

**BUNBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – COMMENTS FROM POLICY SURVEY
RESULTS APRIL 2015**

4	<p>1. Wyche Lane has two properties which do not meet a reasonable standard commensurate with adjoining properties. There needs to be action by council and community to ensure properties are maintained or demolished/developed within the Plan. 2. Whilst affordable housing is a national policy, development of retirement accommodation should be encouraged. Policy Survey and Neighbourhood Plan is excellent and the work done highly commendable.</p>
10	<p>Policy H2A re Tweddle Close and proposed development of The Grange site next to it. Policy LC1 - can window size be added to this. There is a pond at the back of the site of the Grange in Wyche Lane. No provision or mention of this is shown on the proposed plans! Policy B101 and B102. Policy E4. If the Health Centre can be passed as appropriate design, it does not provide a great deal of confidence in future development.</p>
11	<p>What a jolly good plan. Well done and thank you.</p>
12	<p>1. What about housing for elderly or assisted housing - not just starter homes. 2. Please stop giving all monies to the village to the playground - there are other more inclusive projects that need money - such as the pavilion, village transport, and parking near the school. 3. There is much talk of the 80 houses we need - we need 62 maximum not 80.</p>
13	<p>Respondent queried the statement about the national housing shortage - "Is there? Empty houses everywhere". Greenfield not necessary. Acres of brown field sites in Liverpool, Chester, Crewe, etc. Low cost for how long? Buy, sell, make a profit and off we go again. T4, How is this calculated? 1 house, 3 children, - 5 cars!! C12. School places etc.</p>
14	<p>Many thanks to the NPG for all your hard work</p>
15	<p>Policy H2E - agree up to a point. I am concerned that our historic (100YRS) village cricket field remains as such - ideally with a 25 year lease. Any school car park must be gifted to the school in perpetuity. Policy H6 Agree with amendments on the number of houses in the phasing table. Policy LC5 agree but marked 'refused' not 'resisted' ENV1 It is particularly important to protect cricket field and jubilee playing fields and open vistas. ENV3 - Ideally banks should not be destroyed during construction. ENV8 Please consider the cricket field as a historic site. People played cricket there 100 years ago a new site would not be the same. I do not support relocation of services or facilities within the area of Bunbury. School parking must be where it would be used. We do not wish to see yellow lines introduced. The four Bunbury's, Bunbury Heath, Lower Bunbury, Upper Bunbury and Bunbury Common must be retained as distinct entities as they are important characteristics of Bunbury. I have very strong feelings regarding our Village Cricket Field. I support Cheshire East's 25/3/15 rejection of development in front of the cricket field. I object to the idea of changing the settlement boundary at that point. It would hide our traditional village cricket pitch, provide building on open countryside when there is no natural boundary and open up the prospect of much further building on the cricket field and beyond. It is not sustainable given the road conditions on School Lane. We also value the heritage of our cricket field. I also would point out that the proposed car park is sited on the wrong side of the road for the school. We have no 'Lollipop person' and would, in any case, need it gifted to the school in perpetuity.</p>

16	<p>H2 - agree to all bar any greenfield development in any shape or form (but did not mark a box). H3 Agree as long as there is a clause on low cost housing that price cannot be raised on resale otherwise in 10 years' time we are back to square one again. H5 Should be also eco build - look at what Sweden/Germany are doing. H6 As long as it sticks to 62 new homes from this date today. LC1 Disagree - agree with hedgerows and walling only. LC2 "Disagree" - Agree with hedgerows and walling only. CI4 For centre of village parking there is already a good car park provided at playing fields which very few people use. People are generally lazy or in too much of a rush and have to park as near as possible to shops, rather than walking from this car park. Around school and chip shop must be addressed before someone is seriously injured or killed.</p>
17	<p>A most excellent, efficient, eloquent report on the needs and aspirations of our village. Well done Committee, a tremendous effort. Thank you for devoting so much time. PS Consult Henry re Nag's Head. Car Parking.</p>
19	<p>Excellent written, thank you for all your hard work in helping to protect our beautiful village. It is very much appreciated.</p>
20	<p>Within H1,H2, ENV1 and ENV2 I would like to see added that the open spaces which separate "the four Bunburys" are given protection in order to project the overall character of Bunbury eg: the frontage to the cricket field gives separation between Bunbury Heath and Lower Bunbury. Re CI4 there needs to be a clearly defined legal process in place which protects and ensures such parking areas in perpetuity and defines a clear maintenance plan and responsibility.</p>
25	<p>H3 and H4 Care needs to be taken to avoid supporting developers who include some 'low cost housing'. This could be a form of 'bribery'! Affordable housing should not replace 'appropriate' housing. This village may need more homes suitable for down-sizers - low cost may not be the main focus here. H6 I thought that original plans were to be taken from 2010. We have already had around 20 new homes built since then, so in total 62 new ones are needed, as you say on page 2. Please clarify. T3 please do not allow any more pavements on country lanes. They look ridiculous. They certainly do not improve safety as they are not consistent. CI4 Another potential area for developers to 'bribe' planners</p>
