



Cuddington Neighbourhood Plan

Undertaken by Cuddington Parish Council

Cuddington Neighbourhood Plan Vision, Objectives and Policy Ideas Consultation November 2016

Summary of Data from Survey Responses

1 Introduction

1.1 This document lists the scores associated with each of the policy ideas that were proposed in the survey. The form offered very simple choices – to abstain or skip the response, to support, or not to support. The form also included some very limited space for free format comments. These comments are given in full in the Appendix to this overview – with a brief Summary of Comments where they are felt to be relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan policy development.

1.2 It should be borne in mind that the total response rate was roughly 19% (463) of the total number 2474 of forms that were distributed – one to each occupied household in Cuddington, Delamere Park and Sandiway. The comments (which vary in number) were obtained from a proportion of the forms. Care should be taken recognise that while the comments may be indicative of village opinion, they are the views expressed by a small proportion of village households.

2 Environment

2.1 Policy 1: Protecting our heritage

A policy that protects and enhances historical structures and areas of value through ensuring new development of all kinds (not just housing) is sensitive to its surrounding context.

Table 1

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
459	4	37	451	8	98

Summary of Comments

The main thrust of the comments support the proposed policy idea. Restriction of future development in the village is also mentioned to ensure the character of the village is maintained.

2.2 Policy 2: Habitats and wildlife corridors

To establish and protect existing wildlife corridors to avoid fragmentation of habitats within the Parish to enable the movement of species.

Table 2

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
459	4	29	456	3	99

Summary of Comments

Once again the majority of comments were supportive. The comments ranged from specific places that should be protected, through those that propose no more building as the solution, to one that suggested that it was important that wildlife corridors did not inhibit overall development.

2.3 Policy 3: Trees, hedgerows and other vegetation

This policy will focus on preserving trees, hedgerows and vegetation throughout the parish by resisting their loss and encouraging new planting where development is proposed.

Table 3

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
456	7	68	447	9	98

Summary of comments

The comments support the policy idea. They emphasise enforcement of Tree Preservation Orders and the through life sustainable management of trees and woodland. As in other surveys carried out by the Steering Group, they raise the issue of overgrown hedges encroaching on footways and support flower and bulb planting. Once again there is a low level theme of no more houses.

2.4 Policy 4: Protected Green Spaces

Identify and designate Local Green Spaces of value to the community to ensure they are protected from inappropriate development. This may include playing fields, allotments and registered common land. Parish land designated as open countryside to the south of the A556 to be retained for recreational use.

Table 4

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
461	3	48	454	7	98

Summary of comments

The majority of comments are supportive with the land south of the A556 mentioned explicitly in 12% of comments. As before there is a low level theme of no more housing but one comment noted that further houses are required in the village to ensure parishioners can downsize and continue to live in the village if they so wish - and future generations have affordable housing.

2.5 Policy 5: Views and Vistas

A policy that protects identified key views and vistas and seeks to avoid their loss through new developments.

Table 5

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
455	8	37	444	11	97

Summary of Comments

The vast majority of comments are supportive with a realistic recognition that not all views/ vistas can be protected. One comment reminds the SG that there is no legal right to a private view/ vista. Once again the low level theme of no further development is raised.

2.6 Policy 6: Landscape Setting

This policy will seek to identify and protect the special character of Cuddington's landscape setting.

(Note that this statement gave rise to some misunderstanding that only Cuddington village was being considered. This was not the intention.)

Table 6

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
454	9	33	451	3	99

Summary of Comments

The comments strongly support this policy idea especially the use of brown field sites for any future development. Concerns are raised about the quarries close to the village in a couple of comments with a split of opinion about reuse for renewable energy and reversion to state before quarrying.

2.7 Policy 7: Village Gateways

A policy which identifies key gateways and approaches to the village and seeks to protect and enhance their role.

Table 7

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
454	9	36	443	11	97

Summary of Comments

It is clear from the comments that what was intended by the term 'gateway' needed further elaboration. The comments contain a few which are actively supportive but the remaining comments cover wide area – from the need for more housing for children and grandchildren, through protection of the green belt, to a submission of a plan for a village bypass.

2.8 Environmental Aspiration

Carry out an annual audit of historical buildings.

Table 8

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
449	14	44	418	31	93

Summary of Comments

Those commenting were lukewarm at best to the idea – the majority suggesting that, if it were to be done at all, every 3 to 5 years would be appropriate. There appears to be general view that other legislation should protect such buildings – although one comment recognises that such buildings can be left to deteriorate.

3 Economy

3.1 Policy 8: Employment Development

Promotion of the local economy and employment opportunities by supporting conversion and expansion of existing employment premises, as well as appropriate small scale new build development, within or adjacent to the village.

Table 9

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
430	33	114	367	63	85

Summary of comments

There is general support for increased employment opportunities generated by expansion of small-scale local businesses. It is suggested that this will help keep young people in the village. There is virtually no support for light or heavy industrial estates in or adjacent to the village. Concern is expressed that such developments would undermine the character of the village and lead to it becoming a small town – which is not favoured.

3.2 Policy 9: Tourism

A policy which supports and develops the tourism economy in the parish by encouraging the provision of small scale tourist-related businesses such as overnight accommodation, campsites and cafes.

Table 10

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
439	24	88	374	65	85

Summary of comments

Roughly 40% of the comments are not in favour with campsites a particular concern. Noise, late night events, and traffic figure among the concerns which are thought likely to undermine the quiet residential character of the village. There are several comments on the lines that Blakemere already provides this. Of those that are in favour 'small scale' is often emphasised and increased B&B receives support. Special attractions are not favoured and the point is made that it is necessary to protect the countryside.

3.3 Policy 10: Blakemere Village

Any development on this site should support the commercial and tourist facilities at Blakemere, avoiding loss or change of use whilst improving links with Cuddington.

Table 11

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
433	30	85	395	38	91

Summary of comments

20% of comments say (effectively) “no”, while roughly 18% of the comments say (in short) ‘no housing’. Whether those who object on the grounds of housing development would agree with Blakemere developing without additional housing is unclear. However, the responses which disagree outright do so because of concerns about noise, traffic, access, etc - but these concerns are also raised by some of the ~61% of comments which agree with the policy idea. There is, therefore, some support for providing better access to Blakemere.

3.4 Policy 11: Supporting the Leisure Economy

A policy that supports the contribution of the leisure economy, such as public houses, restaurants and takeaways; in particular their contribution to the evening economy whilst seeking to maintain a safe atmosphere at night.

Table 12

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
436	27	81	380	56	87

Summary of comments

The majority of the comments suggest that there are sufficient public houses, restaurants and takeaways within - or in the vicinity of - the village and more are not needed. Takeaways – and the resulting litter and disturbance – are particularly disliked.

3.5 Policy 12: Working from Home

A policy which encourages starter businesses and working from home, whilst ensuring there is no negative impact on local amenity or traffic.

Table 13

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
435	28	51	420	15	96

Summary of comments

Comments are in general supportive with concerns expressed about large vehicles in the village, increases in traffic, resultant parking problems, and noise. The comments also stress that the existing broadband speeds and mobile phone signal within the some areas of the village are not adequate to support this.

3.6 Policy 13: Protecting retail uses

To identify key areas for convenience shopping and protect their loss from change of use applications to residential or other no retail uses.

Table 14

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
447	16	34	432	15	96

Summary of comments

The comments clearly express the wish for the existing retail outlets to continue with, possibly, additional small businesses. A supermarket is not supported. There are views expressed that market forces have a role to play in this area.

3.7 Economic Aspirations

Seek the latest broadband to be available throughout the village.

Table 15

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
443	20	51	437	6	98

Summary of comments

The comments are all supportive but there are complaints about the existing performance of both broadband and mobile phone signals within the village. Fibre to the home seems to be the preferred option – rather than fibre to the BT box which some of the village have.

4 Housing Development

4.1 Policy 14: Housing mix and type

A policy focussing on the provision of a housing mix that includes affordable housing, assists families into home ownership and enables an ageing population to downsize, by providing smaller family units and bungalows.

Table 16

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
425	38	102	372	53	87

Summary of comments

45% of comments are in favour and 38% take the line that no further development should be permitted in the village for reasons ranging from lack of spaces and/ or facilities, through infrastructure limitations to the village becoming a town. Other comments suggest this policy has not been followed in existing development, that developers will get round such a policy by various means, and that all those that downsize will want smaller high quality properties.

4.2 Policy 15: Prioritising the supply of affordable homes

A policy that encourages the development of smaller groups of affordable dwellings with priority given, in perpetuity, to applicants with strong local connections. In addition, the policy seeks to reduce the threshold for requiring affordable homes from 10 units to 5 units.

Table 17

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
431	32	85	365	66	85

Summary of comments

~29% of comments support the policy idea and ~45% do not. Reservations are expressed about an influx of disruptive people from outside the village – and the ability to ensure access to such housing is limited to those with local connections. A few comments suggest that flats, properties for those starting out, and for older residents should be included. A common theme for those who do not support the idea is that no more development in the village is needed.

4.3 Policy 16: Location of Dwellings

Applications for small new developments on brownfield and infill sites will be supported, provided they have access to local amenities and are in close proximity to sustainable modes of transport.

Table 18

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
434	29	77	382	52	88

Summary of comments

35% of comments are in favour of the policy idea and 36% are against – with a significant proportion of those against not wanting further development in the village. A variety of concerns are raised – from housing plot density through load on facilities and infrastructure to the lack of adequate public transport serving the existing village.

4.4 Policy 17: Maintaining rural character

New developments must use materials and styles that are sympathetic to the rural character of the village. Housing density and plot size must remain consistent with the surrounding village setting.

Table 19

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
442	21	54	419	23	94

Summary of comments

35% of comments are in favour while 33% are not – in many cases the latter do not want any development in the village. Comments include a note that recently constructed estates don't meet this policy idea but others note that we already have a diverse mix of housing styles and modern ideas should not be stifled – stating that 'even John Douglas was modern once.' One comment raises small retirement and starter homes.

4.5 Policy 18: Eco Design and Energy Saving

A policy, which encourages existing and new developments to utilise cost effective eco-design and renewable technologies to reduce energy usage throughout the village.

Table 20

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
436	27	37	415	21	94

Summary of comments

54% of comments are in favour with 35% not in favour – with objections ranging from solar panels are unsightly/ cost effectiveness not established through no windmills to the usual no more development.

4.6 Housing Development aspiration

Village energy saving scheme

Table 21

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
428	35	46	401	27	94

Summary of comments

The majority of comments are not in favour of this policy aspiration on the grounds that solar panels are ugly and do not fit into the character of the village. Other objections suggest solar panels will not be effective in the longer term. Some comments simply state there is not enough information to judge.

