

PUBLIC CONSULTATION APRIL 2021

ALL COMMENTS TAKEN FROM FEEDBACK FORMS AND COLLATED BY SECTION

SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES

Why have you drawn settlement boundaries which are not the same as Option A in the original consultation which 80% of residents approved? (refers to both boundaries)

It's not clear what impact the boundary has (refers to both boundaries)

The proposed boundary does not include the site that has already been agreed for 10 houses known as the Orchard (refers to Stoke Cross boundary)

Cannot support at this stage (refers to both boundaries)

As long as red brick workshop at Nether Court is included inside the boundary (refers Stoke Lacy boundary)

Do we have power to enforce development? (refers Stoke Cross boundary)

No preference (refers both boundaries)

Townsfolk protect themselves and put all development in the countryside (refers both boundaries)

The townsfolk seem to want to protect themselves from development but want all growth to be in the countryside. Unfair! (refers both boundaries)

Why are all proposed sites in Stoke Cross area, why no sites at other end of the village, Stoke Lacy??

Why has this area suddenly become Stoke Cross when the signs state Stoke Lacy? Who changed it!!! I was born in this village and it has always been Stoke Lacy for 75yrs

Good (refers to both boundaries)

Good (refers to both boundaries)

With no schools/medical facilities or shops, settlement boundaries are characterised by the existing pattern of the parish (refers both boundaries)

With no shop/school/medical facilities, settlement boundaries are only relevant to the character and pattern of development in the parish (refers both boundaries)

Not qualified to comment with any understanding (refers Stoke Cross boundary)

Boundaries could be tightened as per attached suggestion (refers Stoke Lacy boundary. Map provided suggesting amendment in areas of Herb Lane)

Room needs to be considered for Stoke Lacy to take its fair share of development (refers Stoke Lacy boundary)

Stoke Lacy should have potential sites (refers Stoke Lacy boundary)

I cannot see any information relating to a boundary change, but any enlargement is unwelcome as it will increase the urbanisation of the area and erode its nature. This is a small agricultural and residential area and any enlargement for yet more poor-quality housing is opposed. (refers both boundaries)

No enlargement of the existing settlement boundaries should be permitted, increasing urbanisation of the area will destroy its character and is not sustainable. (refers both boundaries)

SITES

Option 1 – Site 3 Crossfield House

These numbers are ridiculous. It's not supporting local people; it's forcing development onto a community.

Too many houses. There is no real need for any more new houses in this area.

Creeping urban development. Will be followed up with further development creep no doubt

Urban development creep. Development within the existing boundary would be natural but not outside it.

We have enough development in the village

If we had to have more new build, estate type housing, this is the least bad option

Would not alter view of village

There's too much traffic already. There have been a number of near miss accidents recently

I don't think it is safe to increase the amount of additional traffic from that junction. I've seen 2 near misses in a month so far this year

Existing properties have had enough upheaval with the building of the new houses

Existing properties have had enough upheaval with the building of the new houses

Existing properties have had enough upheaval with the building of the new houses

Overdevelopment of area

Enough new housing en masss already in Stoke Lacy

Not 8 houses on this site. Support 1 or 2 houses on this site

Would support 1 or 2 houses on this site -not 8

Too many houses at this site. Would support a small development of 1-3

This appears to be a fairly narrow strip of land with limited options for house/garage/garden orientation in order to accommodate the suggested 8 dwellings. Combine Option 1 with Option 4 together with the adjacent orchard plot which has/had planning for some 10 or so dwellings and the sum of those plots appears more appealing. Could be connected and all accessed from the A465 as opposed to the Swedish House lane which may have no known owner and pose legal access/maintenance difficulties.

Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the Core Strategy quota has already been met!

Current road is unadopted, entrance onto A465 dreadful, more water draining across roads/fields.
Greenfield development

Entrance onto A465 is terrible, greenfield site, where does all the water go? Where are the local services going to cope with increased demands?

1 or 2 houses maximum

I feel the access could run through the Orchard which has already got planning commitment however would impact heavily on the houses between the proposed site and Woodland View

Ruin viewpoint from lower in the village eg Hopton Lane. Adjacent to new development

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Cross is already overdeveloped. All of these sites are part of the natural environment of Stoke Cross. A maximum of 3 houses on any site is more acceptable. Building of more would interfere with rural vistas

Any more development of Stoke Cross will spoil the feel of the village. Also, there isn't a shop, doctors or school. Cars would be in constant use.

