.	Infill Housing: The normal planning constraints come into play in matters such as these and the Parish Council is always available to base their responses to planning applications on the observations of members of the community. The Planning Dept have a very efficient method of allowing anyone to voice their observations on any planning application directly on line. You can access it through the Parish Council web site It is envisaged that the extra required housing would be met through infilling or "windfall" housing as laid out in the NDP. The NDP would of course offer more protection against developments above those wanted by the community in the questionnaire Economy and Facilities: Indeed your observation is already supported for encouragement in the NDP. The problem is that whilst the Parish Council can support such applications it is for the owners of property or land to come forward with the schemes for consideration Communications: Whilst BT has updated their exchanges to fibre optic the last hurdle to faster broadband is converting the connections to each house (or business) to the exchanges. This unfortunately is in the hands of the individual ISPs who are reluctant to meet the costs involved in rural areas. The PC will continue to put on whatever pressure they can to resolve the problem
4	Ruth Whitehouse	Same address same comments apply	
5	Graham Whitehouse	Same address same comments apply	
6	Michael Sheriff	7.6 Strategic Green Gap As Heather Morgan has been generous enough to give to the community land it should be registered as such. The area subject to all normal planning constraints but if a majority want a facility for the community then it needs to be incorporated	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1980 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
7	Michael Sheriff	5. Housing Having Attended the Church Site Planning Meeting at the village hall I'm confused. Pleisfields Development, whilst on hold is approved. Hereford have issued the housing requirement for Cradley until 2030 and we are only a few houses short. However, subject to an application being received, Church Site propose a development for 20 plus houses in an area outside of the Village Boundary in an area designated ACNB and wildlife sensitive I don't see the requirement or the location works. Or am I missing something!	Housing: The NDP does not prevent anyone making a planning application and nor should it. What it does is to give a framework as desired by this community, within which planning applications must be considered. So if the NDP says no building development over 10 houses then the getting of approval over that number becomes much harder for developers.
8	Heather Hughes	7.6 Strategic Gap In section 3.1 it says that the council wishes "to continue to respect and reflect the views of its community" and so I was very disappointed to see that the whole of Morgan's Field is now to be included in the parcel of land referred to as the Strategic Gap. A large proportion of the community have said that they would like to see a community shop built in the upper area of this field so generously offered to the village by the Morgan family for community use. Does the council mean to deny the community this possibility? I would like to see made clear that Morgan's Field is not to be included in the Strategic	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1980 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
9	Elizabeth Gwyther	5.3 Settlement boundary Why the strong desire to prevent coalescence of East and West Cradley? Having lived in the parish for nearly 30 years I have not previously been aware that local people defined the village in this way. We have always referred to the village as Cradley. It seems that his plan seeks to divide the village for some reason. 6.2 Policy CSNDP 4 This follows my previous comment relating to the determined attempt in this plan to create 2 villages rather than one. By choosing to keep a strategic gap between the newly designated "East" and "West" Cradley this effectively scuttles the Heart of the Village project. This project seeks to provide a community hub and is widely supported by members of the village and parish. By insisting that no development should take place on the gap the plan goes against the statement that the Parish Council will support the provision of additional community facilities as it steps the Heart of the Village scheme in one simple step. What alternative provision for community facilities are suggested by the Parish Council? Policy CSNDP 8 The Strategic Green Gap appears to be an admirable space when first considered. Yet, in this instance actually represents something quite different. Firstly, people do not normally refer to East and West Cradley apart from in this document. It seems that there is a clear intention to split the village and create a new divide that did not exist previously. Notwithstanding this, the Heart of the Village project will be stopped completely. This requirement is too rigid. Policy CSNDP 2 The stated aim is that "housing should be in sympathy with immediate surroundings and the character of the village as a whole". This is admirable but I would suggest that the Parish Council should not always fear setting any precedent and should seek to achieve this aim by using the design of today rather than looking for architecture that produces a pastiche form of an earlier era. Innovative modern architecture is perfectly capable of sitting well against the established form. Cradley needs to be a living, breathing, evolving village and not fixed in the past. The award winning small development at St Katharines is a refreshing example of this.	The reference to East and West Cradley in the NDP was used for identification purposes as there was a natural split of open countryside between the two sections. The prevention of coalescence between the two strategic green gaps/parts was formed over 20 years ago by Malvern District Council and re-affirmed in the Village Design Statement and Parish Plan in 2004 and updated in 2010 as desired by the community. This was confirmed yet again in the NDP questionnaire last year. There is no "plan" or reason to divide the village. The community have stated that they want the gap retained and free from development. 6.2 policy CSNDP 4: The assertion that the NDP is attempting to create two villages is not borne out by the facts. As stated the references to east and west are used for identification and not an attempt to rename Cradley village. The Heart of the Village Scheme was well aware of the prominence and community desire to keep the gap clear of development before they embarked on their scheme. So nothing has been introduced to "scupper" the project. The NDP is not there to define specific schemes but to present a framework for the development of the community until 2031 (and beyond) Any development must take heed of the requirements of the NDP and work within the framework. The Council does support the provision of community facilities but within the definitions of the NDP Policy CNPD 8: Most of this is covered by the comments given to your comments 1.2 & 4 Policy CSNDP2: The definition of "in sympathy" is flexible enough to judge each application on its merits. The Village of Cradley hosts a large range of properties and styles sitting sympathetically side by side. We will continue to support such a viewpoint which will we are sure meet your expectations. There will of course always be a difference of opinion in what is "in sympathy"
10	Richard Harris	9.1 The statement that major improvements to the road network in the parish are unlikely is not acceptable. The road infrastructure is essentially unchanged since the early 20th century and is already inadequate and in poor condition. No further developments should be approved until significant improvements are carried out. This is a serious health and safety issue. 10.6 High speed broadband is now available in the village, at least with 'last mile copper'. The NDP needs to be updated. Appendix 3, SD4 I can find no mention of the long standing parish sewerage problems in the NDP except for this Appendix heading. For many years the sewerage pumping stations in the parish have been overwhelmed after heavy rain, discharging raw sewerage into the roads and Cradley Brook. This is due to all the older parish properties having their storm water fed into the sewerage system. Severn Trent are fully aware of the problem but have no funding to fix this major problem. Notwithstanding this new planning applications for houses have been knowingly approved for many years. The NDP must address this issue as a major planning constraint. It is interesting to note that the default Welsh Water assumption is that all storm water goes into the sewerage system and they charge for this 'service' which they collect on behalf of Severn Trent. Individual customers have to prove that it isn't to avoid the charge!	9.1: We agree completely with your viewpoint on what is a statement of fact given to us by Herefordshire Council. Unfortunately the road network is even in its present deteriorating form still held by the County as adequate for future developments. 10.6: As the NDP is a document designed to meet the communities needs until at least 2031 such a fast changing situation based on todays technology cannot be defined accurately. Who knows what we will be using in 10 years time as updates happen daily. All we can commit to is supporting the communities ability to get the best solution available to it Appendix 3 SD 4: This is a problem that has evaded a solution for some considerable time now and at most planning meetings the matter of extra pressure on the infrastructure is quoted. Unfortunately we are up against Severn Trents refusal to admit that there is a problem when approached. I have attached their reply to our inclusion of them in the consultation process which will show more graphically their response to their system being not up to the job. Unfortunately the planners tend to not question this just accept their answer.