5 Travel and Movement**5.1 Policy 19: Improve pedestrian and cycle access**

This policy supports improved pedestrian and cycle routes across the parish and in key specific areas, with particular focus on safety for cyclists and walkers:

- Delamere Park to Railway Station and shops
- Access to cemetery on Gorstage Lane
- Access to shops
- Access to play facilities
- Access to Blakemere Village

Table 22

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
428	35	85	419	9	98

Summary of comments

The comments overwhelmingly support the policy idea.

5.2 Policy 20: Parking standards

This policy requires that parking provisions for all new developments are proportionate to the size of the dwelling to avoid on-street parking, including provision for visitors. In addition, this policy will seek adequate parking provision at village retail centres to accommodate potential growth.

Table 23

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
427	36	83	417	10	98

Summary of comments

The comments overwhelmingly support the policy idea.

5.3 Policy 21: Traffic Impact of New Development

Developments over 10 dwellings must complete a traffic assessment, which shows the impact on key routes and junctions in and around the village.

Table 24

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
422	41	43	405	17	96

Summary of comments

The comments that express a clear opinion are split 15 for and 12 against this policy idea. Some of those against have concerns about traffic lights but the theme of no more development surfaces once again.

5.4 Policy 22: Traffic calming measures

This policy focuses on the implementation of traffic calming measures, especially in response to increasing volume of traffic. Examples include chicanes or reduced speed limits of 20 mph.

Table 25

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
417	36	133	365	52	87

Summary of comments

The vast majority of comments are supportive but tend to be caveated support. It is clear there are major differences of opinion as to the effectiveness – or damage potential - of speed bumps or chicanes, with some respondents in favour of one but not the other. Reduced speed limits find favour on the whole but there are some who object to even these.

5.5 Travel and Movement Aspirations (1)

Extension of bus service to serve a greater area of the parish including Delamere Park and the railway station.

Table 26

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
423	40	80	408	15	96

Summary of comments

With one or two exceptions the comments are overwhelmingly supportive of this policy idea. A variety of suggestions are made, the vast majority of which have been made before the Village Plan and other surveys. The advantages to the village e.g. reduced car parking are emphasised.

5.6 Travel and Movement Aspiration (2)

The use of new or improved parking at schools, the railway station and community buildings to allow motorists to park and use the extended bus service.

Table 27

No. of responses	No. skipped	No. of comments	No. supported	No. did not support	% of responses in support
354	109	57	344	20	97

Summary of comments

The vast majority of the comments are supportive. There is some emphasis on encouraging walking and cycling within the village in the comments but only very few that are not supportive of this policy idea.

Free-format Comments

Respondents were asked to write any additional comments on the vision, objectives and policy ideas in their own words. These are recorded below.

Policy 1: Protecting our heritage

It is the lovely Forrest's and woodlands which make this area so special -
Let's preserve it for future generations
History information plaques around the villages would provide an added interest to people walking within the village and provide for understanding and value for the community helping them to make informed choices when it comes to future developments.
THIS IS A GENERAL COMMENT - I would prefer this village to be called Cuddington and Sandiway OR Sandiway and Cuddington - which 'historically' is what it is known by!
Cunnigton Lane farm dates back before 1700
unique village identity enhanced
No spec developers
Historical significance of the village should be preserved.
So important for future generations.
But not a block on any development
This is a must. New developments are not sensitive.
Email address supplied
No more house building.
Not too much new housing
I am very much against any more development. Traffic lights and reduced speed limits slow traffic flow and changes in limits along a route just confuse
There is too much new housing affecting surroundings, even if sensitive, still looks bad.
Disappointing that Sandiway where I live gets no mention in the Cuddington Neighbourhood Plan
We need to ensure any development does not change the feel of the village
Important to preserve 'windows' of green belt in the village.
Fully agree.
Good architecture and modern design should be encouraged.
Beware of over development
Is the future of Sa diway subsumed?
As C & S has done its duty in respect of new housing, only infill to be built.
Sandiway and Cuddington Neighbourhood Plan.
I am annoyed by the way in which Sandiway is being written out of official documentation by those who have no historical knowledge of the area. Please refrain from this practice before Sandiway disappears.
It could be a little extreme to call John Douglas a great architect!
Private or commercial developments should use sandstone facings and mullioned windows etc.
Important
They seem to be slowly taking part of the forest.
Ok
This should be privately financed as buildings will be privately owned and existing

legislation should protect.
Important for the future of our grandchildren
Totally agree with all the policies
Why was Toolerstone allowed to build a tower?
Green belt is important to protect from urban sprawl. Identifiable communities can retain identity and work together on local projects such as litter picking, bulb planting and footpath monitoring to provide benefit of natural world for exercise and good mental health.
My main issue is with the quarry company's leaving holes in the ground. Oh of our local quarries gave land to the parish for extending the graveyard as payment while the once green land is now a hole. Where as it is the perfect location for solar panels as the sun is never shaded, and yet its been left to do as it pleases. The same company have bought the plot next door and aim sure planning to do the same thing I am not happy with the parish selling land for it to be abandoned ugly and mostly unsafe more needs to be done to use the land to its potential.
Not interested in 'value' of more housing. Its to late to so called protect the area.
Have you not passed the new housing estates!!! Oh and as for greenbelt.
Greenbelt was lifted at the back of Ash road. So don't flannel us with protected by greenbelt, the more smart residents know full well it can be lifted!! Nice attempt at your wording though!!!
The John Douglas buildings are what distinguishes our village from others. They must be protected - beware of plans to alter the inside of the church.

Policy 2: Habitats and wildlife corridors

Where are these?
We only have one chance to look after and keep the local wildlife
Nature information signs or nature trails would add interest, understanding and value, helping residents to make clearer choices when it comes to considering future developments.
Hedgerows must be protected
do it now before opportunity is lost forever
Reduce traffic and pollution.
To keep our wildlife healthy.
But must avoid bureaucratic intrusions (great crested newts a sour joke)
Priority over developments.
No more house building.
Particularly land adjacent to Clay Lane, Kennel Lane & Petty Pool.
It is important that wildlife corridors don't inhibit overall development. If it's possible to maintain wildlife corridors they should be maintained. If, however, there is a pressing use which disrupts a corridor I would support that disruption.
Definitely. Again, stop building, problem solved.
Strongly in favour of protecting existing wildlife.
Could children be involved. Education and awareness of local habitats
For OUR wellbeing too!
Fully support any policy which halts the decline in wild life.
Please can someone check the wild flower meadow natute reserve at Eden Grange. J Wimpey's efforts so far are very disappointing.
Not allowing Kennel Lane woods to become a theme park.
I hope that future policy is handled far better than the disgraceful way in which Kennel Wood was layed out on a plate for businesses and property owners without consideration being given to generations of local people and their children who very much enjoyed this once beautiful woodland.
Necessary formus andnfuture residents

Very important

Ok

Essential to the species e.g. hedgehogs

Lived in the village 50 years and never wanted to move till now

Vital

Why is this not a Cuddington AND SANDIWAY survey?

Too many species are being lost in the drive for more housing and better road network. Without biodiversity our world will be the poorer.

This is a no brainer! We all want the wildlife protecting.

Policy 3 Trees Hedgerows and other vegetation

Support this in principle but trees should be compatible with the local habitat. Some existing hedgerows impinge on visibility and footpaths and should not be protected.

Yes To hedgerows, no to TPO on every tree + too many trees

Shame that Flea Moss Pit had to be sold

Pathways and verges (e.g. opposite the Blue Cap) are often overgrown. This would be my priority.

- there needs to be a consequence if trees are felled that shouldn't be. atm its just 'oh dear, its done now nothing we can do...'

Bulb planting and 'Flower' planting needs to be carefully thought through and professional advise sort to avoid the pitfalls of creating inappropriate and bland displays that are so often seen in other villages. Street container, Hanging baskets, Mass Daffodil planting, Victorian bedding schemes should be avoided at all cost. The contemporary use of naturalistic herbaceous perennials and small scale wildflower meadow sowings would better reflect a go ahead, forward thinking village community. Eg Norley's fantastic wildflower project and the many examples around cities such as Warrington or further a field Sheffield.

Hedgerows must be maintained so that they do not obstruct footpaths and footways. It makes sense to preserve and replace trees. Flowers and bulbs will make the village look lovely

Management of woodland is important for sustainability and safety with particular reference to trees in danger of falling.

Except where damaged or dangerous.

Hedgerows must be protected

more emphasis on replanting by owner who remove

More space required for trees.

New developments, especially eden grange, have poor understanding of positive planning.

To keep our wild life healthy.

but growth needs controlling. Common sense should apply

Priority keeping landscape.

Having an absolute statement such as "Any new development MUST preserve existing trees" is daft. I would rather a developer lopped down a few leylandii and replaced them with native hardwood.

No more house building.

Particularly land adjacent to Clay Lane, Kennel Lane & Petty Pool.

If trees need to be cut down because of previous inappropriate planting, then replace with new ones which on maturity, will not be too big. Lots of different species will be of use. (Builders need to be given/ or to get expert advice re trees and shrubs).

OVER HANGING HEDGES NEED CUTTING BACK.

So long as hedges are correctly trimmed back

I am against any further housing development.

Hedges need cutting more.

Definitely - especially after trees cut down. Stop new building!
 Roadside hedges need more attention.
 Strongly agree
 For OUR wellbeing too!
 Many trees are being chopped down illegally now, but not checked or reported.
 Provided dangerous trees are felled when necessary.
 Fully support any policy which halts the decline in wild life.
 Some hedges along the A49 need attention.
 But do not allow people to have overgrown hedges. Also to prevent large trees overgrowing other peoples property.
 Not all trees should have preservation orders
 Strictly adhere to all tree preservation orders
 Patches of land have been bought by property speculators who allow hedges to grow out of control over on to the road. Cuddington Lane is one example.
 I would like see a group set up to manage this.
 This does not mean they should be ignored but that they should be cared for and services when needed.
 TPOs must be enforced.
 Also with focus on maintenance of large trees and hedges.
 No more new houses
 Tree Preservation Orders. I hope that future orders are handled with greater diligence than in the past.
 Too many trees in some areas - Delamere Park - which have an ADVERSE effect on the safety and quality of life for people nearby.
 Cockpit Lane has significant growth of dog walkers & cyclists. It is a significant amenity.
 Protected trees require ongoing management to ensure the safety of people and properties.
 Our landscape and well being matter.
 Definitely need new planting.
 Unless trees become hazardous or dangerous to people or buildings.
 Some TPOs were instigated in the 1950s when the trees were relatively small. We now have colossal oak and other trees, probably over 100 years old, in gardens where they are totally out of place. Some must be coming to the end of their lifespan and when they fall over will cause unnecessary damage. This should be borne in mind when trying to enforce TPOs
 Good
 Not no Leylandii hedges please
 This looks like it will resist development everywhere.
 Some trees are now too large for their environment.
 I support the green policy but not the temporary seasonal planting of bulbs and flowers
 New housing developments should have required planting.
 Very concerned re leaf miner moth on horse chestnuts + other diseases. Policy needs to be created to stop spread
 The current level of planting is adequate, maybe spend the money on better upkeep.
 Important to maintain current trees with tpos
 Some protected trees are in the wrong place e.g. back gardens. More plants not just on the bypass.
 Too much has been lost already
 Agree although some pruning of TPO needs to be done for those which are dangerous.
 Needs management to ensure traffic visibility (tall grass in central reservation of A556) and pedestrian access (bushes blocking paths).
 Trees need to be managed even if preservation orders are in place. Yes to bulbs and flower planting.