1 or 2 houses only

1 or 2 houses only

As expected, we support the site. However, we consider 8 homes to be over development; we are mindful of our immediate neighbours and consider 2 self builds to be more acceptable

Possible drainage difficulties

Stoke Lacy has met its proportional housing quota until 2031

Support only after the Orchard has been developed

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an "island" and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an "island" and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Option 2 – Site 4 To the north of Westbury Rd, Stoke Cross

These numbers are ridiculous. It's not supporting local people; it's forcing development on a community. It's greed as simple as that

Ridiculous number of houses. This is a conservation area, not a huge free for all. Trying for a quick buck

Creeping urban development into rural agricultural land. Outside the settlement boundary

Urban development creep into an agricultural area that is outside the settlement boundary

We have enough development in the village

Current lane not suitable

More new housing estate, visible from the roads, changing the face of our village

Access to/from a very narrow lane with steep hill at junction to access main road

Noise, traffic pollution, impact to local wildlife. Plant more trees, plants, native species

The lane is dangerous, people speed up/down already. Additional noise/pollution is not welcome not to mention the impact to local wildlife

Less impact on current properties

Exit onto the C1116

(General comments referring to site options 1-4) Enough new housing en masse in SL

(General comment referring to site options 2-4) No more estates in Stoke Cross. They create division in the community and are out of character with the area

(General comment referring to site options 2-4) Given the Newlands development it is clear that estates lead to community fragmentation. Environmentally and architecturally they clash with the ambience of the village

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands

Open field in a more open location which might require screening which by its very name and nature is no answer to landscape harm.

AECOM made no mention of the septic tank on that plot which could have some bearing on its viability, whereas they did with the more distant Option 3

Access onto a class C road which was denied in Bromyard for the same reason

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the Core Strategy quota has been already met!

Only access onto a narrow country lane !!

Flooding issues. Access on a bend

Access is terrible. Access onto A465 is plainly dangerous, more traffic on a single-track road, more water flowing into local rivers

Terrible location. Road is single track. Access onto A465 is dangerous, water run off into stream, greenfield site

I think there will be access problems on this road, Westbury Rd

Road junction?

Views and nature of village. This lane to Bredenbury will not support more traffic!

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Cross is already over developed. All of these sites are part of the natural environment of Stoke Cross. A maximum of 3 houses on any site is more acceptable, building of more would interfere with rural vistas

Perhaps 2 or 3 houses

1 or 2 houses only

Support- it would be out of sight and discreet having minimum impact on the existing residents of Stoke Cross

Vehicles having to access main road near to Woodland View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, it would spoil the roll of the land

Vehicles having to access main road near Woodland View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, would spoil the roll of the land

(General comment referring to site options 1-4) Stoke Lacy has met its proportional housing quota until 2031

(General comment referring to site options 2 & 3) Compromise drainage. Also increase pressure on sewage site

(objection) as it is near the sewerage farm

Option 3 – Site 5 to the east of Westbury Rd, Stoke Cross

Too many! it's supposed to be a Conservation Area

There is no way this can be justified, Crazy

Would appear to be appropriate commercial development – depending on the use of the site

Would appear to be OK for mixed use as it's alongside the road but is still outside the settlement boundary.

We have enough development in the village

We moved from a city centre to Stoke Lacy making it our forever home. If these houses are built it will obscure our views (the whole reason for buying this house) There was never any mention of this when we bought the house

Would encroach on view from houses at front of estate

Increased junction confusion on main road. Our house is already surrounded on 3 sides, to build in front would seriously impact quality of living

More new housing estate, visible from roads, changing the face of our village

Access could be achieved onto main road

Terrible access, dangerous traffic levels, noise pollution. Being overlooked somewhat, loss of privacy. Plant more trees and wildflowers

Lack of access, increased traffic generation, being overlooked, loss of privacy, increased noise, pollution, traffic etc. Plant some trees, wildflowers instead. Preserve the green spaces for wildlife

The new house owners have bought their properties with open views. Not fair to build houses opposite

Exit onto either C116 or main road. Over development of this area. Better use as a recreational area or conservation

Enough new housing en masse already in SL

Ideal site for recreation area

No more estates in Stoke Cross, they create division in the community and are out of character with the area

Given the Newlands development it is clear that estates lead to community fragmentation. Environmentally and architecturally the clash with the ambience of the village

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands. Maybe green space for recreation?