27	<p>LC1 Agree houses should be to a good design but this should not result in excessively expensive build cost and house price. LC2 see previous comment. LC4 There has been a move to demolish smaller low cost housing and replace with larger more expensive housing. This destroys mix and should be prevented. The village is a nice place to live but is in danger of becoming a commuter centre as the commercial/business facilities are weak. Village should encourage more shops and more small business to set up and hence bring potential local employment. Improving public transport should be a priority - if you don't have a car you are a prisoner in the village!</p>
28	<p>H1 Respondent underlined minimum and wrote in maximum.H2 ticked agree and put a cross for disagree so no return. CI4 should be implemented before any significant development is given a green light.</p>
34	<p>Why exclude self-build or include houses built in large gardens as brownfield as we have some currently not touching the settlement boundary. Why are Bunbury Heath and Bunbury Common not included in the settlement boundary. Why do the BPC keep pushing the fields behind The Grange as an option when Cllr Jones says it will not be allowed and is in contradiction to these plans. Limited parking at The Dysart is currently an issue and should be addressed with any proposals behind Bunbury Church. Why not have the Bowls Green behind Tweddle Close, the cricket field behind The Grange along with a new shared pavilion and then use the space behind the Co-op etc. as a central village car park (now that is a plan)</p>

35	<p>H5 This supposes that all sites for development can accommodate 15 dwellings. Surely the dwellings, whatever their number, must be restricted to the size of the plot. The fewer the better. C1 The use of local tradesmen, where possible, should also be encouraged. ENV1 Surely this must be a given!? Non-negotiable. ENV3 Mature trees should and must be protected at all costs - and the same for old established hedgerows. ENV5 Solar panels are an eyesore! ENV7 Essential. T1 Footpaths must be protected. T2 All groundworks should be repaired immediately, T5 However, pavements throughout the village would detract from its rural nature and would give the impression of urbanisation. T6 Not speed bumps please! First and foremost, Bunbury is a village and should remain as such. Calming measures and pavements point towards urbanisation, something which should be avoided. Established hedgerows need protecting at all costs and footpaths should remain open. Can the sewerage systems cope with any increased housing? Infrastructure must be in place before any new developments are seriously considered.</p>
36	<p>A well thought out and presented plan</p>
37	<p>The 80 houses by 2030 seems to start from 2015 yet we were told that the start date was 2010. This has a significant impact on being on target as quite a number of houses have been built in 2010 and should count towards the target. 20?</p>
38	<p>H6 Should this policy reflect the fact that 18 houses have already been built since 2010? ENV1 Is it legally possible to protect this?</p>
39	<p>I have written in separately. H1 - Date changed to 2015 in brackets. My main areas of concern are:- extending the settlement boundary; accuracy and completeness of housing need assessment; the robustness of CEC on a whole range of planning issues especially highways, access to developments, sufficient parking to stop on-road parking in new developments, loss of important vistas, drainage etc.</p>
40	<p>H6 Why not 62 over the period as on page 2. ENV5 does not fit in with ENV4, solar panels/traditional materials. ENV8 -what about the Grange? T1 - not paved footpaths please.T5 A good aim but this is an unobtainable wish. Once again this is a poor survey. Take E4 - how should one answer it and agree to A & B but not C and D. CEC need to sort out Cheshire Homes Choice it is never effectively purged so all data from it is corrupt.</p>
43	<p>H2E last bullet point - who decides this (regarding highways and car parking)? What are the criteria? Resolution of Policy CI4 is an essential prerequisite of any further development. The statement of 'consideration and encouragement' seems vague and rather passive, given the crucial nature of the parking issue in the village centre. An excellent document - the hard work of Group members is much appreciated.</p>
49	<p>Policy CI3 - I do not understand this, it does not seem relevant?</p>
52	<p>There is no reference to transport (public) for the village. If more houses are to be built increasing the local population, public transportation should be encouraged to enable older people who cannot drive to commute. It would also reduce the traffic of private cars used in Bunbury.</p>
53	<p>H6 - Plan period 2015 -2030: 80 houses reduced to 62 because 18 already built since 2010? Phase 1: 2015 - 12 homes?</p>
54	<p>H6: Phase 1 numbers should include those houses already built since 2010. Well done to all the team that have worked so hard to create this plan.</p>

55	H2E - What about the building opposite The Nag's Head and the redundant police house? Both are an eyesore. Agree in principle providing something is done about these buildings ie made habitable. H5A - and provision for bins so they are not kept at the front of properties. H6 - Query on no. of houses 62 not 80. LC1 No more black metal railings please! ENV7 item on drainage ditches, brooks and culverts - Overdue! BIO2 Last bullet point - Very important as 2 proposed building sites are on land which is waterlogged for half the year as close to the River Gowy. The river needs flood plains and needs protection. T6 - thought the first bullet point was already the law. (20mph by schools). CI2 last paragraph - such as a new classroom? CI4 I have never known a primary school not to have parking problems for 30 mins at each end of the day, it is inevitable. C14 the centre of the village does get congested from time to time BUT it stops people driving fast through the village. Surely that is safer. I have taught in primary schools all over this country and have had my children and grandchildren in many more. Bunbury is not a problem compared to many I know of. Just educate mothers to stop letting children access vehicles from the road side.