11	Ivan Smart	Whole document	Can I formally congratulate the NDP team on an excellent piece of work. Logical, well argued, compelling conclusions and an strong framework for putting our beautiful village on a sound footing for many years to come - well done	Whole Document: Thank you for your vote of confidence in the hard work that has been pu into produing it on behalf of the community. Nice to know that it is appreciated.
		CSNDP 1: Settlement Boundary	Comments also cover 'CSNDP8 Strategic gap, which together with the settlement boundary are completely supported. This maintain and uphold what generations of settlers have known, as well as respect, not to encroach...They harmonise nature with the distinct character of our village.	CSNDP 1: Settlement Boundary and CSNDP 7: Nice to hear that the vital importance of the settlement boundary and the Strategic Gap to the community has not been lost
		CSNDP 7: Areas of Flood Risk	While the NDP makes specific reference to not allowing development that would increase the risk of flooding, I can see no mention of the NDP including measures to reduce current flood issues. Something along the lines of 'Activity working with all stakeholders to reduce ...' or akin	CSNDP 7: Areas of Flood Risk: A fair point raised by others as well and we will re-examine the flood report we submitted to Hereford to ensure that I proactive action on flooding and flash flooding from run off is addressed as far as possible
		CSNDP 8: Strategic Green Gap	Incorporates comment 2, CSNDP 1 Settlement Boundaries. But would like clarification in 'of Development', reference to a definition elsewhere, (e.g. National planning portal, HCC, other), as on its own, the intention of the wording could be challenged without clear definition.	CSNDP 8: Strategic Green Gap: A significant point and references to the official planning definition will be no doubt included in the final document
12	Bill van Marie	7.6	I feel strongly that Morgan's Field should be removed from the Strategic gap	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
13	Anonymous	7.6	The statement 'maintaining the separate identity of East and West Cradley' is also unhelpful to village unity. The idea of a green gap should not be used as an argument against the development of a village community facility on Morgan's field, which has been given to the village for this specific purpose. Such a facility shops, cafe, walks by the brook-would draw the two sides of the village together in a positive way to enhance the character of Cradley I would therefore want the NDP amended to allow a project such as the Heart of the Village scheme on Morgan's field to go ahead, whilst still maintaining the green gap surrounding this small development.	No Comment Made
14	David Rova	Strategic Gap	Can you please note that I consider the area known as 'Morgans Field' should be part of the strategic gap.	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
15	Bill Van Marie	7.1	I would strongly object to any development in the village on land that is designated as an ACNB.	It is standard procedure for the Parish Council to also object to any development on the same grounds
16	Alan Hughes	1.1	I am unhappy with the introduction of the terms WEST CRADLEY and EAST CRADLEY. they are not on any map I am aware of and I know of no historical precedent nor are the terms in 'local usage'. The terms are necessary, divisive and should be removed throughout the document.	The terms East and West Cradley were used in the preparation of the NDP document for identification purposes only to aid those reading the document without local knowledge of the village. The terms are not designed to be divisive in fact Cradley village has had a division as shown in 19th century produced maps. Malvern Hills council confirmed the desirability of the gap as far back as Jan 1992 its existence has been confirmed as desirable by the community to the PC in 2004, 2010 and most recently in the questionnaire of 2015
		1.11	The NDP questionnaire should not be relied on for any decision making process. It was fatally flawed in wording, design, and scope. The results were entirely predictable and designed to get support for the fictitious 'strategic gap'	The questionnaire was thoroughly examined prior to its issue to obtain answers to simple straightforward questions the NDP document required
		6.2	The statement commits the parish council to support community facilities but the NDP contains no future plans for proven facilities. An opportunity missed (or avoided)	The Policies in the NDP document do indeed commit the PC to many things including community projects. It is a policy document that forms a framework within which projects can be advanced. It does not name or comment on ANY projects. Projects proposed within the framework must comply with the defined framework and not conflict with it.
		7.2	The strategic gap appears to be an invented term concocted for reasons not clear to me. The extent of it has been changed to suit circumstances. There is no justification for the descriptions of the strategic gap as given in this section, especially 'the single most significant space in the village and central to its character' in whose opinion based on what? Why is it necessary to maintain the separate identities of 'East' and 'West' Cradley? This is very suspect to me.	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
17	Alan Hughes	9.1	Another opportunity missed. Why no specific plans to provide pedestrian footways in the village as walking the roads currently is dangerous.	You make a valid point and the Parish Council have addressed the matter on several occasions over the years. Unfortunately desires to either add footpaths to the roads or across open land always meet with the problems of ownership of the land involved
		10.4	should have specific plans	The NDP is a policy document which forms a framework for development by and within the community. It does not describe or specify ANY specific projects. It does give the framework within which those projects, when they come to fruition, can be incorporated. The PC has stated in the policies which areas it will give support to.