Development on this site could mirror that of Newlands development opposite and as a result be less incongruous. Potential rainfall run off together with that runoff already piped from the Newlands site into the Woodend Lane stream could be an issue with increased levels and potential risk of flooding to existing properties in the valley

Access onto a C class road or main road which already has too many turnings

Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the Core Strategy quota has been already met!

Access onto a narrow country lane or busy main road

Flooding issues and overuse of sewerage facility

Access is dangerous, way too many houses, Greenfield development. Now building across road is a dangerous precedent

Appalling location. Development of Agric. Land, access dangerous, urban sprawl into countryside, too many houses

10 houses as proposed, not 20

I think there will be access problems with Westbury Rd, Woodland View and the new development coming off the A road in such a short distance causing traffic accidents on the A465

10 houses are far too many. Stoke Lacy has already been extended extensively and not in character with the village. However, if there must be more houses it should be kept away from the more rural areas where wildlife is more likely to be

10 houses as proposed, not 20

Road junction?

No houses. Opposite Newlands estate, drainage, nature of village ruined

A maximum of 3 houses on any site is more acceptable

Any new houses on this large important corner site would conflict with the mixture of house styles in the village

Strongly object. The roadside view of Stoke Cross has been spoilt by the Newlands development and further development along the roadside will urbanise the appearance even more. This is a small rural settlement and needs protecting

Vehicles having to access main road near to Woodend View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, it would spoil the roll of the land

Vehicles having to access main road near to Woodend View which is already a dangerous junction. Also, it would spoil the roll of the land

Stoke Lacy has met the proportional housing quota until 2031

Compromise drainage. Also increase pressure on sewerage site

Object as it is near the sewerage farm

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an "island" and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an "island" and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly

object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Option 4 – Site 6 to the east of the Parish Hall, Stoke Cross

Too many! That's 16 houses in a conservation area

There is no way this can be justified, crazy. Too many houses, there is no real demand for any more new houses in this area. This is a conservation area not a huge free for all trying for a quick buck

Creeping urban development of a rural area. Outside the settlement boundary

Development creep into an agricultural area

We have enough development in the village

The village hall should not become engulfed in housing

Would not alter view of village

Personally, I feel there is already enough permitted development in that area. I have animals and children, more people and traffic is not what this village needs

There's already houses permitted in the adjacent field, another 6 houses seems perfectly reasonable

Little impact on current properties. Best choice

Enough new housing en masse already in SL

No more estates in Stoke Cross, they create division in the community and are out of character with the area

Given the Newlands development it is clear that estates lead to community fragmentation. Environmentally and architecturally they clash with the ambience of the village

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands, but maybe green space for recreation?

Stoke Cross has enough houses with Newlands, but maybe green space for recreation?

This appears to be a fairly narrow strip of land with limited options for house/garage/garden orientation in order to accommodate the suggested 8 dwellings. Combine Option 1 with Option 4 together with the adjacent orchard plot which has/had planning for some 10 or so dwellings and the sum of those plots appears more appealing. Could be connected and all accessed from the A465 as opposed to the Swedish House lane which may have no known owner and pose legal access/maintenance difficulties. There would not appear to be a PROW on this plot as suggested

Access onto a C class road or main road which already has too many turnings. Speed limit is not adhered to on either road

Stoke Cross has more than enough development already and the core strategy quota has been already met!

I feel this is the best as access could run through the Orchard which already has planning commitment

Ruin viewpoint from lower in the village. Enough homes planned adjacent to it

Building of more would interfere with rural vistas

No more here

No more houses in that area

Perhaps 2 or 3 if the drainage and sewage systems would be satisfactory

If we are honest, we all knew this site was going to be built on. Although we would prefer that it wasn't, I don't believe we really have a choice

Stoke Lacy has met its proportional housing quota until 2031

Support only after the Orchard has been developed

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an "island" and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Object to any 'mass' development on any site but aware that we have to offer something to be compliant with NPPF. Also know that we cannot be an "island" and will be expected to contribute to a general shortfall across Herefordshire, unfair as that may seem. I could accept 1-2 houses on the most appropriate site that meets the requirements of access, safety, drainage, lack of impingement on views etc. I strongly object to the inevitable fallout that a greater density of development would have by increasing traffic on our narrow and already abused lanes

Site 9 Barn conversion at Hopton Court Farm

Support for residential use only. Strongly object to commercial use as this is on residential and agricultural area only.