This policy should also include the management of established trees to further enhance the environment in which we live alongside nature. For example, the management of large old trees through careful, sympathetic pruning which reduces the impact of such trees on light loss to residences but also maintains the canopy for wildlife.

I agree and I think one of the first places that needs doing is the bench on Norly Road. It is in a great patch of green grass and in the spring it would look lovely with daffs.

What a stupid question? If we know that any new development must re-plant and 'preserve' existing trees then why put it in question. Yes of course we want the council to spend money on planting new trees etc.

Agree that TPOs should be enforced but you should not require new developments to preserve existing trees (they should be TPO'd if they need to be preserved). A landscaping policy or some form of tree replacement policy would seem more sensible.

Policy 4 Protected Green Space

The last sentence in the policy implies that all land south of the A556 should become recreational. This implies change of use and no development and is therefore contrary to some of the economic policies. The protection of existing designated green spaces is supported.

Unfortunately the wishes of the village can be over-ruled by a government inspector Essential.

The map is unclear and contains extensive private land. The policy needs to be clarified.

Once a playing field is built on it is gone forever. No further development is needed on green space.

Due to the new housing estate we need more services. Some of this land is needed for schools, improved doctors surgery shops etc

Special nature reserve area with information signs would help with interest and understanding and sustainability. However there will need to be commitment to ongoing maintenance.

Must not let commercial pressures dictate parish land encourage use of green space

More green spaces.

Stop cars parking on grass verges - it devalues the village.

We have a right to open views and green spaces.

Countryside south of the A556 is very important to the identity of the village.

Strongly support as this retains the village as it is

As a general policy but merit should apply

Green space before development.

No more house building.

Stop any development south of A556

No development south of A556.

A MUST. Stop building new homes.

Unaware of allotments

For OUR wellbeing too!

Strongly support.

Enjoying the local countryside is a major part of our family life. We moved here 4 years ago from Manchester to bring our children up without all the hustle and bustle of city life and love the area!

This is essential

Protection A556 south land is vital.

I hope this includes Cuddington Vale with improved access. The new pipe will provide

an opportunity.

Open countryside to the south of the A556 to be protected.

Can the parish land south of the A556 be used for a specific recreational use for the village?

Interested in allotments

For future generations

Difficult to preserve all green field spaces as well as providing necessary parking.

Leave some area of grass to grow wild & add wild flowers.

Cockpit Lane has a significant growth of dog walkers and cyclists. It is a significant amenity.

Have already lost too much.

Land south of the A556 must be protected.

We support the protection of the green belt land around the village and in identifying designated Local Green Spaces, however further homes must be provided within the village to ensure older parishioners can downsize and continue to live here if they wish and future generations also have affordable and smaller houses available to enable them to continue to live in the village.

Excellent

No more houses on farm land.

Northwich has more than enough brown belt for redevelopment

Grass verges need more care. House owners need to keep hedges neat and not overhanging the pavement.

Too much has been lost already

Priority

Currently the field by Dalesford Lane is not recreational.

Also farm land - we will have no land to cultivate if the builders are allowed free reign.

I refer to my previous statement about quarries just because we can't see them from the main parts of the villages doesn't mean they can be abused.

Not holding my breath, an appalling job of trying to implement this hasn't so far been a success has it!

The map provided on page two of the booklet appear to include a substantial area of private land, such as Petty Pool and sections of agricultural land. This policy therefore needs to be clarified as applying only to land owned by the Parish and should not be allocated for general recreational use.

Policy 5 Views and Vistas

To protect all 2000 views is restrictive and subjective. As long as new development maintains the views from the edge of the development and makes it accessible to the public.

Yes, we do support, but it should be borne in mind that the distant vistas referred to are only available in limited places. In English law views from individual houses are not protected.

Untidy and inconsiderate parking of cars can spoil vistas.

Agree

sympathetic consideration

Qualified. People do not own their view. Zero change is not an option.

I don't naturally regard the village as having vistas! Few and far between surely!

Also stop / planning permission. Large houses being demolished then small developments being built. Change landscape. This is happening. A lot in Kelsall spoiling the village setting.

No windfarms or mobile phone masts.

Especially the view from Sandiway school crossroads to Winter Hill.

I am against any further housing development
 Had a lovely view across fields, now see 120 new builds - awful.
 Perhaps this could be more specifically about not interfering with the existing skyline
 with inappropriate development e.g. three storey buildings
 Otherwise the village becomes urban sprawl.
 Stop building on the edge of green belt and woods.
 Nimbyism and unrealistic
 Renewable energy OK, ie windmills
 On the whole we support this but we feel we should bear in mind the number of
 affordable houses that are now or will be needed for the younger members of the
 community. They find it so difficult to get a house in their own home village
 Especially Kennel Lane and Cockpit Lane
 Apalling loss of vista by Taylor Wimpey Eden Grange from top of Cuddington Lane
 Enough new developments now.
 Loss of views brings with it loss of wildlife.
 Areas designated for future housing should be chosen whenever possible to reduce
 the loss of key views, but if only one or two houses are affected this should not
 eliminate a site for possible development, common sense should prevail to ensure the
 continued economic success and future viability of the village as a whole.
 Very important ot residents
 I have a stupendous view from my bungalow in Delamere Park all the way to the
 Winter Hill & the Pennines. Do not destroy this
 Policy 4 is adequate
 Use brown belt not farmers fields
 ? Not many fortunate to have a view
 This is essential. The parish is only slightly elevated, thus it is very easy to obliterate
 views.
 Are the 2000 photographs the number or a reference to the year 2000?
 Completely agree. Village is key - village - not small town.
 i again refore to the quarries they cut up the landscape in an unnatural way that can ruin
 the views from below.
 We live in hope
 Agree in some cases but has to be looked at on a case by case basis. A blanket policy
 is too restrictive. This has to be balanced with a land owners ability to use/ develop
 their land as they see fit.
 In addition to the natural environment, preserve features such as old finger posts,
 milestones, Cheshire Railings etc
 I would like you to also prevent temporary eyesores Eg large scale drilling and
 potential disturbance to our future water supply by companies wishing to frack for
 shale gas. There is also the danger to our clean air by commercial enterprises such as
 these.
 It's a very subjective decision making method and often used to enable NIMBYism.

Policy 6 Landscape setting

Also protect the historic and built up settings.
 I would totally agree that only brownfield sites be developed and developments (such
 as was proposed at Blakemere) be stopped.
 Whole community understanding and value for the environment may be the key to
 gaining support.
 Vital tot maintain the charm of Cuddington
 mandatory
 So important to our way of life.
 Generally yes but not if we are moving earth from one place to another to fill one up
 If possible

Brownfield sites should not include people's gardens. These are part of the special character.

Sand extraction areas should be returned to wildlife and possibly "park" facilities for people to enjoy nature as an antidote to overcrowding as seen on some new estates.

As above

Special character and landscape is being lost.

Otherwise the village becomes urban sprawl.

Most ex sand quarries are reverted back to natural landscape.

Litter still a major concern in some areas e.g. shops/ library.

Brown field sites for development is fine but make sure that they do not dominate any housing that may be nearby and do not NOT adversely effect traffic flow anywhere in the village

Once again keep in mind the number of smaller affordable houses that are or may be needed

One brick, lump of concrete found on green belt can lead to it being declared as a brownfield site ripe for development.

Developments to be on brown field sites and allow in-fill. The green belt should be protected.

Special character of Sandway and Cuddington's landscape setting. Lest we forget.

We should always consider & remember that Sandiway is a village & put a stop to endless property developments at the extremes, e.g. Bovis development & the proposal to build on Blakemere village. It is a quiet village - let's keep it that way (& at the same time don't let Blakemere Village expand to the detriment of the local residents).

I agree with brownfield sites - however I think quarries could be used for renewable energy such as solar panenls & wind power.

Its character is essential.

Most strongly support.

We agree that sand extraction sites should be returned to a condition in keeping with surrounding landscape. However, for clarification does new developments relate solely to future quarrying or include housing? If it does include housing is this realistic - how many brown field sites are there in the village as additional housing is going to be required in the village to accommodate future generations born in the village and wishing to continue to live here, as well as smaller houses for older residents to downsize into.

This should be privately financed as Company has obligation and existing legislation should protect.

? It needs a use not just weedy field left overgrown

New developments should be restricted to brownfield sites. The parish has had an overload of development in recent years: well out of proportion for the county as a whole. Further destruction of open countryside would be sinful.

But sand extraction creates brown field sites!

Definitely. Brown field sites can be improved by use of residential development and small businesses. Please avoid taking more green land.

the special character is destroyed by extraction anyway so lets not kid ourselves these areas need to be used for solar pannel fields and wind turbines.

Again, this is wishful thinking. Money talks and decisions will be made on a financial basis. The question is how much of this survey will influence key decisions

there are no brown field sites.

Policy 7 Village Gateways

Do not see the link between gateways and land for development. What are the gateways. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot exclude all future development

Village signs original sandstone from Tower to create memorial

Plus thin trees. Need to cut grass on approach to Cuddington.
I do not think further development is warranted but if any occurred it should be brown field.
Support not developing on greenbelt and countryside but not sure what "key gateways" are.
Most routes into our village are aesthetically attractive and worth protecting. due consideration to gateways. Resist loss of green space
By-pass required - see drawing.
But there may be a cost and who pays.
NEEDS TO BE FLEXIBLE APPROACH - NOT IN MY BACKYARD APPROACH IS NOT SUSTAINABLE
New development only on Brownfield.
Also to resist other villages encroaching into the important gaps to protect the individuality of the village
As above
Sympathetically including 'inbuilding' on large plots. Avoid overdevelopment also WITHIN - see 'over development' in Chiltern Close where 2 houses are being constructed on under sized plot.
When are we going to get the by-pass promised years ago?
Bulb to be re-planted at the Round Tower verges.
All development should be examined with great care. Anything that has bearing on green belt areas should be resisted and prevented where possible.
The greenbelt plan is ineffective and each development should be on individual merit
Not sure.
Establish quiet areas, impose traffic calming methods and keep speeding motorists off narrow roads.
The land to the east of Kennel Lane is benefitting from previous sand extraction and landscaping. However the paths have deteriorated and need to be maintained.
Strongly support
If only greenbelt and countryside had been given more considered in the past. It's the future decision makers that need to learn from the past and not think of it as old fashioned and not important.
No more development of Green Belt eg Eden Grange used some. Poor planning decision
Waste of money.
Most strongly support.
There are areas that could be considered as 'infill' areas. The field opposite the Church is one such example as it is bordered on two sides by buildings and one side by Norley Road. This could be used for Church Car Parking (a problem) and also for sheltered housing for the elderly that is in very short supply in the village as the existing stock appears to have been sold off or used for family accommodation
We do agree that development in greenbelt and countryside areas should be resisted, however there are surely insufficient brownfield sites now left in Cuddington and Sandiway for future housing needs for the village. It's all very well people living in the village not wanting any more housing but what will be available for the children and grandchildren of the village when they want to leave home but remain living in the village. Are we not going to allow sufficient housing development to accommodate these needs? Are we going to drive future generations out of the village?
Great
strongly support
As long as kept neat and tidy
See my previous comment. There is no requirement to destroy more farmland in this area.
Definitely. Greenbelt and countryside is essential for health.
Been fighting for this for years

How is this possible, there are no brown field sites to support this policy.
Very important that green belt land is not built on.