58	Policy B101, 102,103. The sentiments are good but where development occurs on a reasonable scale there will be an inevitable loss of habitat and therefore a decrease in biodiversity.
62	Respondent queried H6 phasing and altered numbers
63	Any development needs traffic calming on the entrance to School Lane e.g. sleeping policemen etc.
69	I think you have addressed all the concerns raised - thank you
74	H1 - crossed out minimum and wrote 'target'. ENV4 - Although I believe this not to be paramount. Some amazing modern housing being built in Kelsall (lots of cedar cladding, glass etc) which enhances the village
75	H2 - I agree with points B, C, D and E. I think point A is wrong. Many of the developments over the last 70 years have been on a larger scale (e.g. Church Row, or The Highlands). Allowing larger developments of, for example, 30 properties, allows for a more planned and holistic development. H5 - as above. E3 - I would prefer a longer time period than 4 years for the conversion of agricultural buildings and stables to prevent, or discourage, owners from intending the conversion to houses from the outset. T6 - Road safety is clearly important and I support measures to improve road safety, however I disagree to T6 because:- a) A speed limit of 20 around the school is only required at times when pupils will be going to and from school. The limit should therefore be variable and set by controls in or adjacent to the school. b) A speed limit of 20 is desirable for new housing developments but the existing 30 limit should remain for the main access routes to and from the village centre.
76	1. I have a problem with the use of the word 'minimum' alongside the proposal for 80 houses. Surely the inclusion of the word means there is no maximum? I think the village expects the 80 houses to be the maximum. 2. The phasing of the houses suggest a figure of 80, but we are told we have already built 18 so the phasing should be 12, 30, 20. 3. I agree with no co-location, but would welcome some definition of the space required between locations to clarify what co-location actually means.
77	T5 - should read 'must' not 'when appropriate and practical' this is open to abuse.

79	H1 - A map showing the current and proposed settlement boundary would have been helpful therefore, cannot comment due to absence of this! There are questions relating to the Settlement boundary - there isn't a plan attached and we checked on line where it is listed as 'to be completed'. Difficult to comment without the map It would give a better perspective if it was clear who has sold land for development to builders. Developers can still make a viable, significant profit from developments of 5-10 houses but it would appear that 15 has wrongly been defined as the point where they will make a viable profit. There was nowhere in this document to reflect this. Developers often build 2-3 houses on a site where a larger property has been knocked down. They are hard headed business people and would not do so unless they can realise a significant profit - do not be hoodwinked.
80	H1 - Ticked agree and wrote "mostly but not all." H3 - mostly. H6 - Anything up to 160 more cars in the village. Agree with some reservations. ENV1 - What amenity? ENV5 - Agree with reservations. Swale a moist track of land usually with rank vegetation. ENV7 - don't understand the second half of this statement, the first is fine. CI3 Agree with reservations.CI4 - Don't know how you will do it!
81	T3, T4, T5 - Would prefer traffic calming measures to putting pavements along country lanes where they are not appropriate. CI4 - would not like to see a large car park in the centre of the village. People should be encouraged to walk more. Possibly signpost the free parking at the playing field. ENV1 - would like to see fields with well used footpaths given greater protection
82	More should be made of the available parking by the playing fields. A parking sign would help reduce the on-road parking by shoppers outside the Co-op and butcher's shops.
83	Village Centre parking is essential
86	No more houses
87	Policy H1. Planning permission will be allowed for 80 new houses not a "minimum of". This is what is stated on page one of brochure.