Industrial development into a residential and agricultural area with all the ----(illegible) of noise and excessive traffic

It's important to support opportunities for business and employment in the area

We have enough development in the village

New uses for existing, redundant buildings – this is the way to go

Narrow, single track, winding lane with blind bends. Have been several accidents in recent years. Wholly unsuitable for an increase in development/traffic. It is also far outside what would be considered main

village settlement. This lane is used extensively for walking etc and is access to wood. Any additional traffic would be hazardous

This is a good idea, bring old buildings back into use. I'm all for this idea

Making use of old buildings is a great way of re-using existing buildings, preserving character and offering unique business opportunities

Would strongly support business opportunities. However, business type, hours of operation etc would need to be considered

Satellite development and business

Support a business venture

It depends what type of business and the amount and type of traffic it would attract to a narrow single-track lane

The intended business is unclear as is the amount of traffic entailed on a single- track lane

Small conversions and garden in-fills should take priority

The access lane is already very busy for a lane in the area – there have been ‘near misses’ on many occasions. It is prone to pot- holes (due to the speed of some vehicles) This is a quiet rural area not suited to industrial use. The infrastructure is already stretched (internet, water etc) and it seems unrealistic to add to the weight

The road is far too narrow to take any business development and traffic. Also, the area is of a rural nature and not appropriate for industrial use and ‘white van’ traffic

A good opportunity for small business start- ups and employment for the village

The access lane to this site is a small rural single-track road which has high hedges and very limited passing places, leading to frequent reversing when vehicles meet. It is little more than a farm track in places with several 90-degree bends and numerous potholes caused by large agricultural machinery. These frequently use it as there are several farmers with land to either side of the lane. The potholes created by this are frequently treated but quickly reappear. The road is also subject to surface water in several places via run off from field entrances in the winter. Inadequate drainage causes this to congregate on the blind bend at the church end where there is standing water for most of the winter leading to large flooded potholes. The introduction of more commercial vehicles onto this narrow lane as a consequence of this development will only exacerbate the above issues and make it more difficult for existing residents’ traffic which need to use it on a daily basis

The access lane to this site is a small rural single-track road which has high hedges and very limited passing places, leading to frequent reversing when vehicles meet. It is little more than a farm track in places with several 90-degree bends and numerous potholes caused by large agricultural machinery. These frequently use it as there are several farmers with land to either side of the lane. The potholes created by this are frequently treated but quickly reappear. The road is also subject to surface water in several places via run off from field entrances in the winter. Inadequate drainage causes this to congregate on the blind bend at the church end where there is standing water for most of the winter leading to large flooded potholes. The introduction of more commercial vehicles onto this narrow lane as a consequence of this development will

only exacerbate the above issues and make it more difficult for existing residents' traffic which need to use it on a daily basis

Not shown on map. Where is this site please?

Traffic down narrow lane would be a problem

Depends on type of employment

Not shown on map?

I agree employment improves a village socially

Access via the narrow Hopton Lane is difficult and disturbs the wildlife of Netherwood

Access to more traffic will be damaging

No more traffic in Hopton Lane

Access for business use could be difficult. Hopton Lane is always in need of repair

Other than questioning whether this is a 'green' option with regard to the extra traffic that would be generated, we have no strong feelings

Support for business is important

Would depend on type of business, noise impact and traffic movement as narrow lane

Would depend on type of business, noise impact and traffic movement as narrow lane

Any additional comments – related to Sites

(Reference Site 9) The lane (Hopton Lane) and unmade road leading to site 9 are not appropriate for increased traffic use as they are used by farm vehicles, residents, walkers, riders etc. The unmade road is also a public footpath. There are no passing places. Use of the land for workshops is not appropriate due to incidental noise and as this is a residential and agricultural area this is out of keeping and could become a nuisance and source of dispute

