

BUNBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – FREQUENCY OF COMMENTS APPEARING IN SURVEY RESPONSES APRIL 2015	
COMMENT	No
Affordable housing – keep low price when re-sold	3
Affordable housing – more specific criteria	1
Affordable housing more suitable for towns not Bunbury	1
Affordable housing rule nonsensical for small developments	1
Affordable housing?	1
Affordable/low housing put at School Lane end of village as there is none there	1
Agricultural buildings – wait more than 4 years before developing	2
Agricultural buildings/stables and animal field shelters only if power and water available	3
Assisted housing required	1
Avoid traffic calming measures i.e. speedbumps - urbanisation	2
Backland – why not all around a property?	1
Backland policy too restrictive	1
Beeston station – re-open	2
Bins - provision so they are not kept in front of properties	2
Black metal railings - no more	1
Building allocation – reserve some for smaller developments	1
Building to a ‘Standard’ pushes prices beyond some people	1
Bunbury – village should be preserved not destroyed	1
Bunbury Heath and Bunbury Common are not in the settlement boundary - why?	1
Bunbury is a village not a town, don’t move here if want more	1
Car park – any land should be given/leased in perpetuity	2
Car park – land by old surgery should be used for new car park for church and walkers, not housing	2
Car park – large new one in centre not wanted	1
Car park - Sign post where the existing free car park is situated	2
Car park at playing field – use more	1
Car park provide a larger one	1
Car parks - don’t just provide them - walk more	4
Centre of village around shop and chip shop dangerous, needs addressing	3
Cheshire East - robustness re all planning issues questioned, e.g. highways access to developments, parking, drainage, loss of vistas etc.	1
Cheshire East and West should address road congestion on the Crewe to Chester route	1
Cheshire Homes choice is corrupt	1
Co-location – need gap defined	5
Congratulations/thanks on survey	16
Conservation area – extend, especially to include footpaths and area between Church and Bunbury Mill	1
Contemporary building – allow as well as traditional design as long as it is of a good architectural standard	3
Core sites – where are these?	2
Cricket field, bowls club etc. – move to behind the Grange and extend existing car park	1
Cricket field-protect and preserve	2

Cycling – more facilities for cyclists	1
Design/quality/sites concerns/no flat exterior finishes	3
Developers – small to medium sized companies can build smaller sites. Evidence for 15 queried – don't accept big developers numbers without independent research	1
Design etc. survey properties 100 metres on either side, tight terraces with small gardens and cars and bins parked outside is not rural	1
Developers – why do we need financial contributions from developers if we are already getting money against identified priorities via 106 agreements	1
Developers can make a good profit on smaller sites (5-10) not necessary to have 15 houses	2
Developers – should provide off street parking and pavements	1
Development - 1 unit on each for a farm worker	1
Development density – distance between overlooking buildings should be greater than in towns	1
Development – judge on merit not bribes	1
Development – spread them out so it is not all in one place	1
Development – with 400,000 homes now being built on brownfield land is all this extra pollution necessary here?	1
Development of reasonable scale will always destroy habitat	1
Development sites would have to be big enough for 15	1
Developments – carefully managed phasing of small groups is the way to go	1
Developments of say 30 desired to get a more holistic planned layout	1
Eco building - encourage	1
Educate parents about how to get in and out of cars on the pavement side	1
Employment - look at locality as a whole	
Employment development – have regard to impact on traffic/parking etc	1
Employment sites loss – these should be left 6 months not 12 to prevent an eyesore for a longer time	1
Environmental sustainability of buildings too over reaching. Should read 'where practicable'	1
Fibre optic concerns/not a priority, already outdated and only valid when signed up by phone company	2
Financial benefits from developers – needs to be planned for the benefit of the whole village, don't waste the opportunity. Not all money should go to the playground	2
Financial inducements – none should be given (brown paper envelopes) complete disclosure necessary no bribery	3
Footpaths – need improving/providing to village centre – Vicarage Lane and School Lane and from Church	3
Footpaths – no more (dog muck and TB testing concerns)	1
Footpaths – protect all existing footpaths	4
Footpaths - protect fields with well used footpaths	1
Footpaths a disgrace	1
Four Bunbury's - keep separated	3
Green spaces – protect (includes 1 - ploughed field is it in conservation area?)	3
Greenfield development i.e. Tweddle Close and the Grange	1
H3 Aff. Housing, Starter homes etc. – SOME (not ALL housing developments) to include an element of	1
Health Centre poorly designed affords no confidence in future developments	1
Heritage assets – what are these /does this include farm land in the village?	2
Housing - keep a good mix	1