89	While I agree broadly that traditional materials should be used in construction this should not preclude the building of homes in a contemporary style so long as the architectural standards are of the highest standards. C13 - Bunbury is not a tourist destination and I see no argument for trying to make it one. The lanes and the village centre are busy enough as it is and very few would benefit from additional tourist activity.
91	Parking outside the school is a real hazard and needs addressing as soon as possible before there is an accident
101	H2. - "What the hell" written after the 80 new homes section. Farm workers to live on the farm. Moving settlement boundary means less farm land. Extra playing field to be provided by the builders for every 50 units built on land they have.
102	H6 - 2010 - 2030 Check your figures

103	<p>H1. This plan should propose a Settlement Boundary for Bunbury based upon the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011. H2 - Infill should be up to 3 dwellings in character and scale with adjoining development. H3 - The requirement for affordable housing is normally applicable only to developments exceeding 14 units it would be nonsensical to apply this requirement to a development of say 2 houses. H5 - I feel that para E is unnecessary as it is simply going to increase the cost of providing housing needed in the village beyond the reach of those who need it. LC5 - Where it helps meet local needs and in character with adjoining housing and does not exceed 10 houses in number on a particular site. ENV2 - The existing Replacement Local Plan 2011 and neighbourhood plan by their nature may breach the Local Plan requirement but they apply only to the area locally, otherwise their plan will have no practical application. ENV3 - Not all existing trees need to be protected. ENV5 I am against solar panels in fields which can't otherwise be used for agricultural purposes and also wind turbines over 20' high. ENV8 - Agree so far as applies. Do we have any I wonder? (Historic/heritage assets). E2 - 6 months is sufficient I had experience of this in Fulham. Nothing would change in the second 6 months and simply leave an eyesore in the village while the 12 months expires. CI2 - But only where it does impact on that infrastructure and not in the case of small developments of say 3 houses or fewer. CI3 - We do not want tourists everywhere in the village.</p>
109	<p>Overall a good plan. However, I was disappointed to see no measures against light pollution. One of the reasons that Bunbury retains a rural feel is sensitive, low level street lighting. This also benefits wild life and allows our children to see the night sky. Whilst a small amount of street lighting can help road safety (such as we have now), I would not like to see this increase. Sky glow caused by excessive street lighting is ugly, it gives a feeling of urbanisation and it is wasteful of money (as well as contributing CO₂). For this reason I disagree with Policy T6 which advocates more street lighting.</p>
114	<p>H2 - maximum of 15 houses per site is TOO MANY! 5 max. would be acceptable, so spread others around the village. Bloor Homes' proposal on School Lane would increase traffic - already too crowded with parked up cars. Very dangerous for school children plus residents trying to exit their premises.</p>
116	<p>H1 - Ambiguous grammar implies future so what about those already granted 2010 to date? Should be clear 80 is inclusive of those already built. H3 - There is nothing here to ensure affordable homes remain affordable once sold to a second or third owner. H6 - Inconsistent numbers/dates with statement in H1. Implies the 80 excludes any houses already built. E4 - Needs to also have due regard to impact on traffic levels parking etc. T1 - Not a priority in terms of what the village may want back from development. T6 - Strongly disagree; 20mph limits have a place in town environment where rush hour traffic needs calming but not in a village environment. The only real issue is the inconsiderate parking on School Lane by parents dropping off/collecting children morning and afternoon so let's not get this out of proportion. More to enforce a 30mph limit throughout the day and night would be a much better start in my view. CI4 - Depends what is meant by "centre of the village" as there is a currently no space to do that and I wouldn't support taking green spaces in the centre to do this. (P.S. and I live in the centre of the village so it is not a NIMBY comment) 1. I do not feel that this plan adequately defines the community infrastructure projects that may be priorities for the majority of the Bunbury population. This needs more consideration/feedback. 2) There is very little in here for the younger residents of the community. Should this be reviewed e.g. supporting facilities for our school age population for evening/weekend activity etc. Bike racks provided at main bus stops to improve ability to travel to Tarporley/Chester/Crewe etc.</p>
117	<p>No mention of any cycling provisions!</p>

119	It is hard to see anything in this that could be disagreed with! It is ironic that the 130 year old (or more) view on the front of this document - used to give an impression of rural "Bliss" has now been turned probably for evermore, into a ploughed field! This field did not form part of the conservation area did it?