(Reference Site 9) Access is via an unmade track which is also a footpath. There are no passing places and Hopton Lane is a single-track lane that is not suitable for more traffic. There are no services (water, electricity and telephone) to this area and there is legitimate concern that adding these will create further pressure on these facilities

Why are all the sites for development in Stoke Cross? Lots of areas down in Stoke Lacy not being used, should be at least one potential site

The site allocations are completely unfair. Why are they all in Stoke Cross? I think Stoke Lacy needs to take its fair share

Stoke Lacy is now up to the housing levels that are required of us. We have a good development at Newlands, and I feel strongly that development now ought to be odd conversions (granny annexe), a new

home here and there (like the one property on the C116 which already has permission. More business opportunities (small workshops attached to homes) Site options 1-4 bunch up housing/make problems/overcrowd rural area/overstretch sewage

Any further development should be homes for people not estates for profit. Only build in one's and twos at any one time-in the tradition of the way houses have been built in the area in the past. Drainage must be properly designed to not have detrimental impact on neighbours and wildlife

Planners should increasingly focus on enhancing the community rather than estates for profit. This means smaller developments to enable elderly members to remain in the community rather than in Care Homes

Stoke Cross has enough development. To help bring both parts of Stoke Lacy together, the footpath should be investigated. Maybe look for funding?

Stoke Cross has enough development. To help bring both parts of Stoke Lacy together, the footpath should be investigated. Maybe look for funding?

At present it appears that the siting of settlement boundaries runs along the back of many existing dwellings. That being the case does that preclude extension to any of those dwellings as then falling outside the settlement boundary or should the line include the garden for instance?

I am not in favour of including the industrial units within the settlement boundary as that could create a large potential building plot. That said I can see why they have been included.

As we are not directly affected by any of these proposals, I believe the majority view of the nearby residents should be supported and will do so once that is known

Since we live at the furthest reaches of Stoke Lacy, I think it best to allow those residents who live closer to the sites listed to have priority voting

Major flooding concern. The 28 dwellings already have made the situation a lot worse. They use a hydro-brake and a tank to smooth the output, but the brook seems to be at maximum capacity during heavy rainfall. This is imperilling the 2 grade 2 listed buildings at the bottom – Hall Place Farm and the Oast House. With 10 more properties already set to be added, the situation could become very grave. Where in the NDP has this been addressed?

Options 1,2,3 are dreadful. All developments are outside of Stoke Cross/Lacy using Greenfield sites. Access is dangerous. Option 3 is agricultural land and is a Greenfield site, it is plain lt unsuitable for development and increases urban development over the A365 which is a dangerous precedent. All water will drain from these sites into the stream and cause more flood risk in the village

Options 1,2,3 are dreadful. It's difficult to see how worse locations could have been chosen. Greenfield site, terrible access, dangerous access onto A465. Where are the local services to support more people? Water runoff will increase flood risk in a flood exposed zone. Option 5 appears to create a dangerous precedent by building a mini housing estate north of A465

Any new houses in village should be built in one's or two's, certainly not an estate

In the last survey development sites were suggested for both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross so why in this consultation document is only Stoke Cross considered? Surely sites in both areas should be considered. Why should all sites be in Stoke Cross? Developments of the type suggested could bring a variety of ages into the actual village of Stoke Lacy as well as stoke Cross which can only be a good thing, otherwise Stoke Cross will end up being a diverse population whereas Stoke Lacy will become a retirement village then die out!

We have exceeded Hereford's wishes in developing Newlands estate. This is a village with no amenities other than hall and church. We want to prevent extra cars and road use. No footpaths up and down hill. Infill of one or two houses acceptable in a village. Large development absolutely inappropriate

Stoke Cross would be grossly over-developed

We already have too many new houses in the village (planned and completed) We do not need or want any more

I spoke out in favour of the Newlands development because I felt Stoke Lacy was an aging population and we needed some new people in the village. I felt that development was enough and objected to Neville Symonds application. I therefore strongly object on the same basis- 28 new houses in a village the size of Stoke Lacy is sufficient for the foreseeable future and these new proposals are so closely packed together, we will be more of a town than a village.

More provision needs to be made for an open public space at the top of the village- somewhere to walk dogs, sit and meet others without having to get into a car and come to Netherwood.