		10.6	should have specific plans	As previous statement
		appendix 4	Plan already behind events as planning permission (P153490F) already granted in an area designated as having LOW to VERY LOW CAPACITY.	As you rightly point out the world moves on at a pace. And the unfortunate fact is that until the community gets the protection of the NDP in place then essentially anyone can sidestep the policies in place in our old Parish Plan (2010) or intended in the NDP. Only the acceptance of the NDP by the community will prevent developments happening that would not normally be desired by either the PC or the community they represent.
18	Hugh Forsyth	5.3	I agree with the proposed changes to the Settlement Boundary which now includes domestic curtilages previously excluded such as my own as now set out in Proposed Map on page 22.	Thank you for your comment
		7.2	The Landscape Assessment plan should be amended to fit the areas now shown within the Settlement Boundary as it does not comment on areas set out in the former Settlement Boundary, and for areas of domestic curtilage with existing buildings and formal gardens the comments in the Landscape Assessment are inappropriate.	The Landscape assessment pre-dated the Boundary change and remains as printed
19	Caroline Forsyth	5.3	I agree with the proposed changes to the Settlement Boundary which now includes domestic curtilages previously excluded such as my own as now set out in Proposed Map on page 22.	Thank you for your comment
		7.2	The Landscape Assessment plan should be amended to fit the areas now shown within the Settlement Boundary as it does not comment on areas set out in the former Settlement Boundary, and for areas of domestic curtilage with existing buildings and formal gardens the comments in the Landscape Assessment are inappropriate.	The Landscape assessment pre-dated the Boundary change and remains as printed
20	Sue Hyson	CSNDP 8	I strongly support this proposal to maintain the strategic green gap, and protect it from all development except which may be require to mitigate flood risk	Thank you for your support
		CSNDP 1	I support this policy as defined	
		CSNDP 6	I fully support the protection of wild life sites as defined in the policy statement	
		CSNDP 7	I strongly agree that development should not be permitted in areas identified at risk of flooding	
21	Jean Holtom	CSNDP 8	I strongly agree with this policy. The strategic green gap should be maintained and should be protected from all development except that which may be required to mitigate flood risk.	Thank you for your support
22	Veronica Jones	7.6	Strategic Green Gap This must be preserved, and protected from ALL development for the reasons stated, (PolicySNDP8) and in part, as a valuable natural flood plain for Cradley Brook. (PolicySNDP7).	Thank you for your support

23	<p>David Bryce</p> <p>I have found the communications in the parish newsletter regarding the Heart of Village and via email far too emotive all round and bound up in red tape and so have now switched off. I just want to say that I DO support the ideals behind some form of community based development that also endeavour to unite the two halves of the village.</p> <p>I went along to the meeting at the hall regarding the other proposed development (commercial residential plus orchard and shop). I agree in principle, but would want to be assured there are checks and balances the parish council will put in place at some contractual stage, to ensure they hold to their promises and the community related areas are staged in development ALONGSIDE the residential (i.e. not left languishing after)</p> <p>Re: Development above Pixiefields. Poor on the greyscale map handed out to residents, is this in the "Additional land within established Domestic Curtilage. And what does this mean in plain English? Will this contain footpath improvements to access the countryside from my property? What considerations have been made regarding drainage and run off onto the existing lower properties? What community related development is planned here?"</p>	<p>Thanks for your comment but we have no control over what appears in the newsletter</p> <p>The Parish Council will always respond according to each individual case</p> <p>All will be considered when a detailed planning application is made</p>
24	<p>Ian & Sue Chadwick</p> <p>We generally support this plan and are particularly concerned about two aspects detailed below.</p> <p>CSNDP 7 We strongly support this policy bearing in mind the recent flooding.</p> <p>CSNDP8 We support the definition of the Strategic Green Gap as outlined in the plan. We feel this is of vital importance in maintaining the overall character of the village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p>
25	<p>James Burton</p> <p>Section 10.6</p> <p>The second paragraph states that "High speed broadband in the parish must be a priority. The majority of houses in the area are already receiving "high-speed broadband" given recent upgrades. This enables house holds to achieve speeds of around 15-20Mbps. However 1 in 10 households nationally are now able to access "SuperFast Broadband" (Ofcom Feb 2015) which can achieve speeds in excess of 30Mbps. Plans for rollout of Ultra Fast Broadband are also underway which can achieve speeds in excess of 100Mbps. With increasing trend for content services to move to online platforms only (such as BBC 3, Netflix, Amazon Prime) plus increases in productivity (4K) there will be a continuous need to improve broadband speeds in the parish and keep pace with technology. The second paragraph should be reworded along the lines of: "Continuous improvement of broadband in the parish in line with national plans must be a priority".</p>	<p>Broadband – thank you for this. The wording will be amended in line with your suggestions</p>
26	<p>James Burton</p> <p>1.11</p> <p>The wording of Question Three in the Questionnaire Aug 2015 was highly ambiguous. No clear definition was provided in the Questionnaire as to the boundary of the Strategic Gap or reference to a document that contained such a definition. The term was previously used in the Village Design Statement. This document provides an outline of the concept of the Strategic Gap defining it as "straddling the Cradley Brook and west valley side". The included diagram showed the field to the West of the Brook sometimes referred to as the "Bean Field" but no clear boundary. The minutes of the Cradley and Storridge NDP Steering Committee, March 2015 indicate that the NDP was intending to introduce an extended definition of the Strategic Gap. Item 7 states the following in response to a question by SH as to the definition of the Strategic Gap. "This overlaps with the VDS definition of the Strategic Gap but extends to include all land between the two settlement areas." Question 3 was badly defined, potentially misleading and certainly provided no indication to any change in the definition of the Gap. Therefore any conclusions generated from Question 3 are open to challenge especially given the Strategic Gap's extension to the north and south in this draft of the NDP. Question 3 should be removed from Section 1.11 and an explanation added to Appendix 2 as to why the responses unfortunately cannot be used in this NDP.