121	Well done keep up the good work, Bunbury will be a better place for your efforts.
122	Well done Neighbourhood Plan Group. You are doing an excellent job for the Village
126	The lack of bus services in the village is a real problem
128	Very disappointed that the village I grew up in will have so much extra housing, but you have explained the arguments very clearly and therefore I have agreed with your proposals in this N.P. One suggestion:- If building is allowed outside the settlement boundary, it should be attached on a minimum of 2 sides to the original boundary, so extending the boundary by the smallest amount. Otherwise small pockets of development will occur surrounded largely by open countryside, and creating possible infill areas, which at a later date could be ripe for development and so creating larger developments - bypassing the no co-location guidance.
130	H1 - when will it be moved again? H5D - define garden space. HFE - Not rabbit hutches. H5 general - enough room to grow vegetables? As well as garden. H6 Only 60 required, see first page. Bunbury is an attractive village. Please do NOT turn it into rural suburbia. Judging by Malpas developers will run roughshod through this Plan - BE CAREFUL. They tore up the Malpas Plan.
131	There is a strong need for footpaths on the main access roads to the village centre ie Vicarage Lane and School Lane
132	I live in The Highlands and there is a considerable problem with traffic parking for the school, however other considerations as well as parking must be taken into consideration before any encouragement for new buildings be given. Size of development being paramount
133	H6 - date changed
134	H6 - 62 houses as per intro.
135	Parking MUST be addressed round the centre of the village and round the school BEFORE any building is allowed
136	CI4 - Strongly Agree. Respondent said "is adversely affected". Early stages of dialogue between land owners and development company are not sufficiently monitored, financial inducements go unnoticed (brown paper envelopes etc) there should be a requirement in law ie complete disclosure.
137	Until there is visibility of proposed extended settlement boundary for Bunbury, it is difficult to determine an agreement to the Neighbourhood Plan.
138	T3/4 Parking and traffic on School Lane and Wyche Lane is an issue, especially School Lane. Suggestion is that a traffic survey is done - 8.30am and 3.30pm on a school day.
139	It seems that we are now to have 400,000 new "homes" on brownfield sites, so is all this currently proposed pollution now necessary? Phasing development is common sense: any development causes peaks in demand for schooling locally, followed by troughs it happens every time. Smaller carefully managed phased development reduces the impact and puts less pressure on infrastructure. Obvious really.
140	All planning/developments should stand in their own right. There should be no "sweeteners" "Bribes" or quid pro quo. "We will give you this if you will give us that".
141	No more footpaths (loose dogs and dog muck to get your feet in!) At present this area is on a 6 month TB testing window.

160	More transport links - to the C84 Tarporley. Either public or private transport which would help people coming into the village to use pre-school, shops, clubs, societies, within the village.
161	Whilst there may be some areas of our village with potential for affordable housing development it lacks the infrastructure to support any large scale development, in particular parking facilities and roads with narrow hazardous bends.
166	Affordable Housing
167	CI4 - But where? Do not knock down existing buildings. Please don't forget we are a village. It's not London and if new people want more things going on they shouldn't move here!
168	Specific attention should be given to the current dreadful condition at the entrance to Wyche Lane opposite the 'Nags Head' of derelict shop. This should be addressed with urgency.
169	H6. Already had 19 houses 2010-2015. Therefore this number to 2020 should be 11. CI2 - Why is this necessary (meaning financial contributions from developers) if we are getting money allocated against already identified priorities in the neighbourhood plan (via 106 contributions etc). CI4 As long as it is not the only consideration.
170	1. Regarding co-location - there is no definition of this meters away from each development? 2. Footpaths - we need to protect existing footpaths - none should be diverted or reduced. A group of volunteers in the village are in the process of setting up 'Walking for Health' in conjunction with medical practice to promote local walking for people with health and mental issues. They will be using already well used footpaths in rural locations.
171	1. With regard to co-location, can we try to define this eg planned development off Wyche Lane appears to co-locate with Tweddle Close, but it appears to be supported by the Parish Council (H2A) 2. Footpaths - we should do more to protect existing footpaths through the village. No development should require footpaths to be re-routed, nor encroach on them (T5). 3. A final note on above points - H2A is it a 'Gimme' that any close co-location should have its own safe access? If not, it should. T5 - some footpaths are published on local pubs website - these should be protected.
172	H6 - Less the 18 already completed 62 in total.
173	CI3 - not sure. I welcome the commitment to pedestrians, biodiversity, renewable energy and low density development in this policy document. I hope this can be complemented by improved public transport and the re-opening of Beeston Station.
174	H5D - Avoid car parking and bins in front of terraces with small gardens. T4 - extra visitor parking - Bunbury has poor public transport and family members usually arrive by car. E4 - look at the locality as a whole; not sure if single or pairs of houses should be discounted if not in village.