Environmental Aspirations

stapled to this form is a typed sheet with further comments.

For what purpose?

Not sure what this seeking to achieve.

Too frequent - perhaps every five years.

The provision of environmental and historical information leaflets for local people, as well as guided walks, might help with improving knowledge, understanding and value.

link them and feature these

In support in broad terms but worried at the cost in resources - both people and financial

Depends on how much it costs & possible disruption to the owner.

Information should be available already. Annual exercise OTT

An audit of what? To achieve what purpose? Needs to be clear to get support.

A must!

Think annual may be too often. Every 5 years, maybe ???

Why annual audit?

REGULAR BUT NOT NECESSARILY ANNUAL

Don't feel this needs to be an annual audit once buildings have been identified and listed

every 5 years

This aspiration is not explained in the documentation. Without further details, and quantification of what is involved, I don't feel able to support this.

Not sure about this due to cost maybe a 3 yearly audit

Is this needed?

Why is this a requirement?

Waste of money.

Is annual audit too often?

Some householders have no pride in their property or frontage. Shame them?

Otherwise the 'occasional' one will disappear.

If this is required on an annual basis. Maybe every other year would be sufficient in some instances, which would reduce costs to the local community.

Cannot see the point of such an exercise.

Very Good. We have had new developments, enough is enough

Annual??

Not necessarily annual

NIMBY VIEW NOT MINE

This should be privately financed as buildings will be privately owned and existing legislation should protect.

It would be money wasted, 5 years is sufficient

No more developments on green belt or farmland

Is this required? Who would carry it out and on what basis?

I cannot see the necessity for this. By their nature, historic buildings do not alter.

Protection by listing ensures their continuity. If audits are deemed necessary, I suggest 5-yearly, to reduce the administrative burden.

An annual audit of historical buildings is a bit excessive; those involved should have better things to do and this sort of thing is the role of English Heritage (see Policy 1).

Make sure those with little value and making no contribution are not protected for the sake of it - so many properties become in poor repair and dangerous when unsuitable for other uses. Is it not better to demolish and start again without years of eye sores and vandalism?

it is important that these buildings are not allowed to become damaged due to current

occupents and businesses
Waste of time and money,
legislation on protected buildings should suffice
Just question whether this is really necessary at this frequency
Would be nice to know who/what/where these buildings are and access times?
An annual audit of historic buildings is quite often for a structure which is not going to degrade significantly over one year. A more realistic approach would be every 3 to 5 years.
Can anything be done to prevent historic buildings being left to deteriorate, until all that can be done is pull them down? eg A556 old courthouse, next to a new housing estate on the site of the Fourways Inn.

Policy 8 Employment Development

Think it would spoil the rural appeal of the village
The character of the village is residential and should be kept that way.
In principle but not new build, use existing or brownfield development.
Business and Enterprise zone within village boundaries.
Depends on business type, location + increase in traffic. No light industrial
Use existing buildings only.

Yes to promote employment opportunities within existing businesses. No to bus. enterprise zone and industrial estate
The success of this will clearly depend on the provision of PURE fibre broadband.
A light industrial estate would destroy what little is left of a 'village' feel.
would totally depend on what, how large and importantly where, if it is new build.
Discourage constraints on working from home.
This has to be a positive for the residents of this area
Support for the existing employers in helping them to develop their businesses without spoiling the landscape might help. An audit of the employment provision within the community might be the starting point followed by consultation with the employers to understand how the community might help.
We should keep our "village" environment.
Help locals minimise cost of commuting
Providing that new developments are small scale. We need a definition of 'small'.
Light industrial development should concentrate/ be included in the many brownfield sites in Northwich.
On brownfields sites and within the home. Better wi-fi and business links for those who work at home. A community hub.
This is essential or there will be nothing left in terms of employment for the next generation. They are important
Essential to keeping young people in area.
Not an industrial/commercial village
Do not support new build developments but would support existing premises expansion & conversion of existing building.
No more new build developments.
Along with Policy 9, some B&B for tourists using trains and buses would be good
As we do not feel a light industrial estate would be suitable to the area.
Agree/ disagree. All for employment - less we not forget we are a village not a small town.
No more building - the village is starting to grow into a town.
Support in existing areas but do not support industrial estate as this would not sit with previous policies.
Enough development already.
Cuddington is a residential area. The expansion of commercial premises and their

activities will conflict with residents' enjoyment of their homes. The recent opening of a boarding kennels within earshot of our house is an example.

I am concerned that proposals such as the Blakemere retirement home and the recent expansion of Define into a restaurant (and it is even though this was denied at the time) are included in this. Good transport links could promote employment as could supporting existing businesses and premises. Building new developments on greenfield sites is not something I can support.

Supports sustainability of current businesses

I do not agree with any new build development in or adjacent to the village

Do not support conversion/change of use of existing buildings or new build for commercial purposes

Support development of existing buildings and brown sites but new build must stop
Development of a light industrial estate (subject to strict pollution controls) and/or a business park on land off the A49 would encourage investment in the local area and bolster the village's case for improved public transport provision.

No to any business or enterprise zone

In a way, but this is never done appropriately and conversions become massive horrible developments - be careful.

The Village would become a small Town which we do not want - there would be more traffic and maybe noise.

This would create further traffic congestion, possible eyesores in development buildings and down value in local residential properties

In favour of promoting existing employment opportunities. Not in favour of building more.

Need to define more clearly what is meant by 'appropriate small scale new build development' and I disagree with "adjacent" to the village as this implies extending the village

No to the development of light industrial estate

Sounds like too much new building to me

Architectural merit must be considered.

A lot of business is already run from private house and Weaver Vale Housing.

Yes to present businesses. No to light industrial units.

I would support further small businesses but against development of a light industrial estate, as this would spoil our village.

Provide more parking and easier access to local shops. Don't make things more difficult for traffic.

No commercial development should have any detrimental aspects that would impose on residents of the village.

No issue with expansion of current business premises but do not feel build of new premises is necessary when nearby Northwich and Winsford have so many empty locations

As a small business wishing to stay in the village we need opportunity to expand

Small businesses welcome. No to light industrial estate

No to new build development

would support apart from the extra development - traffic already a problem

would support apart from the extra development - traffic already a problem

must ensure that local opinions are not ignored

Self defeating. Nimbyism again

An enterprise zone would not be appropriate

No more rubbish homes. Improve infrastructure first.

Not sure about this, have we the room for enterprise zone or light industrial estate.

Will this not clash with policy 5 and new affordable homes

NO NEW BUILD

would support except for 'adjacent to the village'. This wording suggests to me going beyond the boundaries we have tried so hard to maintain against property developers

No more new build developments either residential or commercial.
Not on greenfield sites.
Interested to know where the developments will be situated.
Good idea to improve employment in the area
Small village life is unique to the UK and must be protected
There is a need for balance. Support the development of a small business park eg Blakemere, to provide local employment and thereby discourage commuting out of the area.
I support this plan for young people in order for them to learn a skill that will support them in the wider world.
Within reason
This is an open ended opportunity for commercial development which, over time, will change the nature of the village. Employment and commerce development needs a much stricter definition.
No fast food outlets.
It is now time for CWAC to put a stop to further development in the village.
Developments of business developments should be minimised. Sandiway & Cuddington is a rural area & building up business centres e.g. Blakemere Village should be very closely monitored because it is in very close proximity to a large number of residential properties
We have enough.
It is vitally important to the future economic success of the village that the community support local businesses and the employment opportunities these offer within the village. We should definitely encourage conversion and expansion of existing premises and encourage new build developments in the village to attract more businesses.
People need jobs and income which will flow back into the community.
Against new development re impact on local area i.e. more cars on local roads.
Very small scale.
No industrial estate
Would be concerned about industrial expansion having negative affect on village
Plus enlarge Doctors surgeries and opening times
New building for business. Please no business parks like Gadbrook or Lostock
Low profile non industrial premises only.
I like Policy 8. You should have a look at Didsbury Village, South Man. Didsbury was a sleepy village. Lots of people let out bedsits to students. The village is now one of the best places to live, restaurants Bars, lots of people. Maybe you could contact your opposite people there
No to the development of a business/enterprise zone nor light industrial estate. That can be done on redundant site in Northwich
Support some businesses but NOT business zone or industrial estate.
This presumably could include the conversion of dwellings into factory units
Do not agree with small scale new build adjacent to the village
Employment should be in keeping with the surroundings.
Expansion, if necessary, to be kept relatively small & in keeping with surroundings ie village atmosphere
We do not need a light industrial estate
I do not want to see the sort of development that has ruined so many towns - square boxes at a perimeter with new businesses sucking the life out of the centre. Look at France for an awful example.
No support for a light industrial estate
Support apart from developing light industrial estate area and this would spoil the special village atmosphere of Cuddington, Sandiway and Delamere Park.
Employment is available for those willing to travel.
New build for business is fine on small scale but not for residential

Small businesses must be supported - not held back by bureaucracy
Small scale on sites already in use
There is already nowhere to park round the shops. It is a nightmare even trying to walk on the pavement.
only support if this is well regulated, no large buildings or structures, well landscaped to fit in with the village
I am very much in favour of improving employment opportunities in the local area. Business zones are an interesting idea, but I cannot see that the village has the required acreage for such schemes.
I do not support the development of a business and enterprise zone nor the development of a light industrial estate
I do however, think some sort of light industrial units or office space should be provided. If you look at what the Bolesworth Estate has done for the village of Tattenhall as a model, it now has a thriving business community.
Do not consider light industrial estate would be suitable within the village.
As long as businesses are not pollutant - noise, traffic, chemicals, aromas - there is potential for light industry in other parts of the area and so I do agree that size of business needs to be small-medium.
The days of local jobs for local people is past. Although right in the past and desirable to some now the reality is that nationally the norm is now for a commute to work of up to 1 hour. As you have allowed our village to become a domicile to meet exactly those needs it is a conflict of a residential area trying to become an employment zone.
Not interested what so ever. Don't live in a rural village if you can't get to work in a nearby town or city. Don't want ANY more shops or businesses. What part of it won't be a village soon don't people understand. We have Blakemere, that is more than enough!!
This will require development outside the village.
I would not support new developments for a business estate.
Employment opportunities within the village should be encouraged, avoiding the need for people having to travel long distances to work on already overcrowded roads.
The success of this policy will of course depend on the provision of state of the art infrastructure, including the provision of fibre to the premises.
Our villages do not need more large industrial estates. We have plenty of easy access to Northwich, Chester, Winsford for stores such as B&Q, M&S, etc and home shopping growing in popularity, an additional sprawling industrial zone seems somewhat unnecessary. Can we instead focus on small traders and cottage industry by encouraging local markets, improving local parking, and multi purpose use of sites already here, as we do with church halls, schools, village halls, amenity land etc?
These sites encourage local people to walk and join in with village life and allow people from outside of the immediate area to come and join in.