</p> <p>Section 5.1</p> <p>This section states that the "Planning permission was also granted in outline in January 2015 for up to 60 dwellings on land north of Pixiefields, West Cradley." Herefordshire County Council only provided "Outline Permission" and as yet I do not believe that full planning permission has been granted. The paragraph should be reworded to make this clearer. In addition this paragraph, as worded, effectively means that it is now Parish Council strategy to support 60 houses on Pixiefields. At public meetings held in 2015, I believe the overwhelming majority of parishioners was against 60 houses on the site. Views changed on the exact number. The NDP should state what the Parish Council believes should be the maximum number of houses that should be granted on the site, in line with the results of Question 4 and 5 of the Aug 2015 Questionnaire. My personal view would be 30 houses on the site. The NDP should look to identify a second parcel of land to accommodate the remaining 30 houses so that it can make a strong argument to reduce the scale of development at the Pixiefields site.</p> <p>Section 7.5</p> <p>Cradley is blessed with a rich network of footpaths around the village and surrounding countryside. The work of the village Lenthman has also done much to improve these village assets for which I am grateful. However the village lacks good pedestrian pavements along a number of key roads within the village, especially in East Cradley. Other than residents of Buryfields, there is no safe pedestrian pavement for the residents of Cradley, especially its children to reach the school. Similarly residents of Buryfields cannot reach any of the other village facilities (Church, Butchers, Surgery) without walking along the roads. It is unlikely that the existing road network within the village boundary could accommodate new pavements (though markings on the road for pedestrians as used on the Continent might be a possibility) given its age and existing properties.</p> <p>Therefore the Parish Council and NDP should identify strategic footpaths that could be used to connect the village with the objective to upgrade them to an all weather surface for easy access by pedestrians, buggies, mobility scooters, even bicycles. The NDP should state that any proposed development that has one of the strategic footpaths running through it should ensure that it does not degrade the route (such as fencing it off to become an overgrown route) but contribute to its upgrade in line with this objective.</p> <p>Section 7.6</p> <p>The definition of the strategic gap in the NDP has been greatly expanded from the definition used in the VDS without any rationale in the NDP as to why this additional land needs to be included. The statement taken from the VDS of "the single most significant space in the village and central to its character..." is also an overstatement and is misleading within the NDP. There are a range of locations within the village that are more significant and central to the character and way of life in the village, the area around the Church for example. No clear rationale or purpose is actually provided as to the need for a Strategic Gap. Why does the village need a "buffer" for example. The Strategic Gap should focus on specific aspects such as "protecting significant views of the village and the nearby AONE", such as restricting development of the so-called "Bean Field". The purpose and boundary of the Strategic Gap should be re-examined with better consultation with the Policy CSNDP 8 effectively rules out any development within the Strategic Green Gap. This seems very excessive and would stop proposals that could have benefit for the village. Proposals such as the Heart of the Village may have flaws but the opportunity to enhance sites such as Morgan's field for the community, which currently provides the village with little value, should not be discouraged or excluded by the NDP. The wording at present is too restrictive and in my opinion should be amended.</p>	<p>Thank you for your observations</p> <p>Pixiefields – Whilst we have no power to influence planning decisions that have already been taken, we will strengthen the wording in the Plan to counter such high density housing developments. We will also propose amended wording in the Plan to support small scale developments on land within or adjacent to the settlement boundaries, on land identified as moderate to high capacity on the Landscape Assessment. This will enable any shortfall of housing on the Pixiefields site to be met without the need for another large site.</p> <p>PROW - thank you for this. The wording will be amended in line with your suggestions.</p> <p>The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area</p>
27	<p>Eileen + Eric Payne</p> <p>CSNDP1 Whilst the strategic gap does serve to enhance the nature of the village it also divides it which is sad. My feeling is that it doesn't need to be quite as large as it is on the current plan.</p> <p>CSNDP4 With regard to economic development the PC seems to support community facilities such as a shop / pub / businesses but the settlement boundaries are very tight. There are few existing places where development of any kind can take place. A little more housing, another shop / post office could help the village to continue to thrive. Ultimately Cradley could become a dormitory village if there is no scope for controlled development when it is required. It doesn't need to be, no should it be, big estates or industrial units!</p> <p>Overall Comment As noted above my feeling is that the plan needs more flexibility to allow the PC to make decisions about housing / other facilities.....especially for the future. As it is, the plan seems to restrict almost everything! Will this be future proof?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p> <p>We intend to alter the NDP to expand the specification of economic development by including Ashvale estate</p> <p>As with Parish Plans no doubt the NDP will be open for review should circumstances change in the future</p>
28	<p>David King</p> <p>General I have read the document and am in support of the complete draft. I have no objections.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p>
29	<p>Maureen Sanders</p> <p>CSNDP7 No development should be allowed. This will increase flood risk.</p> <p>CSNDP8 The Strategic Gap must remain. It is part of the character of the village - any development would have an enormous visual impact.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p>
30	<p>Maureen Edoar</p> <p>CSNDP1 Housing should preferably be restricted to infill, but any further development if necessary should be near the school and be affordable.</p> <p>CSNDP8 Definitely no development of any description on the Strategic Green Gap between East and West Cradley.</p> <p>CSNDP11 Better care and upkeep of the two existing outdoor play/area (Chapel Lane and Buryfields)</p>	<p>Such developments would be reviewed on application</p> <p>Thank you for your comment</p> <p>Thank you for your comment</p>
31	<p>John Gilbert</p> <p>7</p> <p>The "Strategic Green Gap," as referred to on the Plan, is totally illogical. To have such a small village - or two halves if you prefer! - kept apart by a gap rather than being drawn together by development is sheer stupidity. If Cradley is ONE unit, as its name suggests, then drawing together is required. (East and West do not make sense when this Plan accepts that the village clearly is a single entity these days.) And "Strategic?" Just what "strategic" would that be then? Do some people WANT the two halves to remain separate? And if so, why? Development should be confined to the area between the two halves of the village - obviously NOT on the brook's floodplain, but on the areas each side of that of which there is plenty.</p> <p>Buildings The area which has received Outline Planning Permission for 60 houses near Pixiefields has been poorly treated. Sixty is a ridiculously large number of dwellings for such a small field, quite apart from the strain on access and on public services such as sewage which this large number will create. The number must be reduced to about 30. NB Pixiefields has just 38 houses on a field very little smaller.</p>	<p>The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area</p> <p>The Planning application will be considered when it comes before the Parish Council</p>

