



STOKE LACY PARISH

Neighbourhood Development Plan

2020 - 2031

Issues and Options
Public Consultation

Autumn 2020

SURVEY RESULTS & COMMENTS

Question 1:

Do you support the NDP Draft Vision and Objectives?

Yes 61 93.85%

No 4 6.15%

respondents 65

Comments

1. New buildings should be more in keeping with countryside and not town houses like Newlands.
2. Objective 3. Contrast Newlands with stone houses that existed around the site before, therefore not in character. Commercial gain will always sadly overcome rules!
3. This is a significant step for our community's right to influence local development.
4. Mainly. But I think No.3 needs to accept new materials and techniques to achieve better fuel efficiency that may not be 'in character'.
5. We support the main principles.
6. These should be two separate questions. I agree with the Draft Vision however I have issues with the Draft Objectives.
 - i. Obj. 1: who are 'local people'? The parish has an ageing population so one could say housing for the elderly is priority. On the other hand incoming people (currently non-local) would have another view.
 - ii. Obj.3: What does resource efficiency mean?
 - iii. Obj. 4: I realise that COVID has had a major impact on the progress of the NDP but I don't feel that the sense of community so far has been achieved. Just publishing things online and in The Cider Press is not enough.
 - iv. Obj. 5: Again so far the NDP process is failing so far to limited social gatherings.
 - v. Obj. 6: What do the words mean?
7. Objective 1 could be widened to include people moving into the area.
8. The NDP needs to be used to 'protect' the village, not to allow easy agreement later.
9. This is a narrow question as there are 7 objectives to comment upon. There should be 7 separate questions or one strategic objective. I do however agree with the Draft Vision however in relation to the Draft Objectives
 - i. Obj.1 – There is a problematic assumption regarding 'the local people
 - ii. Obj.2 - Agreed
 - iii. Obj.3 – Agreed
 - iv. Obj.4 – Agreed – this is a major challenge for the Parish Council – they can make incomers feel very unwelcome.
 - v. Obj.5 – Agreed

- vi. Obj.6 – This needs to (be) balanced in relation to the wider ‘harm’ that some commercial initiatives can create.
- vii. Obj.7 – Agreed

Question 2:

Which of the options for settlement boundaries do you support?

Stoke Lacy	(A)	45	69.23%
	(B)	17	26.15%
	Neither	3	4.62%
respondents		65	

Stoke Cross	(A)	47	72.31%
	(B)	15	23.08%
	Neither	3	4.62%
respondents		65	

Comments

1. Less development or tighter boundaries. With Newlands and proposed development opposite pub I feel we have plenty of new housing. We already have a problem with speeding vehicles. This has to be a priority to be addressed.
2. In both instances of ‘B’ option, this seems to allow too much expansion into farmed and green areas and would appear to permit more development than is envisaged by the NDP.
3. (Stoke Lacy): Neither. Both are far too extensive. Any large-scale development alongside the river is liable to flooding. Only v. limited development should be considered within the conservation area.
4. We are outside the settlement boundary.
5. Stoke Cross A: See attachment.
6. Needs flexibility and some building in more rural areas should be allowed.
7. Stoke Cross: See attached option. The brewery site could become a large housing estate.
8. The maps are difficult to read and it is hard to see what is proposed. It would be better to define the settlement boundaries around the existing built areas and then identify if additional land is required. This can then be reconciled against the Call for Sites responses.
9. For both Stoke Lacy and Stoke Cross settlements boundaries should be kept tight. We should be protecting our rural identity and avoid urban commuter settlements sprawling into the countryside. We should avoid ribbon developments where homes are built directly along the A465 roadside. In reality no one wants to live too close to a busy road that is only going to get busier in the future. There is a ‘them and us’ feeling between the two settlements and the recent planning applications have damaged the relationship further. If possible, future development should work towards bringing the two settlements closer together and creating a

more cohesive village. Foot access between the two settlements needs to be improved.

10. Stoke Lacy: Neither A nor B. The boundaries are too loose.
11. A & A. However, I do not agree with including the church and graveyard within the boundary. In the event that the church is closed it would be a disaster if this were to lead to it being sold to a developer.
12. SL:A. Avoid the village migrated outwards
SC:A. Keep the compact settlement. Possible issue: Stoke Cross B does encroach on our land & could potentially restrict our view.
13. You are setting people up to have to choose a predetermined area that has been created without effective consultation. This is not an acceptable methodology. What about people that do not want any development? I note – much of the land area covered is affected by the River Lugg catchment area provisions.
14. You are setting people up to have to choose a predetermined area that has been created without effective consultation. This is not an acceptable methodology. What about people that do not want any development? I note – much of the land area covered is affected by the River Lugg catchment area provisions.

Question 3:

How many new houses do you think should be provided in the parish up to 2031?