175	H6 - 18 homes already built = 12 houses. T6 - Plus car parking off street, plus building of pavements. Developers must be required to contribute to the instigation of pavements if no pavements exist. They should be required to provide off street parking within the village. Only 18 homes to be built by 2020. This would allow time to assess whether developments already under construction in nearby areas became occupied. (Beeston, Tarporley, Tarvin) Also in 2020 a further review of need can be undertaken.

176	<p>T5 - If new development goes ahead surely it MUST provide access for pedestrians and if it isn't practical or appropriate the development should not go ahead!! I would like an accurate definition of co-location. If going on village maps then Tweddle Close co-locates with the Grange development as they are on adjoining land? Policy T5 - the current pedestrian footways are an utter disgrace to the village. One cannot walk safely into town centre as it is. I strongly believe that if it is "not practical or appropriate" to be able to provide safe pedestrian footways then a development should not take place. 15 houses and potentially 30 adults plus 30 children and no safe footways for them???</p>
177	<p>H1- Cheshire East Council calculates 80 houses 2010-2030. This becomes a 'minimum' in this policy. What is the 'maximum' and what protection will the NP give us if CEC changes its calculation? H2 Is the 'viability' of 15 new houses on greenfield sites evidence based? Smaller developments are made by smaller/medium sized 'local' firms. We should not accept 'evidence' from large building developers without plenty of independent research.</p>
178	<p>H6 - 2010 introduction. 18 houses 2010-2015 98 in total (NB This number of 98 is not a typist's error but mistake by respondent - added instead of subtracted). ENV1 - very important. T3 - pedestrian facilities very important. T5 - Pedestrian footways to local village facilities (Co-op and butchers) are very poor and need to be improved as a matter of urgency. Co-location is a grey area and needs to be clearly defined in the final plan statement.</p>
179	<p>H5 – Current distances appropriate in towns. H6 - judge on merit not bribes. LC1. Survey properties either side for 100 metres on either side. Not modern flat finishes which are totally out of character when large areas of wall are rendered. E4 - density - how far each way? CI2 - (2nd para) relate directly to site and neighbours. Thank you for the work you have done on this survey. H5B Rules for distances between overlooking existing buildings should be greater than those in towns. H5D - Tight terraces with small gardens and with cars and bins parked in front is not "rural". LC1 - Design should incorporate or improve on features of existing properties say 80-100 metres on either side. H6 - Paragraph 2 - Contributions - If development is wrong it is wrong. Bribes do not make it correct. E4 - adjoining developments. Should look further than next door to compare materials and design. T4 - In Bunbury where public transport is very poor. The minimum standard for parking is not good enough. Extra visitor parking is essential. CI2 - see my comment re H6 above please.</p>
187	<p>The proposed development in the field next to the old surgery on the road off Bowesgate Road, apart from taking away the view from some of the houses opposite, really should be developed into a car park for the church. When there are any big functions ie weddings at the church - funerals etc. you cannot move for cars, buses on and around the green (which should be a green and not a car park) Also at the same time 20-30 cars from walkers and ramblers cars parked on both sides of the road and occasionally tenants of Church Row get blocked in or out of their premises. There's plenty of fields which really wouldn't interfere with anyone and also it is supposed to be green belt and not enough amenities in the village butchers/village shop/cafe and no garage. ENV1 - Such as car park for church. T3 - No pedestrian facilities from the church and lots of traffic. T5 - None whatsoever from the church. CI4 - what about the church.</p>

189	<p>Generally where CEC Local Plan policies are in place these should apply. H1 - CEC housing numbers are not fixed at this time - Local Plan rejected due to inaccuracies in this. The policy needs to reflect the benefits of small scale developments outside the Bunbury settlement boundary and reflect H2 fully. A 'flexible' settlement boundary is unlikely to be acceptable in Local Plan. H3 - The minimum threshold after which this applies should be stated, together with the ratio to be applied ie more specific criteria. H6 same comments as H1 re numbers. Provision should also be made to retain some housing numbers back/allocate windfall sites ie to ensure large scale developers do not use up all the allocation to the detriment of preferred small discreet developments. How do these numbers relate to housing need? LC5 - This is too restrictive and removes possible suitable sites without any planning size/specific basis. ENV1 - 'Open vistas' and 'rural skylines' is too subjective a criteria. ENV5 - this is too over reaching and not practicable ENV7 - This should be 'where practicable'. BIO1, BIO2, BIO3 - these are too inflexible - should be where practicable. T2 to T6 These are over prescriptive and not necessarily achievable. CI4 residents accessing village services create vibrancy in the village centre. More parking will encourage car use. A voluntary village 'travel plan' to encourage walking where practicable would be more appropriate.</p>