Policy 9 Tourism

Support as long as they are 'small scale' and don't detract from the quality of life in the village.
Do not think it is necessary for campsites and cafes as Premier Inn is on the doorstep
No to camp or caravan sites. They would be totally out of character with the village.
New accommodation would be asset, as limited b & b , holiday accommodation available.
Would need detailed information of campsites, cafes etc
We do not see Cuddington as a tourist destination
Development of large campsites in proximity of village is undesirable
Blakemere provides this already.
Low priority

Blakemere is a prime example of an opportunity to bring employment and revenue into the area

Improving access to improve ease of movement and personal safety is an area that I believe needs to be improved. For example Whitegate way onto Waste Lane and then onto the very dangerous Norley Road is one area that is in great need of improvement for walkers and cyclists. Many footpaths into and around the villages are in need of improvement.

I have concerns that this could be exploited.

Improve run down Blue Cap and White Barn

Small scale in line with environmental policy.

As long as they are small scale - not defined. Sensitive to hours to hours of most - no late night establishments

Provided that it is used for tourism!!!

Much needed.

Happy with Blakemere - need no other

Ok with brownfield site. No new usage of recreational land.

No more house building - the village is starting to grow into a town.

I dispute your evidence. There are not many tourist attractions and the countryside, what's left of it, is not that beautiful. If you "develop" attractions, you destroy what they are valued for. They should be for people who value them, not people who want an "attraction". They just need care and maintenance like keeping footpaths open.

Not sure where these are expected to be situated - we're more than a tourist spot and there are plenty of surrounding campsites and hotels.

I think effort can be more usefully spent elsewhere

We think there are enough caravan and camping sites in or around the village at this time

BUT you need to balance that with the protection of the open countryside/Green Belt around the village

Strong need for a village cafe

Only small scale

No opinion

NO. Blakemere is loud and inconsiderate and doesn't help locals at all. Just more traffic.

Not required in Cuddington. We have enough already.

Only for existing areas.

So long as well managed and traffic considerations are thought out

No travellers Camp sites

Keep Cuddington and its attractions for locals

Does provide local employment but should not be at the expense of existing attractions.

Provide more parking and easier access to local shops. Don't make things difficult for traffic.

Do not have the roads or infrastructure to support development.

Do not support more campsites

Don't feel we need further cafes and without knowing where campsite locations may be cannot support

NB - small scale,

Local - not chains

We live opposite Blakemere

This may bring more traffic and run counter to policies 19-22

Support but it must work together with previous policies

Not happy about campsites. We already have this for Brownies & Blakemere caravans.

More parking.

This sounds like going against the principal of maintaining a village atmosphere. This is the reason many residents like this village. Where is the money coming from for village maintenance if we encourage numbers of non residents who will not be paying taxes?

Some money should be spent on footpath improvements, stiles, etc. Plus a footpath book.

Why support tourism - this is a residential village not a town.

Cafes to be encouraged but campsites may be inappropriate in a village setting.

Yes on a small scale.

Sandiway & Cuddington is a residential area and whilst on the edge of the countryside, we must not encourage the development of "holiday camps" in the village. Blakemere village is one such example, the development & planned growth of which is detrimental to the upkeep of the quiet village environment. Campsites/tourist accommodation must be kept well away from residential areas.

Campsites:- consult Caravan and Camping Club for standards required. They are very good.

New buildings should where possible feature sandstone facings and black and white gables.

We have enough.

Any proposal should be considered on a case by case basis - not in general.

We support this strategy of encouraging further tourism opportunities within the village, this will attract visitors to the village who will also utilise the local businesses and support and boost the local economy.

Feel this is adequate at present.

As long as small scale.

Against new development re impact on local area i.e. more cars on local roads.

Maximum capacity already reached.

Limited small scale.

Encouraging tourism can be achieved without developing camp sites, etc.

We have enough

Provided you sort out the parking problems.

The main attraction is the countryside which MUST be protected.

Providing the sites are properly run and don't become an eyesore.

not campsites

Not on the scale currently proposed at Delamere Forest

We have tourism at Blakemere and camping, overnight accommodation at the Blue Cap and Nunsmere

Within reason but not swamping local services.

Little development required.

Not too many!

I feel very strongly about this

Not too keen on "campsites". Too vague!

B&B's but not campsites. there are enough cafes or places to eat.

Over-development of a tourist economy could adversely affect our environment.

I think we have enough already.

This should be privately financed

Already have at Blakemere plus B&B

Preserve our quiet village and current tourism (Blakemere) is just enough.

Good idea.

It is common that local people rarely visit local tourist facilities. Are they tourist facilities? Why could they not be local community facilities? Footpath and cycle way links, public transport links for rail and bus, would encourage local people to use them more.

we currently have overnight accommodation with the travelodge and huge campsite at blakemere and a cafe there i dont support further development within these areas

We are a large residential area in a rural setting. Tourism is a County wide strategy, not Village centric.
NO, don't want it. Go somewhere else. Wales or the Lake district. Stay away from Sandiway, we don't want this.
Increasing traffic in/ around village plus lot of attractions could be private homes. The village is for living in!
Subject of course to the usual planning process
The village and surrounding are must focus on enhancing the provision of useful amenities for its residents. Whilst cafes are a nice idea, enhanced provision for tourists, such as campsites, would push myself and my family away from the village. What would be more useful would be to encourage more small businesses to open within the village to provide for its residents who do not want to travel into Northwich, or Chester for certain things. For example, a family run bakery similar to Webbs in Northwich would be ideal.
We have hotels already. Often by agreeing to your proposal to extend this, we are allowing the removal of woodland areas to create these areas. Historically, once the developers get in, it's hard to control their behaviour, which sadly is all about profit. eg Delamere Forest and the lodges they want(ed).

Policy 10 Blakemere Village

Blakemere treat their neighbours with contempt, I am not supportive of any further development until they engage with us properly and personally.
See comments above
Do not support on the basis that Blakemere is a local shopping centre, NOT a tourist destination
More detail required
This is a business that should stand on its own feet & shouldn't be part of a community plan. The caravan park has scarred that area of the village & further development is unwanted.
But must be suitable for a quiet rural environment.
See above
Blakemore is something to be proud of. Further links between Blakemore and the local community would be mutually beneficial. e.g.. education courses, community events.....
Care needs to be taken with Blakemere development. This is in a residential area!
Agree
Be proactive
Extend
Improved pedestrian access across the A556 please.
Strongly object to housing development at Blakemere. Blakemere falls within this parish and uses our facilities which are stretched
Since when has it become a separate 'village' - it's a commercial business
Ordinary retail outlets should continue to be regulated. Craft and tourist shops welcome.
As long as it is not used for housing development.
Full support - Blakemere is the palce to keep developments. As for Polciy 9 - ok with brownfield sites. No new usage of recreational land.
No more house building - the village is starting to grow into a town.
I thought Blakemere was given planning permission as a craft centre, not a commercial and tourist facility, but the difference between the two is vague. There will be a constant battle to prevent it becoming an out of town shopping and leisure centre. Yes BUT I do not agree with the plans put forward by Blakemere at the moment. Developments should not be at the expense of village character, green space,

the landscape, and residents.
 BUT be careful not to open the floodgates to other developments on the south side of the A556
 BUT no to residential development, it is on the wrong side of the A556, and the A49. Definitely retain current usage. No new housing or industrial use.
 No opinion
 HATE THE PLACE. All outsiders working there - no thought to locals, keep us awake with noise - getting too big - what next!!
 It provides important employment and business to Cuddington and Sandiway.
 Don't agree with any more development here. Creates more traffic and noise
 I think safer pedestrian access should be provided.
 Need a crossing for people on foot or extend pavement on that side.
 Needs better local access
 Which should not be over-developed so as to avoid spoiling the natural environment.
 With discretion.
 Whilst supporting Blakemere we are not a fan of the recent plans they proposed with regards to the housing
 I do not mind Blakemere being developed but please take into account that people close to the Blakemere development.
 As a private business, I feel that the owners shouldn't be dictated to by us unless they propose something inappropriate etc and remain subject to planning
 Blakemere has 'lost its way'. No longer a 'Craft Centre'. We do not need a retail centre
 The development of the land at Blakemere needs to be very carefully managed in order to prevent it just becoming one big housing estate!!!!!!
 Do not use facilities
 Only if limited to within existing buildings
 The development should be sympathetic and not provide noise or light pollution
 No houses at Blakemere
 As long as Cuddington does not become overshadowed by Blakemere village
 Dreadful place - most things done on the cheap.
 They are ruining Kennel Lane woods. DISGUSTING!!!
 Support this as long as they are bound by the general principles applied to the rest of the village ie no building outside the A556
 Not to include more permanent housing.
 Plans for residential village seem to change the nature of what is a tourist site.
 Blakemere is fine as it is - the village can't support more traffic.
 New homes and over 55 village apartments will NOT aid the village or Blakemere.
 This facility is potentially a good tourist attraction - needs improving again!
 This is an asset and should be developed.
 Do not agree with the proposal at the falconry centre
 Support the development of commercial facilities at Blakemere but would not support and housing or similar development.
 I hate to be boring but should it not read, whilst improving links with Sandiway and Cuddington.
 Abstain - not bothered. It's a bit of a tip anyway. Fragmented retail.
 Commercial use of Blakemere is fine but it MUST close at 6pm, i.e. end of the normal working day. If this is not done, excessive noise/unruly behaviour will creep into & blight the lives of residents who have paid a lot of money to live here. If the centre is kept open in the evening, whilst it might be good for those who run businesses there, it will ultimately drive away those who live here. Change is not always good!!
 While keeping an eye on any development!
 New buildings should where possible feature sandstone facings and black and white gables.
 Blakemere was originally designated as a Craft centre but has become a more commercial operation. I would not wish to see the commercial activities expand any

further.