0 – 5	17	26.15%
6 – 10	17	26.15%
11 – 15	17	26.15%
16 – 20	11	16.92%
20 +	3	4.62%
respondents 65		

Comments

1. At the most 15. The village has already grown considerably. The village will lose its identity with too many new houses. Who's going to buy them? Where is the local industry to support? It will end up being rented housing association which to me de-values the attraction of the village.
2. We already have Newlands and lapsed provision for Neil Symond's land a further 12 houses. Over 10 years 20 more than enough.
3. Really this depends on the housing type, density & quality.
4. Housing seems to be in endless demand nationally. In the context of Covid the demand is tempered by an increasing number of people escaping from London.
5. Preferably in small 1 or 2 groups which do not ruin the character of the village.
6. We must have new homes – but not necessarily on an estate such as Newlands. Over ten years 10-20 homes could easily be scattered over the parish.
7. We already have a new estate of 25 () houses recently built, and I understand there is planning permission for a further 10 or so next to the village hall. All these

houses are in Stoke Cross and to build any more would change the nature of the village. I suggest that any further building should be of separate houses, not exceeding 10, in Stoke Lacy part of the village. These would comprise a mixture of house types, individually built, respecting to the requests of villagers – but NO estate. (also relates to Q.4.)

8. Encourage younger families. Garden in-fills should be encouraged.

9. This is impossible to answer unless the needs of the parish are known. Should this be based on the target set in the Herefordshire Core Strategy or what is actually needed?

10. Stoke Cross – 0-5 homes. There should be no more large developments in Stoke Cross. The 28 homes already built and the 10 additional homes that have been agreed are enough. However, consideration should be given to small infill sites that allow for self-build homes or annexes which allow for families to expand. This would enable multi-generational families to live close and provide support to one another (childcare and help for aging parents).

Stoke Lacy – 20+ homes. There has been no significant development in Stoke Lacy for several years. The Newlands development failed to match the needs of the local people and the outstanding planned development of 10 homes in Stoke Cross will not address this either. Therefore, we may need to consider another large development to address this. There is adequate space to build homes without creating an urban feel. Stoke Lacy has the benefit of the woodland area within easy walking distance for the residents. Most Stoke Cross residents that use the woodland area undertake a car journey to access it.

11. I have ticked 2 boxes because the range 10-20 seems reasonable.

12. Without additional facilities to encourage people to shop/stay local we would lose the welcoming/inclusive feeling that the village currently has.

13. 11-15. My answer is based on new houses being infill. Also what of Simmonds' planning application' for 11 houses which has already been passed? The village has already exceeded its allocation & another estate would not be within objectives.

14. 0-5, maybe 2-3 more if agreeing with comment below. (See Q.4, comment 13)

15. 6-10. The parish has provided more than the number required, increasing by many more limits the 'village' feeling many of us have bought into.

16. 0-5. The Parish has already delivered more than the legally set expectations.

17. 0-5. The Parish has already delivered more than the legally set expectations.

Question 4:

Which house types and sizes do you think are needed in Stoke Lacy Parish?

(Multiple Choices)

Family houses	47	72.31 %
Starter homes	38	58.46 %
Housing for older people	35	53.85 %
Affordable homes	37	56.92 %
Other	18	27.69 %

respondents 65

If other, please explain / Comments

1. Larger detached houses with decent-sized gardens. Not affordable, starter or housing association. Who wants to live next to people who on the whole do not care about their property, surroundings or the environment? Not me! More bungalows for older people is a good thing.
2. Smaller, scattered.
3. Not sure what the difference is between 'starter' and 'affordable'. Whatever the housing purpose, it needs to be high quality and actually attractive & desirable – unlike the ugly, generic recent development in Stoke Cross. Some adherence to a vernacular style would be good for once.
4. It is extremely difficult to be predictive about range and type. We need much more information about needs & requirements.
5. Houses should be considered on their architectural merits but which are sympathetic to local vernacular architecture. Family houses & for younger people should be encouraged to lower the age profile of the current demography.
6. Need good mix.
7. There will always be a demand for every type of home, starters through to downsizing and everything between. (I differentiate between 'starter' and 'downsizing'.)
8. The parish needs the input of more younger families.
9. No more large developments. Differently styled houses with character. Even modern houses can fit into the environment.
10. Again difficult to answer without knowledge of the requirements of the parish or any feedback from the parish.
11. Our community needs family homes that are truly affordable. No more part buy/part rent homes. Affordable homes should be % cap of full marketplace and linked to the village. Equally, we need rented homes that are linked to the village. We must remember that not all individuals can afford or aspire to own their own homes. This should not exclude them from living in our village. With the shift towards more home working and more city dwellers wanting to buy homes in the countryside we are already seeing house prices rising. It is now more important than ever to ensure that our younger generations are not displaced. These homes should have 3 beds to allow for the younger generation to put down roots and have families. Consideration should be made for:- *enclosed safe front gardens where

you can open the front door without the fear of a child escaping onto the highway; allowing children and pets to play safely. Back gardens with enough space for ball games and vegetable plots. * Utility rooms for muddy shoes and dogs. * kitchens that are large enough for families to enjoy meals, whilst **Starter Homes** should be no smaller than two bedrooms.