The number of proposed properties is probably not enough to fulfil the quotas set by HCC

I feel we have sufficient new houses in the Stoke Lacy/Cross area. Over the past few years we've had an increase, assuming that the Orchard will be developed, of 38 new houses. We are a small country village, dependant on nearby Bromyard for shops, surgery, hospital, dentist and schools. Bromyard is struggling to accommodate its increase in population. Increasing the size of Stoke Lacy/Cross is just going to add to the traffic and parking problems. Let's leave it as it is!

We believe strongly that Stoke Cross has seen adequate large development and are disappointed that none is considered for Stoke Lacy settlement. The decision to allow continued development of Stoke Cross while protecting the Stoke Lacy boundary will only lead to an even more divided community. This NDP should be used to unite the community rather than divide it further

Draft Policies

SL1 – Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character

I agree with the points in the policy but am against any new build

Support

Fundamentally this means NOT large estates but small homes that serve community needs

Builds of one's or two's not estates

Most of this happens under planning regs anyway doesn't it? How can you link footpaths without passing over ?? new farmland (writing not clear. Further short comment following this but illegible)

No 5 must finish the statement with 'where possible'. It must be remembered that these paths cross private land and it is often/(words illegible). This must be protected

Important to protect the character of the village from over development

Protecting yes but clarity is required on what 'enhancing' means. Does 5 need 'enhancing'?

What does 'enhancing' mean? It won't be 'enhanced' by more development!

SL3 - Public Open Space

I think the policy needs rewording as it would currently allow teenagers to ride their motor vehicles through designated woodland which I would definitely oppose. Any play area should be centrally located to reduce the requirement for car parking

Whilst open space could be used to bring our community together, careful consideration must be made so as this does not impact on existing residence

Destroy Greenfield sites but plant some wildflowers!

Bizarre! Most of the planning options here will destroy Greenfield sites but we should 'plant herbs' !

Support if we can find spaces

Local community should designate public spaces

Local people should be encouraged to identify and maintain meeting places

Some improvements to the footpath between Stoke Cross and the church will enable better access on foot to the wood and churchyard

It's not a town

Need to for our (illegible)

A worthy statement but unlikely to happen

Putting in some pavements would be good. My blind daughter is unable to walk her guide dog as no safe routes

Other than the woodland amenity area off Hopton Lane there is no public open space – all private land

SL6 – Tourism and Rural Enterprise

Tourism NO. Rural enterprise should be treated on a case- by -case basis through the existing planning system

But emphasis on small scale

Unsure

With reservations re access, noise and light levels

Based on policy detailed it is most important to ensure that the road infrastructure can easily accommodate developments

This is very difficult to reply to as it is not clear where the plan would be

Far more detail is needed. The policy is too general. Our lane can only take walkers and cannot deal with any more rural enterprise than the current existing farms

Increasing traffic on single track lanes for commercial vehicles should be avoided

Beware of increasing traffic on single track lanes which are not suitable for commercial vehicles

Yes to small scale businesses and workplaces. Need more growth

I support rural business, but location needs to be correct and not in remote locations on poor roads etc

A worthy statement but unlikely to happen

There really is no scope for tourism. Rural enterprise should remain agricultural

There is no scope for tourism. What is meant by rural 'enterprise' in this context?

SL7 - Improving Accessibility and Sustainable Travel

The expectations are unrealistic. Cycle paths on developments of up to 10 houses are not going to be of any great length and cycle paths on the roads are going to be impossible to instate. More houses will mean more cars and more traffic on our roads. We are fooling ourselves if we think people are going to give up their cars. A typical 4 bedroomed house in the countryside with grown up children will have 4 cars parked outside. At weekend probably 5/6. If we are going to accept more houses let's be honest and make sure adequate parking is available. There are cars parked on the pavement on the Newlands estate already and that has been during lockdown when no visitors are allowed

Pointless. Just fine sounding proposals so it all 'looks good on paper'

Should enable changes to vehicles and travel in future

Should be flexible to allow for changes to vehicles and travel in the future

But who, if any of us, uses the bus?