32	David Robertson	CSNDP2	The housing policy favours 'infill'. This is at odds with questionnaire findings, where the single greatest number (39%) favoured '5 to 10 units' which could not be achieved by infill. More importantly, excess infill will damage the landscape and character of the village far more than carefully-designed developments on one or more appropriate sites.	Thank you for your comment
		CSNDP4	Claims that the Parish Council will 'support... additional community facilities' are at odds with policy on the so-called Strategic Gap which, as worded, would prevent the building of the Heart of the Village Project - one of only two 'community facilities' currently proposed (the other being the sports field).	Proposals will be examined as they appear
		CSNDP9	As the draft correctly states, the so-called 'gap' has traditionally been understood to consist 'mostly of a single very large field'. The proposal to increase it massively, and to prevent any 'development' within it except that designed to limit flood risk, has no logical basis or community support and would, inter alia, prevent the 'Heart' project from being built. The relevant survey question did not specify the area of the 'gap', and many respondents understood 'development' to mean houses. This issue needs to be re-addressed on the basis of correct and clearly presented information.	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1988 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
		10.4	The document offers support for retail development, also regarded as important by the Herefordshire core plan. Yet the draft would prevent the building of the Heart of the Village project which offers precisely that.	All proposals must not conflict with other policies in the document
33	Victoria Mitchell	CSNDP8	I consider the strategic green gap to be an essential part of the village to maintain its existing rural character particularly the field known as Morgan's Field. This entire area should continue to be protected from development.	Thank you for your comments
		CSNDP2	I was lucky enough to purchase an affordable house for a local person on a 106 agreement at Fairlee Close and think it is vital for local people to have the opportunity of purchasing a house in the village where they have grown up. I think this should be included within the policy document as a requirement for future developments.	
34	Valerie Mitchell	CSNDP8	I agree with the extent of the Strategic Green Gap as depicted on the Proposals' map and consider that it is essential to protect this area against any development.	Thank you for your comments
35	Paul Mitchell	CSNDP8	I consider the strategic green gap to be an essential part of the village to maintain its existing rural character particularly the field known as Morgan's Field. This entire area should continue to be protected from development.	Thank you for your comments
		CSNDP2	Our daughter has been fortunate enough to buy an affordable house at Fairlee Close under the Section 106. I think this opportunity should be made more available to local residents and should be addressed within the policy document.	
36	Alan Eldridge		See separate document submission	
37	Malcolm Brown	General	Overall, I consider the NDP document to be thoroughly professional and addresses all of the key issues.	Thank you for your comments of support
		CSNDP8	I totally endorse the protection of the 'Strategic Gap' from any form of development. The 'Strategic Gap' is a vital area to protect the rural nature of the village.	
38	Julia MacLellan	page 7.3.2 No 5	Most important to improve transport links and better broadband speeds	The PC strives to support this at every opportunity
		page 7.3.2 No 8	Keep the locals informed - even though response may be low. Congratulations to all who produced this document	Thank you for your support
		page 7.3.2 No 1	Only build when definite need is identified	A very valid point
39	Martin McAleese	The document	The document is excellent - congratulations - I have no comments apart from well done	Thank you for your support
40	Wynne Harries		My response was emailed to Mary Barnett 26th April 2016. I look forward to receiving your response to that. Thank you.	
41	Andrea Harries	CSNDP 8: Strategic Green Gap	Please remove Morgan's Field from Strategic Green Gap so that the Heart of the Village shop/cafe, an excellent idea with vast community benefits, can go ahead.	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1988 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
		CSNDP 2: Housing Provision	Where there is extra housing provision it should be stipulated that no street lighting be included as part of the development.	A valid point under consideration in the Plan
		CSNDP: 11 Recreational open space	I feel that the sports facility should be allowed to have floodlighting up to a specified time eg 9 pm, so that it is possible to use it in the winter months.	Thank you for your observation
42	Christopher Pickering	1.11	The NDP questionnaire was ambiguous as there was no provision for respondents to support a second shop/cafe in Morgan's Field while also opposing further housing development in the strategic green gap. A second shop/cafe was strongly supported by a majority of respondents to the questionnaire, but there was no possibility to support this in the SGG without also approving further housing development.	Thank you for your comments
		7.6	I strongly support allowing the community shop/cafe in the SGG where it would act as a focus for the community and help bring the two halves of the village together, while also providing facilities for people and children to meet after school. The SGG should be maintained by restricting development to the community shop/cafe only.	The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1988 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
		5.3	I strongly support maintaining the existing settlement boundaries with the exceptions proposed in the draft NDP, but with the addition of the possibility of the community shop/cafe in Morgan's field.	As for 7.6
43	Rosalind Pickering	1.11	I found this questionnaire ambiguous as to the meaning of development in the SGG. I am in favour of retaining the SGG with no housing or other development allowed. However I am in favour of a second shop/cafe in this area. It was not possible to specify this option as the majority of people in the NDP survey supported a second shop/cafe, if the definition of development includes a second community shop/cafe it is not clear where this would be allowed in the proposed NDP.	Thank you for your comments
		7.6	My view is a second shop/cafe should be allowed in the SGG. If not here has the NDP identified an area where this would be allowed. This is an area where adults and children could meet. It opens up a beautiful, representative area of where we live that could be walked and roamed. At the moment it is largely hidden behind hedges and inaccessible.	A shop can be considered anywhere it does not conflict with the NDP policies
		5.3	I support the proposed extension to the existing settlement boundaries with the addition of allowance for a community shop/cafe in the SGG. If the council is opposed to this have they identified another area that would be acceptable to the residents of the parish?	