12. The village should be a mix of all age groups and have appropriate facilities to reflect this, along with a variety of housing.
13. (See Q.3, comment 14) Housing for older people & affordable homes: homes in ones or twos within about 50 metres of a current dwelling.
14. Variety, maybe more individual to allow families to stay in the village. Avoid houses of the same type (such as recent new ones) which are in keeping with the village picture.
15. Locals only.
16. I think the Developments to date more than provide for what the village can manage without significant improvement of the infrastructure in the village, namely the roads and flood management.

Question 5:

Should the NDP include a policy to protect and enhance local landscape character?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

Which important local landscape features should be protected?

1. River and streams
2. Tree cover & views. No visibly prominent developments.
3. Open fields, trees and wooded areas.
4. The open green fields and countryside.
5. Scattered housing amid agricultural landscape.
6. The open green fields and countryside.
7. Woodland, hedgerows & older buildings, preservation of rural/agricultural character.
8. Public views.
9. The graveyard & Netherwood & more trees & wilding planting should be developed.
10. Church, woodland, views of the valley.
11. Public views, ancient hedgerows, the motte.
12. Farms, historic monuments, the lanes and the public footpaths.
13. The motte, the moat, woodlands.

14. Watercourses and woodlands.
15. Open farmland is our local beauty. Supporting farmers, where possible, is vital.
16. Farming makes the landscape, buildings either enhance or spoil it. There must be space for business buildings, farm buildings and homes.
17. The river needs better protection in terms of water quality & therefore wildlife that it can sustain.
18. Netherwood, the church and churchyard. All other areas of woodland. Restricted development of **existing** local industry.
19. Trees and the local environment of listed buildings. The wood on Hall Place land should be preserved.
20. Footpaths, eg. Three Choirs Way. Netherwood should be pleasant, welcoming, tidy and accessible area.
21. The rolling, undulating nature of the local landscape is lost with grouping of houses.
22. Existing trees and hedges. Low-density houses.
23. Trees, hedges, woodland, rivers & streams.
24. The parish is essentially a rural open space and should remain so. Farming land should be protected and some rewilding permitted where farming becomes unattractive. Recognition should be given to changes in farming practices of the next ten years with potential reduction in livestock rearing due to environmental concerns.
25. No street or night-time lighting schemes. Hedgerows to be protected. Avoid excessive use of signage. Improve the appearance of our verges through the built-up areas; this has been proved to slow traffic down.
26. Churchyard, Netherwood.
27. As much as possible. Any development should enhance Stoke Lacy/Stoke Cross, not make it unrecognisable.
28. The ancient woodlands, the view from Stoke Cross out towards Much Cowarne – agree with draft obj. view 4.
29. Ancient woodland and other woodlands. Streams and waterways flow.
30. Variety of countryside. Protection of wildlife. Protect views for residents.
31. Open farmland, woodland, hedgerows, streams & rivers.
32. The open countryside. The area around the church.
33. Millennium Wood. Church surroundings.
34. Stoke Lacy motte.
35. Millennium wood and river.
36. Millennium wood and river.
37. Church.

38.Many Parishioners will expect you to protect from development the areas already identified by consultation. Namely the Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

39.Many Parishioners will expect you to protect from development the areas already identified by consultation. Namely the Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

40.Church.

Question 6:

Do you support the key views identified by the Steering Group?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

Are there any other important public views? Please explain.

1. Those from Pencombe Lane on the north boundary of the parish.
2. Reduce the speed limit, get some speed cameras, plant some trees.
3. Note one of key views spoilt already by white bungalow on Ullingswick /Pencombe road!
4. From various points along Hopton Lane southwards and eastwards.
5. Plus views from footpaths.
6. From S67 south to The Malverns, west to Welsh hills & north west to Pencombe.
7. From the north end of Woodend Lane across the valley of the Loddon – it is one of the most beautiful views in the parish. It is next to a well-used footpath too.
8. ????
9. Little Cowarne road to The Malverns.
- 10.Any views including the wood. Views from Hopton Lane towards the village hall & the brewery. Views from the footpath (village hall/Hopton Lane) down towards the church.
- 11.From Hopton Lane horizon up towards horizon towards Panks Bridge.
- 12.From Much Cowarne road looking down onto Stoke Lacy and the area around the church.
- 13.Views from Westbury east, over to Pencombe and Little Cowarne.
- 14.Particularly the north end of Woodend Lane across the valley of the Loddon – it is one of the best views in the parish. It is next to a well-used footpath too.
- 15.Particularly the north end of Woodend Lane across the valley of the Loddon – it is one of the best views in the parish. It is next to a well-used footpath too.

16. I agree with all, views however are very subjective and individual for a variety of reasons and memories. What they all have in common is the rural setting and the unspoilt nature of the village, which I think should be protected.

Question 7:

Do you agree that the NDP should include detailed policies on design?

Yes	59	90.77%
No	6	9.23%

respondents 65

Which local built character features are important and why?