Sites should not rely on cars etc and not allow development in more remote sites (Site 9)

The provision of safe pedestrian pathway between 'up' and 'down' areas of the village is a high priority

Yes if there's any real demand

Yes if there's any demand for it

SL8 - Development within the Settlement Boundaries

It mentions that development will be supported if small in scale. None of the options are small in scale apart from the barn conversion

Support

There is no development within settlement boundaries

This is a pointless proposal as all development appears to be outside of the settlement boundary

Given lack of facilities development within settlement boundaries is not justifiable

With no facilities development within the settlement boundaries is difficult to justify

Where? There's not much space as it is

Only where appropriate

SL9 – Housing Mix

This is written to exclude 4 bedroom and larger houses, so I believe it is too prescriptive. People working from home will need the larger houses

Support

More houses for local youngsters

Why do we need starter homes? What young couple is going to come to Stoke Lacy when there are no facilities?

Single builds. Garden in-fills

Policy should be in line with the mixed build character of Stoke Lacy

Individual houses. Variety of styles. Small. In keeping with the mixed build character of the area

Provision for retirement in a rural area? Smaller bungalows with views for downsizing countryfolk!

Family housing should take priority to encourage young families with children into the village

Family housing

Build some traditional oak framed houses. They look easy on the eye and use local/traditional methods

Small houses owned by council or housing association is the last thing we need. They don't care about their property and drop litter

How about higher quality houses that acknowledges vernacular style – not more tacky box development. Housing should be affordable but higher quality. The new ‘tacky box’ development in Stoke Cross is a good example of what is NOT required – charmless and characterless – could be anywhere in the UK

Higher quality development of affordable housing when it's appropriate, but not tacky box development such as that at Stoke Cross. Try using some character and vernacular style!

Any Additional Comments – Related to Settlement Boundaries and Policies

I think the policies are good and sensible. However, I can not support the scale of additional housing these options provide. We have had our quota of new housing in the village

Due to COVID this process has relied too much on internet access. The documents are very long and take a considerable amount of time to read through and digest. No doubt I have missed something or wrongly interpreted it. Some of the references refer to planning policies that are more than 10yrs old, are they still relevant? We need to have a public meeting so that more of the residents can access the information, ask questions to better understand the documents and put their point of view over. It would be wrong to continue without ensuring everyone has had the opportunity to discuss and engage with the process

Drainage is always a major consideration

Many thanks to the team. ☺

We try to keep Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy as one village. This is difficult as no footpath joining them. We have welcomed Newlands; they are here, and we try to include them. This is a rural village – farms – tractors. It should retain this character come what may. Too many houses at the top of the village will create a ‘them and us’ mentality which we don’t want

As we are in an environmental crisis, I cannot support any development on Greenfield sites. We should be holding on to every bit of green space we still have.

This is not a development plan for Stoke Lacy but a charter to destroy the countryside around Stoke Lacy/Cross!

Draft Policy SL2 – ‘Local Green Spaces’. No wonder this is being delayed as Options 1,2,3 overleaf seem to be aimed at destroying Green Spaces!

(Further comment ref SL6) This would depend on the lanes used. Hopton lane, as mentioned overleaf, is a winding and narrow with many farm vehicles so ‘Tourism’ might be difficult. Rubbish tossed on the lane has been an issue in the last year and would need managing if more people used the lane.

Developments reflective of local need-downsizing to enable people to stay in their area and supportive friends. Starter homes to allow young people to stay local.

No mention of self-builds – would reflect locality and better quality

Avoid negative effects on adjacent buildings

Safe access to public highways

In-fills or near building clusters should be allowed outside the settlement boundaries

No mention of self-builds – likely to be in the character of the area and better quality

Housing reflective of local need – downsizing to allow people to stay in the area / smaller starter homes to allow young people to stay local

Drainage does not adversely affect river water quality

High quality sustainable design with emphasis on sustainably sourced materials and energy efficiency
Safe access to public highway
Single builds outside the settlement boundaries should be allowed – in-fills or near building clusters – not detrimental to the character of the area

Should be a shop in the village

Thank you to the NDP Steering Group and Parish Council for undertaking this task which is difficult and fraught with opportunities for people to bring up negativity and conflict. ☺

This is clearly a rural and agricultural area and should remain as such.
Any housing development should remain within existing boundaries and not be allowed to increasingly urbanise the area. It would also be good if housing development could actually be attractive and not more characterless and anonymous sprawl like the development at Stoke Cross.
Commercial development should remain agricultural or agriculture related, or the character of the area will be changed and spoiled forever