190	<p>Cars parking in the centre of the village ie butchers and Co-op is extremely dangerous and will get even worse with new houses that will have at least 2 cars per house. Cars should NOT be allowed to park on both sides of the shops. The delivery man has great difficulty taking new deliveries to the Co-op and I have seen him, having to park as far as the chip shop to push all the heavy food etc to the Co-op. A big enough car park should be made, and car drivers should be made to park in the car park. I am very surprised no accidents have happened, but there could always be a first time.</p>
191	<p>T6 Disagree - If 20mph speed limit at school opening and closing times only, could have agreed. T2 Fibre optic cabling - disagree as understand already out of date as satellite can replace. Cable only valid very short term until BT has signed up most households.</p>
192	<p>LC2 - H5 C and D apply here. LC5 - Why specifically "Backland" development - should this not apply to all development - back/side/front? ENV6 3 separate points here 1 agree, 2 disagree, 3 - agree. ENV6 2nd para. Please define small scale - the site or premises may be small, but impact through cars etc. may be very big. E3 - Why 4 years, why not 10? CI2 - But beware bribes. CI4 - pay and display (£1 for 10 mins) roadside parking - no exceptions. (Try it for a charity fundraiser for the day?)</p>
193	<p>H2B - Could you please clarify whether infill can occur on roads outside the settlement boundary e.g. Bunbury Common, College Lane etc. H4 Does this mean more bungalows? Should there be reference to the people wanting to extend the ground floor footprint of existing dwellings to permit single floor living? H5F - Does 'heritage assets' include farm land within Bunbury Village. LC5 - Does this imply someone who wants to build a new home in their back garden which almost inevitably overlooks the original home and garden is made to do so? (could not read these words) ENV8 - what are 'heritage assets' in the parish? BIO1 - Where are the core sites? Firstly thank you for steering this process and all the time/energy/care invested. Are "service centres" designated long term to expand and become towns? It seems harsh punishment that in village communities which have supported and sustained local businesses there is now extraordinary pressure to transform a village, a vibrant close connected community, into an urban habitat. What is the purpose of a "settlement boundary" if it can be simply re-drawn around new development which we "must have"? Given the pattern of infill housing previously in Bunbury, how can smaller developments not be economically viable? Will the farmland between Upper and Lower Bunbury always be respected and kept development free? Are references to conserving wildlife, birds' etc. newts, implied? Do they need to be identified on the plan?</p>

194	H6 - You said earlier that only 62 houses needed as 18 built since 2010 so below is incorrect. Phase 2010-2020 = 30 houses or phase 2015 - 2020 = 22, phase 3 = 20. If phases amended like above then agreed. It's essential we are rigorous in the design, site and quality of build materials used. It would be good if it was possible to include the use of local builders who are skilled in local craftsmanship and local materials - it also means providing employment to local people.
195	I can see that fibre optic would be a "nice to have" but don't agree that it is such a major priority. T6 I feel contributions made should be spent elsewhere. Road safety improvements I assume are the responsibility of Highways. Also nothing on improved transport links (still reliant on cars). I agree that there has to be some development and that the plan seeks to control and phase this where possible but I think there needs to be a clearer plan as to the benefits to the whole village that can be negotiated with developers. Merely adding ponds/wildlife areas within development won't necessarily benefit the whole village. It could be a real missed opportunity not to have a "wish list" of village improvements to negotiate on.
196	H2B (infill) should have a proviso of except where it conflicts with ENV2 - open views.
197	T5 - remove "where appropriate and practical" such a statement renders the proposal obsolete.
198	Whilst we agree that new and "altered" dwellings should not be an eyesore, we feel that new and innovative design should not be excluded from the development of the village. An open-minded approach should be taken, on an individual basis, so that the village continues to develop in a positive manner, into the 21st century. This doesn't necessarily mean the use of red Cheshire brick and sandstone, with slate or clay roofs!
199	H6 is contradicting the opening statement where it states "this figure is reduced to 62". Whilst we have ticked 'agree', we wish this to remain the 62 and not the 80 homes listed in H6.
200	How can your policy?(Could not read this word)... Re environment and preserving our rural character be achieved if we must accept such a large number of new homes? What percentage increase in dwelling numbers is envisaged? Given the absence of employment opportunities with public transport, why are affordable houses better placed here than in towns? Is it a (cynical) attempt to meet targets and so preserve our precious countryside.
201	H3 - Affordable/starter homes should remain exactly that in perpetuity.
202	Although we are in favour of the 20mph speed limits in certain areas, this doesn't seem to work unless the speed limit is enforced. The current 30 mph speed limit is not enforced. We think this Neighbourhood Plan Survey has been really well compiled, covered everything one can possibly think of and easy to understand. THANKYOU!
