

Feedback comments from the Options Document consultation July & August 2017

Please Note:-

Comments in Black are taken from the hard copy survey submissions and comments in Blue are taken from the online survey submissions.

Policy area	Consultation comment	Steering Group comment
P&D1	But please not 'in-fill' – it has produced ribbon development.	
P&D1	It is important that the SDNP does not promote specific sites	
P&D1	I basically agree with Policy P&D1a but several years ago I submit a plan for 5 homes on a small piece of land opposite my property. 3x3 bedrooms & 2x2 bedrooms, this has been sent again recently.	
P&D1	B and c are not mutually exclusive and could be combined.	
P&D2	Any Affordable Housing must remain Affordable Housing in perpetuity & not allowed to be bought or sold at reduced market value & then be sold on again at full market value as this means it is no longer "Affordable". The "Right to Buy" scheme makes a mockery of this.	
P&D2	I agree with Policy Option P&D2A. 2 members of my family have now moved miles away, as its not possible to pay the huge deposit required on high house prices here. You need a car, as bus services are a bit vague, with no shops, and no papers, the village could die.	
P&D2	It is very important that affordable housing remains affordable and is not sold off as reduced market value resulting in profits for a few. The 'Right to Buy' makes this very difficult to enforce.	
P&D2	If affordable [i.e. modest sized] housing was primarily available to those with connection to the parish, we personally would not have been able to move here 30 years ago. We cherish the village because we have not grown up to take it for granted and I do not believe that people new to the village who move into the Big Houses necessarily contribute more.	

SD2	I prefer design Policy SD2A But would add the fact you buy your property but you don't own the view, house owners never have, but only seems to apply to people who have large houses, they can build all around far too close to each other, when others can't.	
SD3	This list is not exclusive and others may be identified [please add to policy]	
SD3	Please protect the 'Devon Banks' and the ancient trees at the 'Upper Stanton' junction. So beautiful. The central village - that keeps it rural- is the space between the settlements.	
SD3	Protection of views is too subjective. What view is so important to appear on a limited list. I am sure that there are many views around the Parish that are equally as important as that at the junction of the A368 and Bromley Road!!!	
SD3	My option is Policy SD3a. the land I'd planned to build on would not be affected by this plan.	
SD4c	Stanton Drew PC will not support development proposals in the Conservation Area.	
SD5.2	- sympathetic and small scale - 'Amazing Spaces' not 'Grand Design' - serviced plots for finishing by self-builders by way of creating special, affordable small scale.	
SD5.3c	It would encourage applications to look super energy-efficient in order to get past planning	
SD5.4	Policy Option SD5.4A. If homes are to be affordable, any architecture should be based on the type of homes being erected. Prices should be scheduled accordingly to materials.	
SD5.4	Design to be in sync with & sympathetic to neighbouring properties & respect their	

	privacy.	
SD5.4	The majority of contemporary housing development is either weird, bleak or Barratt boring and blocky. We are short of shining examples. Perhaps a design competition? [As was involved as the Garden City principles].	
SD5.4	I would have a concern that 5.4a could contradict 5.1a and 5.2a. Maybe wording could be added to 5.4a say "so long as 5.1 a and 5.2a are adhered to."	
SD5.5	I support 5.5a but safety should override the "minimum signage" clause.	
SD6	Policy Option SD6.A This included statement was never mentioned on the twice I've submit for development planning.	
BP1	Policy OptionBP1a. Why not a shop in the local Pub, people could at least visit it, with a car & not have to park in the field.	
BP1	It would be nice if it was mandated that the developments which occur do not cause excessive light pollution. Also use of brownfield sites should be preferred over greenfield for building developments.	
BP1	Conversion of existing buildings only. No new business developments necessary in the parish.	
BP2	i support faster broadband however not if it means development of greenbelt land to do so.	

Transport and Movement Aspirations

Aspiration	Consultation comment	Steering Group comment
BS	Bus shelter needed opposite Druids Arms	
FP	Too many notices are an eyesore	
CMC	But for safe route apply restrictions to motor vehicles & motor cycles	
JS	Please also consider reducing speed on B3130 to make 'bendy' part between Stanton Drew & Chew Magna safer.	
JS	Important issue for safety. But think this should not be included in Neighbourhood Plan which should be strategic in thinking. This problem should be addressed ASAP rather than put in Plan!	