1. Designs should be considered on their individual merits in their proposed location.
2. Herefordshire stone, oak framing, thatched roofs. Stop all this red brick town houses. Good for developers, not good for local traditional trades or the environment.
3. Note my comments on stone!
4. Variety of design/emphasis on environmental impact. Avoidance of the 'housing estate' look.
5. Stone built or faced, density appropriate to the housing type.
6. Not too large and fit in with surroundings.
7. Yes, as above with regard to local architecture and stone/slate/tile.
8. Retain local character.
9. But not to stifle innovation. Futuristic can blend with traditional.
10. Local architecture to be taken into account.
11. In character with the village.
12. Grade 2 listing. Sympathetic with local surroundings.
13. If it gives the parish a view on building materials etc.
14. This is our parish, we must be allowed a say. We already have an amazing building plot with a fabulous home planned, BUT GREY brick in our beautiful red clay area.
15. Let's have innovation and tradition. I'm pro a lively mix and new ideas.
16. Trees, hedges, garden space. Local stone & brickwork for building; discreet lighting.
17. The designs of new houses should be in keeping with older houses nearby. (The Newlands development sticks out like a sore thumb.) Any outside lighting should be of low intensity, directed downwards and on a timing switch of 10 minutes maximum.
18. New housing should blend in with the local environment.
19. A mixture of styles and materials (brick, wood, slate), not repetitive housing.

20. Use of timber frame and local stone. All hard-standing areas permeable to rain water. Solar power & heat pumps at design stage.
21. That new build should not stick out as a sore thumb as some new built do.
22. There are several timber-framed properties in the village and are characteristic of Herefordshire so it would be good if some of the housing could represent this style.
23. Design is essential. Rather than get caught up with 'in keeping' and accepting low quality design that lacks architectural merit we should aim for innovative green homes that enhance our two settlements. Herefordshire villages are being surrounded by bland modern developments which are robbing them of their identity. The Newlands estate is well spaced out, but the houses are generic and unimaginative. It is an urban development on a rural plot. We need to create a cohesive settlement of homes that we are proud of. Currently the UK is building the smallest new homes in Western Europe. We should push for rural homes that allow for families to grow into them. Let's create an environment that we are proud of. Enabling local people to stay whilst embracing new residents.
24. Eaves, Herefordshire red brick.
25. Although we have a wide variety of styles in the village we shouldn't need any more. New developments should include a mix of styles reflecting the wider village styles. Incorporate a range of hedging/tree planting which reflect the countryside – allow the housing to 'melt' into the countryside.
26. Ashperton has new oak-frame buildings, Stoke Lacy should also.
27. Sustainability, resource efficiency and energy efficiency.
28. Exterior to fit in with the locality. Eco houses.
29. Definitely as stated above (Q.5, 30). Variety and in keeping important.
30. We must make sure that new builds are in keeping with the local character bricks, stone, timber, not grey modern builds! that will stick out like a sore thumb.
31. Red brick similar to those from Burley Gate Brickworks, which most buildings in this area are made from.
32. Modern style of some buildings would be out of character.
33. In keeping with local area.
34. In keeping with local area.
35. Yes – Newlands does nothing for the area. There are several timber framed properties in the village and are characteristic of Herefordshire so it would be good if housing could represent a more traditional style.
36. Yes – Newlands does nothing for the area. There are several timber framed properties in the village and are characteristic of Herefordshire so it would be good if housing could represent a more traditional style.
37. Agreed, mixture of styles which I feel creates a feature in itself to the historical timeline.

Question 8:

Should the NDP support the provision of a new public open space?

Yes	57	87.69%
No	8	12.31%

respondents 65

If so, which facilities should be included? (Eg seating, play, provision for teenagers etc)

1. Dog walking.
2. Woods, trees, seating. Perhaps a play area or picnic area. Dog walking areas.
3. Already sufficient. Not a town!
4. Provision for children of all ages
5. Provision for children of all ages.
6. For what purpose? It's a rural area.
7. Provision for teenagers & separately for elderly people is needed.
8. Seating.
9. A public open space at Stoke Cross with seating?
10. For children and young to gather.
11. See Q.13.
12. All.
13. Anywhere to help people enjoy the outside. Nothing formal.
14. Just open ground. Maybe grant funded. Free access for children, adults and animals. An area maybe 2/4 acres for the village. No play equipment, just seating.
15. Seating.
16. At Stoke Cross. Facilities for seats, play area for small children, benches & picnic table.
17. Only if it is near village hall. For children playing.
18. Seating and walking.
19. Seating for older people and provision for young children (up to 12 years old).
20. Seating in church grounds and green areas in Stoke Cross.
21. Minimal provision due to maintenance & legal liabilities.
22. A play space somewhere between the two main settlement areas to enhance the cohesion of the parish. A wooded area with green space would be ideal. The existing Millennium Wood is very popular and well used but is remote. Also better access to footpaths would be good.
23. Seating and safe enclosed play/green areas (protected from the busy road) in both settlements will allow residents to meet up informally and should help create a true community feel. They should be easy to walk to, have small noticeboards to keep

residents informed of activities and become a destination place for people to walk to.