44	Rhianona Boulton		See separate sheets	Thank you for your comments
45	Joanne Eldridge	policy CSNDP 8	I do not support the NDP as I believe the questionnaire sent out is invalid. I did not know where the strategic gap was + I know that many others I have spoken to also did not. It is my understanding that the chair of the PC said it was 'everything that can be seen from Cocksfoot Hill'. This is not a satisfactory response, it is too vague, particularly as the field that the PC now claim is in the gap, cannot be seen from the top of Cocksfoot Hill. I believe the questionnaire should have defined exactly where the gap was and had they done so, my answer would have differed + I strongly suspect that other people's would as well. It is not good enough to say that this would not have altered the result. How do we know? For this reason, I cannot support the NDP in its current form.	Thank you for your comments and observations

46	Ruort Devereux	<p>1.1 Questions were simplistic and somewhat leading/directive. Therefore the results of the questionnaire should be given low credence and not be considered robust views and outcomes. The inclusion of these questions devalues what otherwise appears a well written document.</p> <p>5.1 Housing Commentary of five year targets is fair however all too soon will make the plan seem out of date. Many areas in the UK are considering their areas in terms of the next 34 years to 2050. Should the plan look further into the future.</p> <p>5.1 The New Eco Houses at Finches corner shows that ECO Low energy building can be developed. Is it possible to state in the plan that the Council will always look for the best standard in building. Houses that are Energy neutral (Zero emissions) or generating energy will be encouraged.</p> <p>7.6 The Strategic gap - this feature is being given unnecessary importance. The Large field is a productive agricultural field and worth protecting as such. The Proposal to develop a volunteer run community owned facility on poor quality grazing land is realistic. This could be more resilient than a private owned retail unit. The Council seems to have become blinkered and narrow minded on this in recent weeks.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment</p> <p>We are working to the time lines given by Hereford.</p> <p>Your comments are noted</p> <p>The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area</p>
47	Christopher Lowder	<p>NDP 7 It is essential to protect the green spaces in the parish. We have lost huge swathes of 'lungs of the village' over the past decade, thanks in the main to housing development. In this, the retention of the so called 'green gap' is essential. This is a village, not a small town.</p> <p>NDP 2 Development which is 'sensitive' and mainly infill is crucial. To repeat, Cradley is a village, not a small town. Anything which threatens this status should be stopped.</p> <p>NDP 7.4 Flooding is still a problem, especially along the Cradley brook, and in particular by Kingsbridge as well as the old shop/PO. We must look at this more closely again. Anything which will exacerbate this continuing problem must not be allowed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p>
48	Gillian Lowder	<p>NDP 7 It is essential to protect green spaces in the village and protect our important and ancient hedgerows. I agree with the policies presented in the NDP, but stress hedgerows please. I also support retaining the Green Strategic gap. I am concerned about light pollution and would wish to see included in the NDP a paragraph stating no more street lighting in the village including on any new housing developments or anywhere else in the village.</p> <p>NDP 1 I agree with the policies outlined and wish for small developments of c10 properties. They should be consistent with the needs of the village.</p> <p>NDP 8 Local people must be consulted over all development in the village, whether housing or community projects.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p>
49	K Aydon	<p>8 The Strategic Green Gap is a distinctive feature of the village and cherished by the majority of residents. To retain it is in a great British tradition of maintaining green spaces within developed areas (eg London parks, Malvern Hills).</p> <p>2 Resisting development to infill within the village makes it doubly important to retain the SGG (see comments above) as development of established gardens can be detrimental to wildlife etc.</p> <p>7 Flood alleviation and drainage should be encouraged esp in new developed. Is this addressed in the NDP?</p> <p>11 Recreational facilities (for all age groups) should ideally be shared equally throughout the parish and not concentrated on one side of the village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p> <p>Thank you for your support</p> <p>Yes- flood policy included</p> <p>The Plan should support this</p>
50	S Roffe	<p>Thank you for the work and effort so far. Policies and objectives must be measurable. Please can specific targets be added to each policy. These can then be used to inform projects and support programmes.</p> <p>Unspecific terms such as 'small scale' 'additional' 'in sympathy' and 'continue to work' should be replaced with clear detail of action.</p> <p>A policy or proposals for maintaining or developing the Parish's communication links should be added.</p>	<p>This is a good point- we would be grateful if you were able to join us and develop such targets</p> <p>comments noted and will review wording- any suggestions</p> <p>see comment 2</p>
51	B Herriot	<p>1.1 I have lived in Cradley since 1988 and was a GP in the village for 26 years. I have never heard the 'local usage' East Cradley and West Cradley to describe the village of Cradley. I think that these terms are made up by the NDP group to support the concept of the Strategic Green Gap. Preferring Cradley with East and West is, I feel, divisive and unhelpful for our single village. NDP questionnaire - I believe this to be an invalid questionnaire for many reasons, but particularly relating to the Strategic Green Gap (another term that I have never heard before in my many years as a resident of Cradley). There was no map to define this GAP with the questionnaire and nothing that was consistent could be found on the web. The NDP group stated that everyone knows what the 'gap' is, but on questioning many people in the Village about it, it is clear that there is a lot of differing opinion about its size and which fields are involved. At a recent PC meeting the Chairman stated that it was in a 'GAP' that can be seen from the top of Cocksfoot Hill. Morgan's Field cannot be seen from the top of Cocksfoot Hill but is clearly included in the NDP Strategic Green Gap map, as are many other fields NOT included in previous documents which talk about the Strategic Gap (without the emotive word GREEN). I am aware that some people responded to the question on the SGG by saying that they didn't want development on the SGG, but in the comments section they qualified their answer by saying that they would support a Community Project on Morgan's Field, but would not want residential development. These people have been disenfranchised by the NDP group as they have only checked 'Yes' or 'NO' answers and ignored any comments when analyzing the results.</p> <p>2.3 The policy states that planning permission will be given to in-fill development within the Settlement Boundary. Have any suitable sites for this been identified? Do they fit with the 30% response from the NDP questionnaire, which wanted developments of 5 - 10 units?? I don't believe any such sites exist and I think that the policy is written to prevent any development in the village. It is possible that the prime building land for development in the village is the School Playing Fields? Economic Development - It is ironic to see this policy when the NDP clearly does not support a Community Benefit Society project to build a Shop and Cafe in the village, even when the NDP document ref. 6.2 Facilities states that a paucity of retail facilities obliges residents to travel elsewhere for many food and drink requirements.