

Question

3 How should housing development be managed within Cradley? (Tick all that apply.)

3.1 Increase the percentage of low cost housing.	Y	33	Of total	44.59%
3.2 Infill sites between existing developments.	Y	45	Of total	60.81%
3.3 Development / conversion of existing premises.	Y	52	Of total	70.27%
3.4 Concentration on smallest number of sites i.e. create housing estates.	Y	14	Of total	18.92%
3.5 Dispersal of new builds across village area.	Y	37	Of total	50.00%

3.6

Storrige needs new houses
5 a year not large development
Small housing estates with landscaping / trees
No building on green sites
Devpmt only outside conservation area and AONB
After a while infill becomes ribbon development
Development sympathetic to existing village
3.2 Not vast numbers in any one space 3.3 if there are any
New holiday lets to become residential
Disperse new build across parish to allow larger plots and more space between properties
Properties to be 2 bed min to house families
Definitely do not want 60 houses built behind Pixiefields
Possibly 3.2. Small scale developments avoid creation of isolated almost ghetto like areas which don't join village life
Can amenities sustain continuous development of housing?
Mix of the above. Not all sites between existing buiding infilled.
Devpmt near school to encourage young families and sustain school
Land be new school might be considered
Build behind Pixiefields - Chockbury Lane

Mant green areas - fields, orchards - already lost. How much more housing can we sustain?

Small developments preferable

Large estates should be resisted - are numbers required? Core Strat required 50 within 10 - 15 years. Recent devpmts and infill applications approaching this.

Retain existing village as much as possible

I think that all styles and types of new development should be considered on their merits and their fitting in with the communities vision for the settlement. Cradley has had its fair share of 'estate' development and small groups should only be considered in future

See Q2 above

I think that infill and conversion which can include low cost is the most appropriate, with new builds spread throughout. Whilst I own a paddock which could be used for a housing estate all of which would be within the existing building line and would not impact on the AONB because there are already properties surrounding it including the church, I believe that infill etc is more in keeping. I see no reason why in my own village area that properties like The Old Rectory and Coach House are completely within 'Protection of open areas and green spaces'. It should only be the church and churchyard that are protected in this manner, not private dwellings.

Small, self-sufficient communities adding interest and innovation to existing services.

Small developments of good design - too much new build is of poor quality.

None

50 houses in 10 years is only 5 per year which wouldn't have a great impact on the village

Ideally mixed development within the village boundary

Above only if necessary

there is adequate housing existing for people of the village

As we live some way from the village itself it is not for us to comment

I would like an answer as to how the proposed boundary was decided. It is clearly unfair as proposed. Some properties are cut in two others left in tact. Why is this? Why does the settlement boundary further divide and segment the village leaving no room for improving village amenities and services. Why was the map that I was given with the questionnaire so inadequate? Surely it is the responsibility of the planning bodies to give all the villagers a clear and unambiguous plan to study. I had to search the internet for a better plan - gives the impression we are not supposed to notice the detail! Now I have the larger scale map to hand it is obvious that more thought clearly needs to be given to the settlement boundary in particular the area between the church and Buryfields. The current settlement boundary not only strangles this opportunity but also unfairly and undemocratically provides some home owners the opportunity to develop while denying others by having their property cut through or even excluded - hardly fair or democratic.

The settlement boundary reflects a point in time and may need to be adjusted to reflect recent changes but the in principle boundary is still valid.

It will have to change but it should be progressive and controlled. Not 60 houses on one site!