24. The old orchard beside Netherwood. The triangle between A465 and the lane to Bodenham.
25. Seating to take advantage of the views. Playing field (small). Skate/bike park. Must be easy/low maintenance.
26. I understand that the Simmonds housing development would include playground – this would be great.
27. Seating. Could seating be put in Netherwood?
28. For children to play. Seats to look at views and in wood.
29. All. But need to consider maintenance and protection of these areas.
30. We already have Netherwood – picnic/dog-walking area. Open space at Newlands. Plenty of footpaths to walk.
31. A play area.
32. Near to church, with provision for adults & children including adequate parking.
33. Cycle paths.
34. Cycle paths.
35. Place to walk dogs.
36. Be very careful however as poorly designed and/or located these can become a hotspot for antisocial behaviour.
37. Be very careful however as poorly designed and/or located these can become a hotspot for antisocial behaviour.
38. No. Would support a nature programme such as Netherwood.

Question 9:

Should the NDP identify any Local Green Spaces for protection?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

If yes, please provide any suggestions and explain why they are so important.

1. Any opportunity to develop waterside walks would be good.
2. Do I really need to spell this out! Bio-diversity, air quality, local wildlife. We moved to the country for a reason, quality of life, less people, less traffic.
3. Stoke Lacy is a countryside village and should remain so.
4. Stoke Lacy is a countryside village and should remain so.
5. All the existing green spaces, except in Stoke Cross adjacent the road, to protect the green, natural and rural environment & character.

6. Netherwood & graveyard.
7. Woodland.
8. But really dependent on whether a public open space (Q.8) is permitted.
9. Clean up Netherwood.
10. NDP has identified local green spaces but no location given.
11. Our dark skies need to be protected.
12. Woodland and footpaths.
13. Mental well-being.
14. Green space around village hall. Extend if possible.
15. Yes, only if the owner and the people who live nearby agree.
16. Especially in Stoke Cross.
17. Netherwood for its peace and tranquility.
18. Those areas that are visible from the proposed Public Views.
19. Yes. The traditional standard orchard beyond the village hall should be protected.
These orchards offer habitats for a wide range of flora and fauna.
20. Churchyard and Netherwood. The night sky, limit the effect of light on wildlife and views of the sky.
21. As much as possible. We live in a rural part of the country and that should be protected as much as possible, especially the wide range of wildlife that lives here.
22. As above for ancient woodland, plus area along the Lodon towards Little Cowarne.
23. The route of the Lodon throughout.
24. I'm unable to identify the local green spaces that are important to the village (being relatively new) but yes, protect views.
25. All green space needs protection.
26. Wildlife and dog walking.
27. As many as possible, for environmental protection and wellbeing of residents.
28. Netherwood.
29. Place to walk dogs.
30. Enhance & support wildlife & wildflowers/herbs.
31. Enhance & support wildlife & wildflowers/herbs.
32. All those areas that are visible from the proposed Public Views and those already identified as sensitive sites.
33. All those areas that are visible from the proposed Public Views and those already identified as sensitive sites.
34. Netherwood.

Question 10:

Should the NDP support local business growth and tourism?

Yes	64	98.46%
No	1	1.54%

respondents 65

If yes, what would you like to see included?

1. Coffee shop; swimming pool.
2. It should EXCLUDE any development generating high levels of traffic such as anaerobic digesters.
3. Support our local traders, help them through Coronavirus etc.
4. Traditional rural accommodation.
5. Traditional rural accommodation.
6. Agriculture & support industries. Tourism – no. This is not a tourist area. Extend the availability of high speed broadband and mobile phone signals, otherwise any development is a waste of time.
7. Local business growth is intrinsically bound up to housing, hence employment.
8. Small-scale support for holiday lets, camping, etc.
9. To support local jobs.
10. Both, but not large-scale tourism given narrow lanes. Don't want to become like Devon & Cornwall in the summer!
11. Limited development of small business.
12. Local business growth.
13. Local business growth. No tourism due to lack of infrastructure.
14. Small start-up units. Extend Woodend Lane Business. Encourage young to 'have a go' at a project.
15. Extension, if possible, of Woodend Business site, support business opportunities around the parish.
16. A farm shop for basics, ideally by WV Brewery expanding their beer shop!
17. Shop & post office.
18. Yes, but very carefully monitored. No coaches for example at the church or the brewery.
19. The footpath between Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy re-instated in a proper way for tourists to enjoy pub, church and Morgan interests. A Blue Plaque on The Old Rectory? – Someone in the Morgan factory offered to pay
20. Conversion of existing redundant farm buildings for low-key rural tourism.
21. Dependent upon the possible impact it may have on its location and residents.
22. Business development within or near the existing business areas could be considered. Tourism could be encouraged but it is not clear to whose benefit? One

of the purposes of tourism is to bring income to local businesses but there are few businesses in the parish that would benefit. The main beneficiaries will be private individuals.