Any proposal should be considered on a case by case basis - not in general
Blakemere provides employment for over 250 local people and is a great benefit to the village, not only providing employment and business opportunities but also facilities for the villagers to utilise and enjoy. It would be terrible for the village to lose this attraction and it's facilities.

Do not support any further development.

Against new development re impact on local area i.e. more cars only local roads - maximum capacity already reached.

Needs monitoring to ensure restricted to commercial development.

This should be the location for tourism related enterprises. Ample scope to promote our village there.

Please no housing estate at Blakemere.

Major concern re current license application for outdoor music until 11.00 pm at Blakemere falconry site. Load noise is not at all welcome in this case

Blakemere is a commercial enterprise. Its success hinges on satisfying customer needs.

No to any development of the greenfield site from driveway to traffic lights on A49
Blakemere should not be allowed to become too large

No new housing.

Encourage craft developments.

But needs improvement!

This should be privately financed

No houses

Commercial Blakemere is given prominence but the Gorstage Burial Ground (same category on schematic map) gets no mention.

I do not see how it encourages tourism to the villages - it attracts tourists to the craft centre. By it's development there will be increased employment opportunity and increased interest with wider diversity of business. Maybe fully accessible facilities to those to encourage families would also increase trade.

This is a private enterprise which has a minimum contribution to village economy or benefit to local residents. As a private entity you have no control of its future development in a rural or residential setting. Whilst not wanting further residential development in our village I think it hypocritical to exclude the owners for taking advantage of that opportunity when other local residents have gained financially through doing so and in meeting national needs.

Do what you want Blakemere, your far enough away from us to not be affected.

Not sure Blakemere brings anything to the local community, maybe the odd individual is employed but most business are from outside the local area..we merely have passing vehicles clogging the roads.

Definitely resist housing development here. It would spoil its character.

Blakemere is an excellent tourist attraction and I fully support any future development.

However, I am against any residential building on the site.

I would not support any further development of this site; it is large enough and provides good entertainment for families during certain holidays. The current noise levels are fine, thus I wouldn't support any additional development.

Shouldn't give blakemere carte Blanche, to the detriment of alternatives. It's not THAT good!

Policy 11 Supporting the Leisure Economy

Not necessary for any

White Barn accidents waiting to happen due to entrance next? to car park and uncontrollable children

We have sufficient facilities of this type. Why a cafe??
 Have enough already.
 Details of location of new restaurants and cafes needed
 No to takeaways, yes to quality restaurant with good parking
 but existing residential areas need protection and permission must be withheld if
 residents would be adversely affected
 Not happy with any new takeaways.
 It is necessary to take account of neighbours to these facilities regarding smells,
 traffic and litter, by means of suitable planning conditions.
 Things have greatly improved but support for business to find parking provision
 would do much for existing and future developments. A two way mutual respect
 and support between the community and the leisure providers would help to
 encourage future improvements. Takeaways provision needs to be carefully
 considered and the managers/owners of the outlets must take full responsibility for
 any potential damage to the environment and the use of eco friendly packaging.
 We have a good balance of these businesses already.
 Help to maintain finance within the village
 Good provision already, quiet is important - don't want much change to night time/
 evening atmosphere.
 The Sandiway shops would be a suitable place for a day time cafe.
 They should have responsibility for cleanliness.
 More litter bins around takeaways and around village in general to be introduced.
 No more house building - the village is starting to grow into a town.
 Enough already.
 How are you going to maintain a safe atmosphere at night? There are no police.
 While I am content with the existing number of pubs and cafés, which I do not use,
 I do not want to see any more.
 I feel this aspect is already covered within the village and surrounding areas
 I think the existing pubs and restaurants are sufficient in terms of numbers - it
 would be more beneficial to provide support to those struggling to stay open rather
 than introduce new establishments. There is no mention of sporting leisure
 facilities within this policy which is very disappointing. The newish Northwich
 Memorial leisure centre is great but not big enough to serve all residents. We
 should be encouraging more healthy leisure facilities in the area.
 We seem to have plenty of restaurants and takeaways. They are supported at
 present but don't seem to be used to capacity.
 I feel that the village(plus Sandiway? facilities) has enough pubs and cafes now
 Need more bins and the shops/takeaways need updating, look shabby.
 We already have enough of these facilities. Not enough parking provision.
 Believe in supporting existing ones but feel strongly no more to built.
 Support in general but not too many takeaways
 Sufficient eateries nearby already
 Should be quality venues offering unique services as opposed to existing.
 I think we need more restaurants in the village.
 There are far too many restaurants within the area and they are closing down all the
 time. Leaving buildings decaying and looking bad. People may say they want such
 facilities but as experience has shown do not support them enough to make them
 viable in the long term.
 Support the existing but not more. 47% feeling we need more is not the majority
 subject to limitation of total number of outlets
 location is important ie noise and traffic
 Could the village support provision of a gym.
 no chains - but independent outlets
 But no takeaways
 We have enough - especially now De-fine has expanded.

Plenty already.

This is suitable as it is.

2 pubs & 2 takeaways & a restaurant is enough for village this size. Definitely don't want late night opening takeaways.

This would completely change the character of the village and seems to be at odds with the policies set out under 'environment'

Development of more B&B or hotels a good idea.

Do not agree with public houses and takeaways.

Northwich is being developed with cafes and restaurants. Why spoil Cuddington with these?

Restricted late night opening in week days/ Sundays.

Cafes/ restaurants OK. No need for more takeaways - enough litter as it is.

By allowing further development of these would jeopardise the viability of the existing businesses leading to their closure. It is important to protect the existing businesses.

Frequented by Sandiway and Cuddington residents.

?

See no 8 - no fast food outlets

NO TAKEAWAYS please! Smell and litter. Bad diet.

Already well served by restaurants. Do not require anymore.

Enough money is being spent on the redevelopment of Northwich town centre which is geared up for this type of economy. It is only a couple of miles away. Do NOT ruin the peace & quiet of Sandiway/Cuddington residents just because you want to make a few pounds for the village. What you gain in one hand you lose forever in the other. Change is not necessary.

Not keen on making Cuddington livelier in the evening.

Sports facilities not mentioned

Some benches near the shops/ library would be welcome.

Do not support night life in small village.

Feel we have adequate public houses in the village.

Enough already

Better WIFI. Mine keeps cutting out.

Form refers to previous comment (MLJ loud music at Blakemere outdoor rave) which is a serious concern.

Parking is an issue at some of these sites especially the new Define Eatery.

I do not see the council actively supporting pubs and cafes.

Some outside places like Bars or eating places

Replace public houses with hotels.

Provided the new facilities do not create construction beyond the current development in the area.

We already have Define, The Blue Cap and another pub. That is enough

Not sure.

Cuddington is not Northwich. Village too small I would think for restaurants/cafes I would support this especially in view of the extra new build housing areas in our village.

More restaurants and cafes needed. English traditional dishes - not garlic and curry. Basic cooking needed.

Lots of cafes have opened up - Church Hall, Library, Community Centre. Plus Whitegate Way.

Whilst I strongly support the contribution of the current leisure facilities, I am not sure we need more of them. The existing ones are not exactly overburdened.

Proper village Inn would be nice, rather than present 'chains'.

There is a limit to how many times people frequent restaurants and cafes - why not let those already here develop and thrive? Certainly not more take aways - unhealthy, focus for loutish behaviour and litter production. Surely if there was a

recognised market entrepreneurs would already be there...

We are not a Town but a village. In a radius of 3 miles, 5 miles and 7 miles we have ample access to such facilities accessed by road, rail and public transport links.

Support Pubs and Restaurants/cafes. However takeaways are a different matter and tend to litter, cartons, packaging etc. leading to poorer environment and ambiance in the village.

No thanks. If you do it then keep it for the toffs living in Delamere and build them there!!

I think we have an excellent choice of pubs, takeaways and café/restaurants. I don't think we need any more.

Residential aspect has priority - a quieter village for living in.

This seems to be a duplicate question.

Policy 12 Working from Home

This is a residential village

If businesses operating from home are registered with local council, and monitored re - delivery of extra goods and people eg childminding bordering on a nurse.

Not if it generates high delivery volume traffic

Our broadband is rubbish

Needs Pure FIBRE broadband to all buildings in the Parish.

I work from home several times a week and can only do so because we have a fast internet connection.

Broadband speeds are not great & mobile coverage is very patchy.

Much improved mobile coverage indoors and out also required. Opposition to new masts to provide this should be discouraged, possibly by improved mast design.

I like this idea, but not every has this option

Fast broadband is a big issue for people working from home. A big community push for improvement might help.

Where practical

Have rules to avoid noise/nuisance

Great formkeeping vehicle congestion down.

can we influence?

Providing fast broadband is essential

Would tick both support for working from home but not working from home for commercial vehicles using main routes through the village as haulage yards i.e.

School Lane, lower Waeverham Road, Plumbers, etc.

No new masts unless they are well disguised.

ALTHOUGH I SUPPORT WORKING FROM HOME, THE MOBILE PHONE AND INTERNET ACCESS IN SANDIWAY IS APPALLING AND PROHIBITS THIS ASPECT.

Should be good for the environment unless there are lots of deliveries. Home workers should be at home, and not put upon their neighbours to take in deliveries, etc.

Provided that this does not result in people running businesses that increase traffic/ parking/ noise problems. Working from home is quite different from encouraging multiple visits from non-residents into residential streets e.g. taxi businesses would be inappropriate.

Superfast broadband is essential

BUT also specifically the affect on neighbours

Except for work vans, wagons etc parked at the front of their homes.

And better mobile coverage for the village

Businesses run from home must not be allowed to impinge on the lives of adjacent residents

Definitely work from home.
It will have a big impact on traffic.
The village is falling behind in respect of fast broadband it is still not available everywhere and the mobile phone signals are very poor.
Important for family work/ life balance.
A lot business is already run from private house and Weaver Vale housing.
Individuals working from home is no issue. Would not want to see existing private dwellings converted to business use.
How would you negotiate traffic?
Broad band infrastructure still variable in quality.
If this would mean a mast in the village then no I would not support it.
Yes - good idea.
Many roads will not support extra vehicles and/or parking
Better mobile signal. Broadband speeds
Developing businesses working from home may soon impact on locals.
As long as 'home' doesn't impact on neighbours e.g. taxi business
Controlled. Nobody wants to live next door to a small business someone is running from their home
This would be difficult to police. The impacts could be noise, large vehicles, inappropriate materials stored. Needs clarification
I aim to work solely from home by 2017
Need better broadband and internet plus phone mobile signals
Live near to a builder - too many vans.
I work from home - improvements to internet connections and speed. Better mobile phone signal coverage and strength.
Our 'fast' broadband is not!
The broadband would definitely need upgrading as I struggle to work from home as it is now.
Please improve fast, reliable broadband access..... yes, yes, yes.
though i have fiberoptic braudband i dont get even 3g signal on my mobile these things come hand in hand a at home work force requires fast internet access where ever they go and this simply isnt the fact in our parish
Very good, helping the environment and less pollution.
This will require the provision of Pure Fibre technology to each and every home in the Parish. Also known as fibre-to-the-home.