205	Bunbury has been a small village community for hundreds of years. Many people have their home here on that basis. I feel strongly that this should be preserved not destroyed.
207	1 - Lack of parking in the centre helps encourage more people to walk. Increased parking areas will naturally increase the traffic cause and effect. 2 - I would like Bunbury to be visited by people who discover us through word of mouth, but do not see the need to have lots of tourists passing through Bunbury as this increases traffic and is not necessary in a residential area.
208	H6 - 62? Note - said 2010 with 18 built so far?
209	Where possible, improvements to additional infrastructure and facilities should be planned for implementation during the early phase of any individual development. Having moved to Bunbury from a nearby village where there has been nothing short of an explosion in planned new development, we would emphasise the need to stick to an agreed plan and not allow the acceleration of building schedule.
226	ENV6 - agricultural buildings part two - stables and animal field shelter only location subject to power and water

227	Note - the location of a stable/animal field shelter sometimes has to be sited near appropriate water/power sources. They also have to be monitored by visual or CCTV. ENV6 - agricultural buildings. Part two stables and animal field shelters only.
228	ENV6 - agricultural buildings. Part two - stables and animal field shelter only location/require power and water
230	Why have the new houses have to be built at the same time? They should stagger these builds, to avoid inconvenience to residents. School Lane should not have the amount of cars parked on it. Also The Highlands have to cope with cars parked in the morning and afternoon for parents to pick their children up. The congestion is very dangerous.
231	Respondent wrote "How?" Against T3, T4, and T5. Parking is a big issue in village. Lack of pavements in village to my mind lead to 20mph in village. Increased housing brings with it increased car usage.
233	H6 - plan period should be 2010-2030. So 2015-2020 would be 12 homes (18 completed since 2010)
234	T6 - no speed bumps
235	Particular attention needs to be paid to developments that could result in additional traffic in areas of the village used for school run and already without a footpath. It's important that any development is spread out evenly across the entire village to avoid intense clusters of new buildings in certain areas.
236	A shame the plan wasn't more obviously available on the website - took me a long time to find it.
237	Parking is a serious issue for Bunbury. The area around the Co-op and the butchers can be unpassable. Some thought as to how this will be managed and/or improved going forward needs to be given.
241	<i>Unfortunately this respondent only printed out a part of the survey document from the web site, therefore only some of the policies were answered</i>
244	BIO3 - and the CPRE? (<i>Campaign to Protect Rural England</i>). T1 - Views from these paths should be protected. The existing Village Design Statement scheme should be referred to and its recommendations accepted. The conservation areas should be extended to cover important footpaths and the scenically most important area between the church and the mill. At present there are already some low cost homes in Higher Bunbury, next to the conservation area, in Wyche Lane and Bunbury Lane. Some low cost homes are needed and the most suitable place for these is on School Lane with pavement access to the school. At present this is the only area in Bunbury with no "social housing".
245	H1 - No maximum? H6 - 80 (Not 62) 18 in 2010 -2015 already?
246	H6 - 80 not 62?
247	H6 - What about the 18 built from 2010-2015? "What are these?" written beside the reference to additional dwellings on windfall or exception sites.
248	H6 - Unclear as to the homes built between 2010-2015 - are they included in this figure of 30? "Sounds vague" written about " <i>updated to adapt to market conditions</i> ". No explanation as to what these words actually mean (<i>reference to dwellings on exception sites</i>)
249	H3 - Not all but some. (2nd paragraph)
262	H6/H1 states minimum of 80 houses from 2010-2030 - deducting 18 houses already built leaves only 62, am concerned that a minimum of 80 homes could mean many more.

264	<p>H1 - I have marked the text relevant to my question comment respondent underlined <i>last section of paragraph C re agricultural worker's dwelling, and in the next paragraph the section about possibly moving the settlement boundary</i>). If development is allowed for agricultural needs, I assume that the settlement boundary will not be re-drawn to the edge of this type of development. If yes, then I disagree, if No leave as marked.</p>
265	<p>T1 - would need detail. T3 - Wider implication - see comment. T5 - what bus stops. CI4 - How? Effect on sewerage capacity needs to be identified. Having regard to other local developments at Beeston and Tarporley, Cheshire East and West Council need to be jointly involved in addressing effects on road congestion towards Chester and Crewe. Also the long outstanding re-opening of railway station in the Beeston/Calveley area to mitigate road congestion and offer wider access to/from the area. We are not involved but primary school capacity is a very relevant issue.</p>