23. Without further discussion I cannot comment on this. I am however against introducing caravan parks and static home development into Stoke Cross or Stoke Lacy.
24. Anything beyond basic public transport is uneconomic. Sustainable cars enable continued freedom, flexibility and convenience. Provide electric points in church car park and village hall car park.
25. Small village shop (milk, bread, newspapers). Improve/develop footpaths/history trails.
26. Yes, but not by increasing size of industrial estate or allowing caravan parks.
27. Possibly, but depends on what kind of growth & tourism. No caravan/camping sites please. No big warehouses.
28. Footpaths – clearly marked and safe footbridges. Aim to re-open old routes.
29. Small-scale, only no large companies requiring large buildings & lots of large traffic.
30. Caravan & camp site – 5-10 van site. B&B?
31. Emphasis on walking, wildlife and National Heritage.
32. Encourage local businesses (Wye Valley Brewery, Business Park, farmers) to work together for locality.
33. (for Q's 10, 11 & 12). A decent reliable bus service. Local shop/post office.
34. On a limited and incremental basis. Schemes just to benefit the individual rather than the community as a whole should be avoided.
35. On a limited and incremental basis. Schemes just to benefit the individual rather than the community as a whole should be avoided.
36. Yes, on the condition that it does not detract from the nature (of the) village.

Question 11:

Should the NDP promote more sustainable travel?

Yes	59	90.77%
No	6	9.23%

respondents 65

Please explain.

1. Bridle paths need to be linked up.
2. Given the rural nature of the parish some version of ring and ride would be desirable.
3. More bus services to encourage people to use public transport. Better maintenance of walkways and public footpath.

4. HMG policy not local.
5. Links between Stoke Lacy & Bromyard & Hereford.
6. Links between Stoke Lacy and Bromyard & Hereford.
7. All new houses to have vehicle charging points and use renewable energy systems. As in many advanced EU countries sustainable travel would lessen use of private cars & help to minimise pollution.
8. This is not possible on a parish scale.
9. Cycling.
10. Affordable, reliable, frequent bus service. Cycle lanes not practical given width of roads.
11. Make sure public footpaths are all open and accessible.
12. Don't fully understand the question. Do you mean make our lanes cycle lane etc.?
13. Due to location and nature of the population any scheme would not be cost effective.
14. Would love to offer advice. However, incredibly difficult in rural areas.
15. Sounds good; in practice very, very difficult when we mostly live away from bus route, electric charge points etc.
16. Village car share? Dunno but couldn't tick 'No'.
17. More public transport.
18. More frequent buses of a smaller size; cycle lanes.
19. Stoke Lacy is NOT a suitable location for more development because of the lack of public transport, a school and a shop. Extra houses should be limited to towns and large villages with a school & shop.
20. Footpaths to enable walking along main roads.
21. All new homes should have e.v. charging points.
22. All developments will need off-road parking & provision for charging electric vehicles.
23. This is a motherhood and apple pie question. Of course and it should be in line with government policy. The greater use of electric vehicles should be encouraged with the provision of charging points at the village hall and other locations. Car sharing schemes and shared electric bicycles should also be considered.
24. Whilst sustainable transport should be encouraged this is a difficult project to undertake. The reality is that travelling is a necessity when living rurally. Residents are always going to practice their right to transport children out of the local community to schools that are further away. Workers are going to travel to other areas and people are going to move around to socialise. Cycling is not realistic: the main roads are busy and to install cycle lanes would mean widening roads, taking out hedges and spending a disproportionate amount of money. Even if this

was done few people would utilize them on a regular basis. Cycling to work adds time to the journey and the cyclist risks arriving either wet and cold or hot and sweaty. We can have bike shed added to new development, but they don't reduce commuting. Car sharing could be encouraged. Is there anything currently in place to co-ordinate this? If so, the village could tap into it and help the residents take part in the scheme.

25. Ideally yes, but difficult as cannot guarantee enough passengers for local buses. Need examples of sustainable travel.

26. 1. Support the bus route. 2. Agree with links to cycle networks but A465 is dreadful for bikes!

27. Support and EXPAND bus services. Maintain footpaths for walkers.

28. Smaller buses, more frequent, to reduce car use. (& Q.12)

29. In principle but unsure exactly what is being thought, maybe increased bus services for those that need it.

30. This should come from central government & Herefordshire Council first. Decent public transport for one.

31. Not realistic. Cycling networks?

32. Encourage use of bus service and resist further reduction.

33. Better public transport.

34. Buses.

35. Yes – in line with government policy. The use of electric vehicles should be encouraged with the provision of charging points at the Village Hall and other locations.

36. Yes – in line with government policy. The use of electric vehicles should be encouraged with the provision of charging points at the Village Hall and other locations.

37. Greater links to the greater walking and cycle networks would be good.

Question 12:

Are there any local transport and accessibility matters that you would like to see the Parish Council address (in partnership with other bodies such as Herefordshire Council)?

Yes	59	90.77%
No	6	9.23%

respondents 65

Please explain.