Policy 13 Protecting retail uses

Market forces will set retail businesses at the right level.
Particular necessary to ensure we keep the pharmacy, GP and dental practices, in addition to other retail uses.
With the new estate surely there is a need for more services
Yes, many thanks to our retailers
Need new initiatives to compete with towns
market forces force business closure
Pavements are dangerous - uneven and broken tiles(? Can't read word)
Increasing parking needed. Disabled - one space? We like to shop too.
Especially independent grocers and butchers.
Not sure³ this could work in visa-versa, also
Encourage local shopping but impossible to control outcomes.
So, keep Blakemere under control.
Support local businesses.
I support retail uses wherever possible but if retail is none viable alternative uses should be found for the premises. A blanket policy just doesn't work.
Without village become less vibrant with little community participation.

We need parking not more shops.
But NOT a supermarket.
Keep good access for vehicles and parking.
Keep the shops and fast food where they are in the village centre. But as we clearly do not have room to develop another area such as this please just focus on the one area.
Parking needs to be effectively managed especially for drivers onward travelling to Chester and filling the local shops parking facilities.
Shops should survive or not on their own performance.
Retail outlets very important to the village community.
Some shop fronts could do with renovation.
It is essential that we keep our convenience and retail shopping areas as they encourage community spirit and offer the community a place where they can meet other local residents. The High Street ethos is essential in rural areas and we should nurture and support them to ensure their continued success.
Important for people with no transport.
We don't need any more supermarkets, encourage small businesses
Change of use criteria must reflect the market
Living on Delamere Park, we regularly use our local village convenience stores, post office, butchers, greengrocers, chemist, and hairdressers as it is much more convenient than having to struggle through traffic into town!!
Too late as our two Post Offices are now in the Spa shop with poor parking.
Surely this must be market driven?

If local people use local shops(which I do a lot but not exclusively) those businesses will prosper and be retained.

If a local business does not provide good products, reliable service and competitive pricing compared with those further afield they will not flourish.
I think it is very important that each shop has a key role and that the other shops on the row are stopped from selling their products such as the Spar selling veg and fruit when we have a greengrocer and the Spar selling newspapers when we have a newsagent this needs to be stopped the Spar needs to sell the things the others don't not steal the customers from them and endanger their businesses
We have a large population of elderly. For many it's their only way to shop. No brainer to keep the shops
I think we are missing a trick by not improving public transport and/or pedestrian or cycle links to Hartford and Weaverham
An excellent choice of shops and I agree that there should not be any major loss or change of these facilities.

Economic Aspirations

Mobile phone signal would be a great improvement. How about a mast?
see 12
This is a key policy and it needs to be fibre to the home.
When visiting cities it is very noticeable how slow broadband is in the village.
100%
Vital
Not fast enough yet
Absolute priority.
current broadband is useless
Broadly support
Agree - very important
No new masts unless they are well disguised.
Low priority.

Not on internet

Also, better mobile phone coverage including 3G and 4G.

We have BT Infinity and it does not deliver its minimum speed. Better investment in the infrastructure by BT etc is required to deliver something that at least meets minimum standards.

A must have soon as possible.

A must.

FTTH should really be the target. Any new developments should be FTTH as a planning condition.

Is this really a priority?

What broadband?

My broadband already excellent- work to get a stable mobile signal instead even 3G see above

Enables Policy 12 and reduces traffic impact.

Important

Essential in the modern world

High speed B/B badly needed

Also to improve the signals for mobiles

Only support if mast not required.

This is the future

Emphasise High Speed broadband

Needs urgent improvement.

Key for home working

We cannot get any reception on O2 mobile phone.

Strongly support.

Speeds are too low.

Car Parking

Broadband on Delamere Park is rubbish

Mobile.

A good mobile signal is needed as there is more available in School Lane and other near properties.

There should be fibre to the house not to the BT box

To support local working from home this is an absolute necessity.

Must prioritise

Definitely

Vital

See comments under Policy 12.

Yes, yes, yes.

100% support for this as currently we have only one choice of ISP namely BT. Full fibre broadband from alternate ISPs would encourage businesses to move to the area.

Yes, all good for everyone to do this.

Of course the latest broadband to become commercially available is NG-PON2 supporting 10 Gbit/s symmetric (upstream and downstream), but any fibre-to-the premises will enable future cost effective upgrade. Installing any new system based on copper (or worse, aluminium) wires will be a wasted investment and obsolete well before the end of its useful life.

I currently only get 2mb internet at best. It makes it difficult to work from home etc

Policy 14 Housing Mix and Type

Would also support public run sheltered housing.

No more building of new houses keep the village a village. Only allow building on sites which had previous buildings

Consider downsizers might want to have smaller property but on exclusive higher

property value retirements type developments

Two new developments already existing Taylor Wimpey + Bovis

There is not much land left for building more houses without violating the environmental objective

too many large homes are being built

We believe that both families and the aging population benefit from reasonable plot sizes. The shift to higher housing density housing should be left for the cities.

It is too late to start making such comments - large developments have been built already. Their use cannot now be changed.

small plots of land, purchased by small builders, get requested planning permission for large homes, to make the most profit. imo this is where need to encourage the smaller property size, as often concentrations on larger developers.

As long as the amount of building is capped

We are in desperate need of homes suitable for down sizing, causing people to have to move out of the community of struggle on in properties oversized for their needs.

Evidence shows that we have already met our quotas.

Hopeful

There is enough development currently underway in the village and the needs should be met by that, we can't cope with any more.

Designed by good architect NOT spec builder.

Only small developments - as 2 large developments have changed the village and even harder to use local amenities.

Want to retain village character and not become a small town

Would support more bungalows but there are so many new houses in the area.

Crucially the Doctors surgery cannot support more residents.

Lots of older people would down-size if they could stay in the village.

Neither support nor do not support. Concern of the quality of homes/ look cheap. The Golden Nook as an example. Also checks should be taken to make sure new developments are actually sold! As I know Golden Nook pushed leaflets to buy existing houses for sale which, to me, is false accounting. They rent existing properties in village then say there is a housing shortage as they have sold their sales quota.

Creating a false housing economy.

No more house building. The village has already expanded too much and is starting to look like a town.

Not if this means "garden grabbing" or demolishing large houses and cramming in many small ones, which will harm the character of the village.

If this means further additional development in the area I do not support it. There are already numerous new housing developments being built - this is where the housing needs should have been enforced. We do not have the infrastructure (roads, public transport, local shops, parking) to support even more additional residents.

Affordable housing needs to be genuinely affordable. I know of families who cannot afford so-called affordable housing. This then leads to developers requesting a reduction of their agreed numbers because they cannot sell them.

This should have been considered when agreeing to the existing substantial housing developments that are in process.

Market demand should decide the mix of housing.

affordable homes for younger people and suitable accommodation for older residents downsizing is important

In the latest 2 big ongoing developments, how many bungalows are being built ?? The planners need to be kept an eye on, homes need to be considered for the future, green areas, hedge rows, wide verges, all are needed for wildlife and people's well being too.

Essential

In the right place.

There is too much development in this area already

This should be driven by commercial decisions. Leave overall mgmt? of housing needs to the market or else it distorts it

I do not support further development in the village

We have enough houses being built in and around the village already

Stop all new building or only allow starter homes

Facilities are not fit for Village expansion.

There are a lot of 2 & 3 bed properties on the "old council" estate.

All for building new houses as long as they aren't for "benefit street" people who can't be bothered to work.

Lovely idea but police always sorting out disturbances, they don't look after their homes in affordable housing - we have enough. Ageing population do need bungalows.

Affordable houses are never built in this area!!

More smaller housing for downsizing

Maybe needs a definition of affordable

Such a lack of smaller mixed housing to enable young and older people to remain in their village

Where. Too many big houses not for local families.

Only allow developments if smaller homes outnumber larger ones.

Also shared ownership with Housing Associations for younger people.

The village will become too large.

A real dearth of affordable bungalows.

Define affordable.

There needs to be some type of starter homes built within the area. That are pleasant and practical.

Rightmove etc show a good mix of properties at all price levels so demand seems to be met to a degree plus strong concerns about growing village size further. Schools are bursting

Bungalows are in particular needs

This has been done at the two latest developments

The village does not need more housing developments

No more low quality houses

Definitely support this plus some new homes should be affordable housing but not only say 3 in a build of 300 as we have personally discovered is happening

Not all older people want to downsize. Property is £ increasing where as savings attract little interest. Concern over social housing: ?not ??? one size?(difficult to read so not sure)

No more houses.

Developers should be stopped from getting round this through use of housing associations and bussing in clients.

No more houses to be built in the village.

This should have already been included in the Bovis & Taylor Wimpey developments.

No more houses now.

Bungalows are needed. I know of many families that need to move to them but don't want to move out of the village.

Provided schools and traffic problems are provided for.

Yes there is a requirement for smaller housing and share ownership scheme.

No more development

Need also to include 1 bedroom properties for single people. Also provision of houses to rent and bungalows for the elderly.

Most important

Why do we have to be an answer to all scenarios. Leave it as it is.

Keeping in mind those who would down-size but not leave village.

Many would downsize if affordable. Prices out of reach for many seniors.

Providing the infrastructure e.g. schools, medical and utilities can support it.

Against new build development - maximum capacity already reached.
Current development meets optimum capacity.
Far too much building over the past few years.
Definitely affordable housing and housing for the elderly.
Recent developments do not show this policy is being implemented.
More bungalows required - that will free up larger houses.
Don't overbuild leave us some green areas.
The village has recently undergone such major housing development that I'm concerned as to how much more it can support.
This implies the expansion of the village. Where?