Housing – don't turn Bunbury into suburbia	1
Housing – more houses more cars	3
Housing – not rabbit hutches and have gardens big enough for growing vegetables as well as flowers	1
Housing - No more houses	1
Housing – allow ground floor extensions for single floor living	1
Housing Needs Survey - concern	2
Housing numbers – should houses be discounted if not in village?	1
Housing numbers/phasing/dates/minimum etc. disputed	33
Housing phasing – 18 by 2010 could allow review of whether developments in nearby areas became occupied. Also in 2020 a further review could be undertaken	1
Include self-build and building in large gardens within the settlement boundary (brownfield)	1
Infill of up to 3 houses (not 2) in character with adjacent	1
Infill only if it doesn't conflict with open views	1
Infill outside Settlement boundary – does this apply to Bunbury Common and College Lane?	1
Infrastructure - put in place before any development takes place and adhere to agreed building plan	3
Infrastructure – more consideration on community infrastructure projects	1
Land owners - knowing who had sold land to developers would give a better perspective	1
Lighting – keep street lighting low level as it is now	1
Local Plan policies should apply/housing numbers not yet fixed	1
Local Service Centres – will these become towns eventually?	1
Local tradesmen – use wherever possible	2
Low cost housing – avoid bribery from developers	2
Malpas – Neighbourhood Plan not effective BE CAREFUL	
Open vistas and rural skylines too subjective a criteria	1
Parking - Cars parked in centre of village make people drive slower so safer	1
Parking – avoid in front of terraces with small gardens	1
Parking – more visitor parking to homes required	2
Parking – more yes but don't knock down existing buildings to do so	1
Parking – off street parking	1
Parking – provide pay and display	1
Parking around school difficult for only 30 mins each end of the school day it is inevitable at all primary schools	1
Parking at The Dysart Arms, sort out before any development takes place behind the church	1
Parking for village centre essential	1
Parking generally including around school, Wyche Lane, Vicarage Lane, The Highlands and Church (some say address before development takes place)	9
Parking in centre of village already dangerous, more houses will increase problem	1
Pavements – lack of leads to 20mph	1
Pavements – no more , we are a village not a town-urbanisation	4
Phasing – phase the building	1
Playing field – one extra for each 50 new houses built	1
Playing field - protect	1
Poor Survey	1

Poorly maintained properties - action required	3
Preserve views from BIO3 areas	1
Public rights of way – improvements not a priority	1
Public transport and links - improve	8
Repair all groundworks immediately	1
Retail facilities – define small scale in ENV6	2
Retirement accommodation should be encouraged	2
Rural exception sites – no explanation of what these are on survey form	1
Safe pedestrian access concerns – T5 - if not practical or appropriate to provide footpaths development shouldn't take place. Open to abuse	3
School capacity concerns	1
Services or facilities - Do not re-locate	1
Settlement Boundary concerns about moving it	9
Settlement boundary plan wanted	1
Sewerage capacity concerns	2
Shops/business - encourage more for employment	1
Solar panels disliked, especially in fields as they take away agricultural land	3
Speed limit - 20mph around school only at certain times – variable controls (for towns not villages)	3
Speed limit - 20mph on new developments but 30mph on main routes through village	1
Speed limit of 30mph all day throughout the village may be better	1
T2-T6 over prescriptive and not necessarily achievable	1
The fewer houses on each plot the better	1
The Grange - PC keeps pushing this development when Cllr. Jones says it will not go ahead - why?	1
The Grange – protect - ENV1	1
Tourism - did not understand C3	1
Tourism - don't make Bunbury a tourist destination	3
Traffic calming is preferable to having more pavements	1
Traffic survey requested at 8.30 and 3.30 each day	1
Trees – not all need protection	1
Trees - protect mature and hedgerows	1
Urbanisation not wanted	3
Village Design Statement – adhere to this	1
Website difficult to navigate	1
Wildlife areas etc. should these be identified on the plan (ie pond behind The Grange)	2
Window size add to policy LC1	1
Yellow lines not wanted	1
Young people – more facilities evenings/weekends/cycle racks etc.	1