1. Bridle paths. See above. Could become cycle tracks possibly. The proposals have ??? (several?) omissions, i.e. no access for riders
2. Better maintained & linked bridle paths and footpaths both for residents and visitors.

3. Buses.
4. Footpath between Stoke Cross & Stoke Lacy clearly marked and improved. Accessibility to public footpaths.
5. Bus service, smaller buses, more frequent; would more people use them?
6. Footpath between Stoke Cross and Stoke Lacy clearly marked and improved. Accessibility to public footpaths.
7. We need to focus on small but regular buses in order to enhance usage.
8. Does the council not understand emissions? More houses in rural areas mean more cars on roads. If they had any common sense they would build by towns or cities where there are bus services.
9. Possibly more access to footpaths but this is costly & needs to be carefully considered.
10. Cycling.
11. As Q.11. More access for all to public footpaths by upgrading stiles.
12. For the more elderly: transport to shops, transport for days out.
13. Some staff at Wye Valley Brewery have limited bus options when travelling from Hereford.
14. Park & Ride this side of Hereford.
15. I don't feel able to comment on public transport. Having lived in Stoke Lacy for 42 years and never having access to public transport under 1 mile away. However, I see many older people in Pencombe use the 'little' bus once a week which goes to Hereford. In fact it is a life-line to them.
16. Footpath upkeep please.
17. As above. (18)
18. The footpath connecting Stoke Cross with Stoke Lacy is woefully inadequate. We need a wide footpath protected from the main road where people can walk safely and enjoyably from Stoke Cross to Stoke Lacy. It should accommodate, safely, pushchairs, bikes, small children & dogs, thus enabling us all to make the most of our lovely village. Would also encourage people to walk rather than drive when visiting the other part of the village.
19. The present path between Stoke Lacy & Stoke Cross is dangerous. A new path should be provided on the other side of the hedge from the current path.
20. Above. (20). Maintain a good bus service. Drainage on lanes to reduce flooding.
21. Poor public transport (very few buses). Could smaller buses be used? Bridge repairs on footpath routes are not being carried out.
22. Footpath from Stoke Cross to Stoke Lacy would help to bring community together.
23. To encourage relevant agencies to improve road safety on A465 from the approach to Crick's Green west to Stoke Lacy.

24. Increased bus services would be good but I suspect that they would not be economically sustainable. A permanent Speed Indicator would be a good safety feature.
25. We need to ensure that all developments have adequate parking spaces. Despite COVID restricting the number of visitors homes can have the Newlands estate already has cars parked on the pavements in the evening.
26. Increased public transport is not the way forward.
27. Improve the footpath between Stoke Lacy & Stoke Cross – ideally adding a bit between the church and Church Farm. Improve signposting on local footpaths. Try & enforce the 30mph max. limit through the village – not always adhered to!!
28. The lack of a proper pavement between Stoke Cross & Stoke Lacy, i.e. one that allows prams & child cycles is urgent – not to mention wheelchairs.
29. Improve bus service. Maintain footpaths.
30. May not be relevant, but re. parish public footpaths. These do seem to be widely accessible to all but those with larger dogs. Not much to put dog-friendly gates next to styles etc. Since moving here we've found ourselves very limited in the paths we can use which is a shame.
31. More regular bus service.
32. As above (Q11.32) but also work in partnership with any other organisation (e.g. Bromyard Community Transport) to enhanced facilities.
33. Better public transport. Not everyone has own transport.
34. A proper reliable & regular bus service, local shop/post office.
35. Lobby for enhanced bus service.
36. Lobby for enhanced bus service.
37. Safer cycling routes along the 465 to Bromyard and Hereford.

Question 13:

Do you have any other comments about the NDP?

1. Well done for putting it all together.
2. A map of the parish would have been helpful.
3. Appreciate local landowners cashing in. Good luck to them. I suspect most will move away so they don't have to deal with the fallout. Developers see our green spaces as a cash cow. Good for them, not good for locals. Plant more trees, support wildlife & biodiversity. Reduce traffic speed * improve air quality.
4. No.
5. A policy must be included to highlight the importance of light pollution and the fact that we don't want it. The night sky in Stoke Lacy is spectacular and needs protecting.