Facilities and Amenities Aspirations

Aspiration	Support	Consultee comments	Steering Group comment
FA1	11/12	<i>Do you support these aspirations?</i>	
FA1		I'm not sure the hall should be larger or that there should be separate pre-school facilities.	
FA1.1	26/29	<i>Do you support these aspirations?</i> Difficult to support as not owned by village. In part.	
FA1.2	23/29		
FA1.3	25/29		
FA1.4	23/29		
FA2	10/12	<i>A Village Hub</i>	
FA2		This is privately owned land so the owner's views need to be explored. The aspirations are supported.	
FA2		Additional building would need to comply with planning rules for washed over green belt which I don't believe it does.	
FA2	23/29	Perhaps owners should be consulted.	
		FA1 and FA2 are the same thing if aspiration of FA1 are realised they need land from FA2 and will become the hub.	
		A hub sounds a bit vague. It suggests, to me, all the things we do in the village hall already.	
		Yes, but with the support of the Local Authority.	
FA3	11/12	<i>Shop/Café in the Parish</i>	
FA3		I don't believe a shop or cafe is viable in such a small village and do not believe a cafe would necessarily be in keeping with the character of the village.	
FA3	21/29 5 blanks	A shop is probably unsustainable.	

	2 no.		
		Yes, but unlikely to be used unless open early & late.	
		Yes, but I would prefer to use the druids Arms rather than paddle in mud at the farm.	
		I suspect that it would not be economically viable unless linked to pub or new farm cafe	
		Rumour has it that the new owner of SD garage has plans to sell fuel maybe a shop could be incorporated alongside.	
		Combine a shop & café ate the Hub & have it part staffed by local volunteers	
		I do not think there would be enough support.	
FA4.1	27/29 1 no 1 blank	Not everyone is sporty. How about a village workshop – like the provision given by the ‘sheds’ organisations ref: UK Men’s Sheds Association	
		I’m too old to help now, but for the younger groups of teenagers I think the parents in a lot of cases should be much more involved & responsible both for & with them as we used to with our children.	
		Having clubs based in the village would help for example, Chew Valley Football for juniors play in Pensford but could be attracted elsewhere.	
		Yes, but not youth specific	
		Best site for football and cricket is current site.	
		The sports field/area should be located opposite ‘The Druids’ as part of a village hub.	
		Convert the existing park to a skate park, use cricket field for swings etc, small play area opposite Druids!	
		No, I do not think that the area is big enough for cricket.	

FA4.2	25/29	Yes, if respectful of its primary purpose	
	2 Nos 1 Not sure. 1 blank	No, we have a village hall for community events.	
		Not sure, I think the church needs to remain a church and events etc held in a new facility or in village hall!	
		Parking is a problem.	
		Increase the facilities available near the village hall	
		Leave the church for religious purposes. Put energy into improving usage of the village hall	
FA4.3	10/12	<i>Bicycle sheds and better Parking</i>	
FA4.3	1 no	Better parking ok, not so sure about bike sheds.	
FA4.3	21/29	At the village hub	
	4 nos 2 not sure 2 blank	Stands would suffice	
		Not bicycle shed, yes to better parking	
		Parking is an issue. Hall parking could be expanded and made available.	
		Better parking yes but not sure where. I don't think bicycle 'sheds' particularly necessary but would agree to stands for security.	
		Should be enough parking with plans for area opposite Druids Arms.	
		Use land opposite Druids	
FA5	29/29	Long term a new school would be a positive for the village. The location needs to have good access but also near the centre of	

		the village.	
		We only have our church & village hall, one pub, no shop & a school, a bit of a bus service that it seems to be run by several companies, no timetables	
		Size should be more than 100 pupils current area used by football/cricket could be enhanced and closest to pupils.	
		The school is adequate for our children. The cricket field should be used for all PE!	
		Investigate, but a different site would be better.	

Additional comments

Consultee Comment	Steering Group Comment
In addition, would also like to respond on the 2 greenbelt 'Emerging Policy Approaches' on page 35 of the document: Would support both GB1 and GB2 and would not support alternative options.	
Thank you very much to all involved in this time-consuming exercise. We appreciate the opportunity to have our say on the future of our village. Well done	