</p> <p>4.7 This is laughable to read, in view of the NDP's response to the Morgan's Field proposal. Areas of Flood Risk - I feel that this isn't the remit of the NDP and would be covered by National Policy. We seem to have many Flood experts in the Village who think that their knowledge is greater than consultants dealing with Flood Risk, and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>8 As stated already, I think that this area has not been clearly defined and that the parishioners have been misled. I also don't think that this extensive area of 'GREEN BELT' is allowed under NDP guidance. 'Strategic Green Gap' is not a term found in any of the following: National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Hereford's Core Strategy or Hereford's Planning Guidance for Neighbourhood Planning. I fear that the Inspector will turn this Green Gap policy down as the area proposed is too large to be designated Local Green Space, and the NDP already lists other areas to be preserved as Local Green Spaces. In conclusion, I think that the NDP have produced a very negative planning policy document, which says what can't be done rather than what can be done. I think that the questionnaire and consultation process has been appalling. The Parish Council Chairman states in the latest Reporter that during the NDP consultation process parishioners have been given over 40 'options' to consider. This is nonsense as he is counting 'options' as the number of questions asked in their misapprehended questionnaire. Options should have been presented at a much earlier stage in the consultation process, and these could have formed the basis of a Community-led document, rather than this NDP, which has been written by a paid professional and the policies in the document are, in my opinion, his and not community owned.</p>	<p>The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area</p> <p>Landscape gap. Assessment can inform sites. We believe the settlement boundary will meet demands for housing on infill sites. Playing fields should be protected from development</p> <p>The NDP does not support the Community Benefit Society because it conflicts with other plan policies. National policy on flooding should not be duplicated in the NDP but it will be addressed in term of local issues, particularly flash flooding</p> <p>We are reviewing terminology and description of the area between the 2 settlement boundaries, in line with the wishes of the community. Options in the consultation process have been deemed adequate by HCC</p>
52	Robert Hughes	<p>The NDP is an excellent and well-prepared document which I strongly support.</p> <p>7.4 The tributary stream feeding into Cradley Brook via the old shop and post office should be protected from any upstream development which would increase the flood risk.</p> <p>7.2 & 8.2 The ACNBS and Conservation Area should be 'out of bounds' for housing or commercial development to preserve east Cradley's character and environment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p> <p>A valid point which will be considered</p> <p>These designations have policy protection independent of the NDP</p>
53	Elaine Huohes	<p>The NDP is an excellent and well-prepared document which I strongly support.</p> <p>7.4 The tributary stream feeding into Cradley Brook via the old shop and post office should be protected from any upstream development which would increase the flood risk.</p> <p>8.2 & 8.2 The ACNBS and Conservation Area should be 'out of bounds' for housing or commercial development to preserve east Cradley's character and environment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support</p> <p>A valid point which will be considered</p> <p>These designations have policy protection independent of the NDP</p>
54	Jack Haddon and Mo Haddon	<p>We want any building (probably only windfall) to be restricted to within the settlement boundary as shown on the map in the NDP proposal.</p> <p>1.2 No buildings should be allowed in the 'Strategic Gap' between east and west Cradley.</p> <p>2 It seems that the rest of the parish outside the settlement boundary is considered to be 'countryside' and as such planning permission to be confined to that essential to agriculture forestry and other defined rural activities. We have just heard permission has been granted in a field at Stoney Cross - in the countryside so where does that leave this statement? We do however agree to the Stoddard plan which we think will add substantial amenity value to the village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support it is hoped that the plan will help us influence future planning decisions</p>
55	Heather Morgan	<p>Green Gap This should be left as it is now, however Morgan's Field should be taken out to be hopefully used for the proposed Heart of the Village Community Project which would benefit us all.</p> <p>Building Cradley does not need any more development i.e. houses. The infrastructure couldn't handle any more i.e. surgery, school, power, sewerage.</p> <p>Traffic There is clearly too much traffic going through Cradley. The volume that goes past Finches Corner from the Ledbury area is horrendous - vehicles which are much too big to be on a village road, its worse than you see in Malvern</p>	<p>Morgan's field will be decided by HCC planners</p> <p>We note your comments on Infrastructure and traffic</p>

56	S Clarke	This document has clearly had an enormous amount of input and I support it in its entirety. It supports local people, business and development without sacrificing the village character. 7.6 Strategic Green Gap - described as a buffer by LA and 'single most important space' VDS and repeatedly shown to be of great importance to the community - so why is development in this area up for discussion? It should not be considered. RE NDP = I support what it says on this matter and hope it will have the necessary weight to stave off opportunistic developers determined to get in by whichever means. 2	Thank you for your support
57	Judith Aldridge	Agree with policy proposed for housing sites. However important that more stress is laid on so-called starter houses, rather than as at Fairfax Close (mainly 5 (or larger) bedroom houses). 5.6.7 These refer to avoidance of increasing flooding, damaging the natural environment and appearance of the Strategic Gap. The decision to refuse development in this, and other currently protected areas, is very important and should be maintained especially in the face of the HOV proposal. A second shop / cafe could be usefully placed in the school site, easy of access from Buryfields and those using / calling at the school. 1.1	This is a valid point which we will try to include we note your points regarding the Strategic Gap and Shop
58	John C.S. Turner	I am displeased to see the unnecessary and potentially divisive formal division of Cradley in to West Cradley and East Cradley and particularly the use of upper case lettering for West and East. I have lived most of my life in or near a new town in Herefordshire and have seen the divisions between two communities not helped by the term Old Town and New Town (note capitals). Cradley should be united and not divided and at most western and eastern (lower case) might be used. 1 Despite your conclusion that you do not need it cover for new housing (5.1) I am sure that over time this will happen and the plan only allows for infill within selected parts of the boundary. No doubt new housing will be needed or imposed in the future and I feel that the gap is the place to build and so unite the village rather than spread out into the surrounding countryside. 6 As I understand it the so called 'strategic' gap was created strategically and also fairly recently to counteract a proposed development west of the brook. With the possibility of a community project for a community shop and cafe (note CSNDP4) on Morgan's Field is should not now be included in a blanket cap on all development. 8	We note your comments and have amended to lower case we note your points regarding the Strategic Gap and Shop The Strategic Green Gap has been in existence since 1998 and has always included Morgan's Field. The area was specified to prevent the coalescence of the two sections of the Village and maintain the natural beauty of the area
59	Dr Susanna Van Marle	I do not think that Morgan's Field should be in the area of Strategic Green Gap. It is an excellent location for a centralised resource for the village. 8	Thank you for your comment