6. The NDP is supposed to represent the views of the residents not replace the Parish Council. – Delicate balance. How to encourage resident to speak? How to get response from the indifferent? Danger at referendum.
7. Speed camera please.
8. NDP is one of the most positive developments for Stoke Lacy citizens. It will impact on the community for years to come and will enhance democratic participation the planning & provision process. It would localise key issues.
9. Further advice to the planning department Hereford (sic) Council: the new building which was passed down Hall Place Lane shows how the countryside will be ruined by there (sic) disregard to keep rural areas unspoilt (sic). EG: sample that carbuncle they allowed in Little Cowarne.
10. Plant native trees on large verges and wild flower planning on verges, foxgloves, annual seeds etc.
11. A shop would be good to see, maybe volunteer one like in Burley Gate. In the village hall or pub or at Wye Valley?
12. Any open space should include seating. Play provision depends on who would use it (?very few children in village). Any equipment should reflect demography taking into account future development.)
13. We are unfortunately outside the settlement boundary, in Lower Hopton, but notice an official 'call for sites' is a field (10) next to our homes. Could we have more information on this please, and what to do in in the NDP?
14. Whilst I support some limited amount of new housing development in our village, I don't think it would be wise to increase by very much. Without a village school or shop, any new residents would have to travel by car.
15. Communities, villages, have always grown and this must continue to happen and NOT all homes must look alike (Our home is an odd-looking place). Growth, either business premises or housing need access to enough WATER, HEALTHCARE (drs' surgery bursting), SEWAGE – not such a problem as can be dealt with on site with BIODISCS etc.
16. Every village needs to grow and to thrive. However, there has to be enough infrastructure to sustain this growth. Water, sewage, doctors, schools. With regards to open space, in the light of criticism of difficulty over stiles on footpaths, purchase of an open field would be a way forward. Properly fenced, for children and dogs, it would require little in the way of maintenance, would be easily accessed and available for all ages and abilities.
17. Pleased that the NDP is acting in our best interests.
18. The settlement boundaries appear to have been drawn without any justification for the proposed options B.
19. Development on country lanes should be carefully monitored as single track lanes frequented by farm traffic make them unsuitable for heavy domestic traffic flow. Any development needs safe access with visibility not hampered by acute angle bends.

20. Encourage charging points on all new houses for electric vehicles, air source/ground source heating, solar panels.

21. It is a great shame that the SG has had to resort to a Questionnaire to try to get engagement when it was clearly agreed at the initial NDP parish meeting that people did not want one. It is not clear how the questions were identified to meet the needs of the parish – I have included comments in my completed questionnaire. The better way was obviously to engage in face-to-face meetings, and several were planned but had to be curtailed due to COVID restrictions. I fear that the NDP process has suffered considerably and has not been a community based exercise that I was hoping. Publication in the Cider Press has not helped and has felt like propaganda at times. The web site is not very user-friendly and hard to navigate. The Call for Sites process was not clearly explained and it should have taken place after draft settlement boundaries had been proposed. Clearly some sites were offered without knowledge of the intention of the Call, in particular Site 11 which was well outside any boundary.

22. I would like to thank the members of the NDP for giving up their spare time to undertake this project. New housing is a contentious topic and there will inevitably be members of our community that win or lose both emotionally and financially. We moved to Stoke Cross to live in a rural environment within a small community. We did not and do not want shops and the trappings of a town life.

23. Herefordshire will want to target Stoke Lacy for building space on frequent occasions in the future. Whilst there is a need to positively identify land for development the boundaries must be tight – e.g. don't allocate space for more than 20 and include houses not their large gardens.

24. I think the questionnaire ought to have included a 'don't know' response.

25. Well done and thank you for all your time and commitment.

26. Stoke Lacy is a lovely rural village and needs to be kept that way as long as possible. We have already reached the quota for building so need to make sure we don't get any more dense plots built. An odd one here or there is all we need! People looking to move here need to do their homework first as to what facilities there are in a rural village. Thank you to the NDP Steering Committee Group for all your time & effort. You are doing a great job for the village.

27. How were the boundaries defined? Stoke Lacy has seen enough development for the foreseeable future.

28. Re. Q.8: If recreation area near church possible, improve communications (e.g. improve footpaths) to reduce the 'two villages' perception and promote a more coherent village. Re. Q.10: Generate a consortium with website (e.g. 'Stoke Lacy Village Enterprises') to co-ordinate activities (e.g. weddings at the church, receptions at village hall, Plough Inn, etc.) to put Stoke Lacy 'on the map'.

29. The need to stress that no housing is sustainable. Population is in decline.

30. Many community members are very concerned about this process and I ask that the SG carefully assess the context and motivation of the individuals supporting the sites proposed.

There are fundamental problems with the nature of the questions asked in this document. If you are to use the simple methodology of using yes/no answers to determine an outcome you will have to give appropriate weight to the broader comments asked and the 'closed' and directive nature of the questions asked. Questionnaire design is a specific science based on skill and you could be criticized if your analysis is not valid and reliable.

Please ensure that the originally identified sensitive sites are protected, i.e. The Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

The Call for Sites process was handled in an unusual fashion. I would ask you to note that Site 11 is well outside your suggested boundaries and has considerable problems associated with it.

31. Many community members are very concerned about this process and I ask that the SG carefully assess the context and motivation of the individuals supporting the sites proposed.

There are fundamental problems with the nature of the questions asked in this document. If you are to use the simple methodology of using yes/no answers to determine an outcome you will have to give appropriate weight to the broader comments asked and the 'closed' and directive nature of the questions asked. Questionnaire design is a specific science based on skill and you could be criticized if your analysis is not valid and reliable.

Please ensure that the originally identified sensitive sites are protected, i.e. The Church, Netherwood and Woodend Lane.

The Call for Sites process was handled in an unusual fashion. I would ask you to note that Site 11 is well outside your suggested boundaries and has considerable problems associated with it.

32. All covered above.