60	Roman Iwanczuk	Scanned and responded separately.	
61	Frank Hare	If housing of the magnitude of 10% are built then to combine it with a village shop, then the Stoddards scheme fits perfectly accessible to many. 5.1 6.1 With no pub-no shop at one end of the village where folk live this should be addressed within the plan. The doctors surgery is not enough. Also to maintain and support this village a new larger surgery will be needed. The pharmacy is being over-run now	We note your comment we note your comment
62	Bernard Wright	Prior to any implementation of the NDP a full synopsis must be addressed. 1 the present design and functioning of the pumping station at Kings Bridge. 2. The infrastructure of the road network within the village and the access roads from the A4103 (Hereford road) to the village. It is absolutely madness going any further with the present matchbox mentality trying to fit 21 century policies to within the current 18719th century structure of the village. 5.3	This is outside the remit of a local plan
63	Tomv Madsen	CSNDP8 no development whatsoever should be built on the strategic green gap. One new development will open the flood gates. CSNDP2 When considering planning permission thought should be given to way housing property privacy CSNDP7 No planning permission should ever be considered in areas alongside Cradley Brook. CSNDP1	Thank you for your support We note your comment The policy is intended to protect the area around the brook
64	Diane Merker	protected area of open space. There is a covenant on this area held by the owners of the bungalows preventing building on the ??? Could this area also include that which is council owned eg. Both sides of the road to poundbridge CSNDP8 Strategic Green gap this should be left undeveloped to maintain the quirky historical development of cradley 1	Please could you clarify your comment We note your comment on the Strategic Green Gap
65	John Davies	The development in Chapel Lane should be in a sympathetic to the existing buildings. 2 Designated housing developments to include affordable houses to help keep the village varied in its life 3 To research a footpath/cycleway to link west to east to provide a safe route to amenities in the village 5 Housing	Please clarify your comments reference development in Chapel Lane as we are unaware of any proposals We note your comments This will need to be pursued once the plan is in place
66	Simon Wilson	should there be specific reference within CSNDP2 to the fact that in the village survey 81% of respondents favoured developments of 10 units or fewer from this list of the village in policy. General This is a thorough and comprehensive document. In my opinion it reflects the wishes of the village as expressed in the village survey of August/September 2015. I agree with the principals the document is trying to achieve through the individual policies. 5.3	We note your comments and thank you for your support
67	Marie clare Blinman	A good clear document particularly support the following statements- the NDP will not need to allocate sites for housing and that any new development will be infill/windfall. 7.1 neither Herefordshire Council nor the parish Council have the power to alter ANPB boundaries and that the ANOB has additional protection from development 3 And finally I support the statement that the Parish has a very limited capacity to accommodate further residential development	We note your comments and thank you for your support
68	Marie clare Blinman	Attached sheet	
69	Gillian Howard	Amend draft to exclude Morgans Field from the green gap please	We note your comments
70	Mrs. E. Gilbert	Since this area is designated an ANOB surely this precludes any more development above Plut fields as it is. Fairly close mainly fills a gap though trees were lost. The oaks would be in danger as also the ancient hollow way. 7.2 policy CSNDP5 re East and West Cradley since the primary school is already built we have to accept it, but development of village should be to unify East and West- not to encroach outwards into the countryside or to make 1970's development a further eyesore from the makers hills, see above reference. 5.3 CSNDP9 any development needs to unify the village with modern building techniques there is no impediment to building here, so lets us do what our forebears were unable to accomplish unify the village at the strategic gap 8	We note your comments but Pixiefields is not within the ANOB. Comments regarding joining the village settlement areas are noted
71	Tracey Iwnczuk	Attached comment	
72	Ian Edger	Throughout document Generally a well prepared document however I have an objection to the terms West and East Cradley, we are one village. There is no West and East Cradley there is ONE village an amendment to the document is needed to allow for the development of a much needed community facility on Morgans Field WR13 SHX 5.1	Thank you for your support. West and East Cradley will be lower case and purely descriptive. We note your comments regarding Morgan's Field
73	Fran Doidge	compleions and commitments do not total 93 dwellings as it is unlikely 60 houses will be built at Pixiefields. The developer has withdrawn possible due to access and none may perseue this further CSNDPA7.6 I strongly support heat of the village and am sure some sort of arrangement can be made to support the current butchers who have given us good reliable service. Community is much needed. 11 Although it is stated there is a clear excess of outdoor playing space development this space into actual sports facilities eg Football field is fraught with delay	We note your comments. Outline planning permission for Pixiefields remains valid for 5 years
74	Sarah Herriot	attached pages	