Need for more shops, schools, adequate sewage & drains
Policy must accept that in order to deliver smaller units it must allow larger units as otherwise nothing will be delivered
No more development please except bungalows within the current curtailment of the village
Support affordable and obtainable housing.
Space, garden & privacy still important even if downsizing to a bungalow.
More new bungalows and apartments to reflect larger aging population.
Very few if any bungalows in new developments!! As the population ages we need more of these releasing big houses to families.
There is a shortage of homes for young people
Strongly support smaller homes and bungalows for downsizing
No more houses needed - we are over populated already.
We do not believe that 'affordable housing' is what people want to downsize into. See comments below about affordable housing on new build estates.
But mixing affordable with OAP bungalows may be a detrimental mix
But not happened on new developments. Cannot see where starter homes could be put.
Modern homes are already too small with poor storage space.
Small houses/bungalows are not big enough to live in - I have experienced this in other parts of the country. Bedrooms do not accommodate furniture, lounges and kitchens not big enough for storage. No space for a dining table. Older people need space to be able to walk freely. I live in a "larger" dwelling and at last I have room to live with my husband and have family to visit. I have neighbours in similar housing and they have space for walking aids, wheelchair and other equipment.
Leave it alone. If there's not enough, TOUGH. Find somewhere else to reside. It's called tough love and saving my community. Have you seen the new residents on the new residential estate!! Not the type of people I want living round here.
There are plenty of smaller houses and bungalows in the area. Most of the new developments in the area are 3 bedroom homes.
This is an important issue. Our three children have all had to look elsewhere for their starter homes.
With the development at Eden Grange and Forest View and all of the other development around Northwich, there are enough houses in the area currently being built.
We have been saturated with new housing and I am totally against any further developments. However, there is a need for some limited affordable housing.
There is a genuine lack of availability of mid sized homes with decent gardens. These are of benefit to families, who avail of the outside space and the aging population who enjoy the gardening opportunities. High density housing is something for the cities, not villages. The need for smaller homes is not genuinely a need for smaller homes, but in reality a need for more reasonable house prices.
But any increase in housing needs to be assessed in line with traffic, facilities and public transport capacity

There has been affordable housing on the new housing developments in the area that have brought major antisocial behaviour to both.

Policy 15 Prioritising the supply of Affordable Homes

Not supportive of small groups of affordable housing-the tenants of which can have a significant impact on a wider area. eg. Bovis development.

Market forces will dictate

I do not believe people have a right to live in a place just because their parents did. It reduces aspiration.

only build on pre-existing sites not on green belt

see above comment

I strongly support this policy

Yes to the 1st paragraph (MLJ small groups of affordable dwellings with priority in perpetuity to locals). No to the second if the policy is to reduce the number of affordable houses per development.

Local interests may ONLY be protecting through the allocation of social housing and intervention in the second hand market.

It is important to have mixed housing rather than to isolate the affordable housing.

I do not support further development. I do not also support interventionist policies to manipulate the building of 'affordable' housing.

Do not favour restraint on re-sale of property. Happy to have allocation of rented property to local residents.

Do not feel that local residents would be given priority in an open market.

We are already overstretched

Care to avoid disruptive families who can wreck a new community

Designed by good architect NOT spec builder.

Not in perpetuity

We have enough housing development.

Already adequate housing

Plenty of affordable housing close by in Northwich area. Don't believe in prioritising local people - unfair on others and diversity.

Desirable but legally fraught and history shows hard to implement

-

Preference to local residents wanting to stay and leave their parents home.

No more house building. The village has already expanded too much and is starting to look like a town.

Definitely.

See above

In the right place.

There is too much development in this area already

As above

I do not support further development in the village

see above

Threshold of 10 units seems adequate

There have been too many new developments.

The Village does not need further housing development.

Only people from local area, not shipped in from Northwich because they are bad.

Local connections - yes, not everybody else's problems.

There's too much.

Do not understand 10 to 5 units

Such a lack of smaller mixed housing to enable young and old to remain in their village.

Affordable housing? You mean like the Grange Estate? Which are soon sold for profit!

The village will become too large.

Do not support any further housebuilding in village. No issue with existing affordable house being channelled to local residents however.

As above

No more housing developments

Caveat: Affordable homes appear to be defined by cost regardless of ? and are rarely fit for purpose

with possibly more flats for the elderly

Not until we have better infrastructure

Not sure.

Norley has a lovely new development. In our village the Housing Trusts need to tighten up as some houses not well kept.

No new build

Other areas insist on affordable houses only being available to local residents/workers.

More homes will spoil village life.

No more houses to be built in the village.

In approx 5 years my children will be in need of housing and will need to move out if this isn't written down.

More bungalows or smaller homes for older residents are also important.

There is a requirement for affordable housing, not just private landlords.

No more development

Black and white gable ends porches

More 1 bedroom apartment homes for single occupancy oap, etc - keep people near their homes.

No more development needed.

Against new build development- maximum capacity already reached.

Current development meets optimum capacity.

Need to ensure affordable dwellings match only need of locals.

Or retirement homes. I have lived here all my life. My house is getting too big. Where can I go from here?

Problems of low stock of affordable houses is that builders want to make more profit selling larger more expensive houses.

Affordable home not always compatible with small developments

Whilst agreeing that those with strong local connections should get the chance to access affordable dwellings if this means more building work in Cuddington and Sandiway then I am currently opposed

Need more information "strong local connections" and the meaning of the thresholds.

Same comments as above i.e. to get smaller / larger units also required. Offsite provision of affordable housing must be acceptable (payment in lieu)

Agree - bring back 100% mortgages!

Local connections important.

DO NOT AGREE THRESHOLD - NOT ECONOMIC FOR DEVELOPERS

Existing council houses for rent should be retained. Home ownership is not for everybody.

No!!!

It would appear that too many get sold to Housing Associations and get allocated to out of area residents.

Leave it at 10

Great care needed here. In the wrong hands dwellings soon deteriorate.

Perpetuity!!

Small groups only

The idea of prioritising people with local connections is a good one, but I am not convinced it could be enforced.

Given the previous policy statements, I would be surprised if groups of more than 5

homes could be accommodated anywhere in the parish, so the threshold reduction I'd a good idea.

I don't understand the reduction from 10 to 5 units.

What is affordable? Poorly designed, poorly built, small, no privacy as the road layout is only one car wide. Does it make it affordable if there is no central heating system? A property with low running costs actually is more expensive to build than one to a reduced specification. Buy to let has killed the market for young people starting out.

Build "affordable and starter" homes and they are frequently bought off plan by property businesses.

No more building. Move elsewhere, we don't want you. If you have a local connection then wait until your parents or family have died then move into there dwelling - simple. An important issue again.

Small developments only. Not large ones like Eden Grange or Forest View

It is not at all clear that restricting development to applicants with local connections will do anything to increase the likelihood that local residents will benefit from living in the new properties. What is needed are schemes to enable local people to enter and move along the housing ladder (in both directions). A transferable shared ownership scheme is one good candidate (with the authorities equity moving with the resident) to reduce costs. Encouraging builders to develop a particular type of home and then allow them to sell to somebody outside the district does not help.

Policy 16 Location of Dwellings

Market forces will dictate

but see comment to Policy 4

A bus service is required that serves Cuddington as well as Sandiway

Developments must only be located on brownfield sites so long as local infrastructure supports this

Brownfield is OK, but land targetted as in-fill is valued by families with young children. Converting brown field sites into small developments is a reasonable way of bringing land back into use.

take into account very closely the surrounding area and be scrupulous with builders plans, that not pushing for more than the infill area should be accepting.

Careful control over the density of the build to ensure housing units are not cramped together and have wide enough access for passing cars and pavements.

On brown sites only, but local schools, doctors, services and infrastructure already stretched.

Difficult

Designed by good architect NOT spec builder.

We have enough housing development.

Limited scope in village

If we have to support more developments then would support smaller.

We already have 2 recent new housing developments.

Good idea but you cannot stop people owning cars (yet)

Small new developments are never 'small' after planning has gone though.

Already sufficient development.

Do not support infill developments.

No more house building. The village has already expended too much and is starting to look like a town.

See comment on policy 14

Dentist & Doctor Provision is key.

This needs to be caveated regarding the impact on historic buildings, gardens etc. We are losing the character of Ivy Cottage if the agreed development goes ahead for example.

As above

Mixed. Brownfield - yes. Infill - needs to meet environmental criteria listed earlier
I do not support increasing density of housing arising from new build in the village
The ? word is brownfield
School provision also needs to be considered.
NO.
Brownfield not greenfield.
Building as it is!!
Only if the alternative is green field. We have had enough developments in recent years - keep us rural
However over development - see note on policy 7 - should be avoided even if considered appropriate.
Where are these brownfield sites?
Agree emphasis to be on brownfield sites.
Affordable housing.
Little thought given to infrastructure eg school; places access to medical facilities.
Do not support further housebuilding in village
Enough new development already
Yes with care and approval of locals
No more new housing estates as we are over prescribed
Only on brownfield. No more garden grabbing
No more houses - we are becoming a town not a village.
Services need to be linked to new developments.
Brownfield
Yet more housing taking up valuable brownfield sites. Would like to see INFILL ONLY
No more buiding please.
Do not want any sites allocated for travellers.
Provided they are old business sites & not building on Greenfield sites - otherwise they will be lost forever.
The demolition of a bungalow in Chiltern Close and its replacemnt with two seemingly tall houses which tower over the other bungalows I hope won't be repeated
Key to maintaining village's character
Adequate off road parking.
To support this policy you would need to define what you mean by small. 5 for example as indicated in the earlier paragraph re affordable dwellings would be acceptable but we could envisage a builder thinking that 50 was a small development which not be acceptable.
No more development needed.
However we are concerned that there are insufficient brownfield development sites left within the village to provide the number of new dwellings required for sufficient housing in the future for local residents to be able to remain living in the village.
As long as no more on greem areas.
Against new build development - maximum capacity already reached.
Developments on brownfield sites only.
Small infil sites leads to ribbon deveploement and eventually large developements.
After large developments at the old Yovhurt factory, off Ash Road and Blakemere do we need any more?
There are areas in the greenbelt that could be considered as 'infill' areas. The field opposite the Church is one such example as it is bordered on two sides by buildings and one side by Norley Road. This could be used for Church Car Parking (a problem) and also for sheltered housing for the elderly that is in very short supply in the village as the existing stock appears to have been sold off or used for family accommodation
Extend the areas around the edges village
Providing there is sufficient infrastructure to support this.
Brownfield site yes - greenfield no!
Do not overbuild

Transport is far from adequate. No 82 bus timetable is a law unto itself. 1 per hour!!

Ridiculous

Not sure what is meant by 'infill'. Do not support a policy of building on green belt or open countryside. Also recent experience has shown it is not being executed responsibly.

Where do new schools, doctors, and dentists, etc. Come into this plan?

Too much building

Current new builds around the area are enough. Roads struggle to cope.

Given the recent overload of development in the parish, this is a sensible approach.

Public transport is poor or non-existent!

The least impact on the environment is for the best.

NO, NO, NO MORE BUILDING. WE DON'T WANT IT OR NEED IT

The land often targetted for in-fill developments is often valued by young families, and properties with reasonable sized gardens are become something of a rarity. The Parish should retain those which it already has.

No further development please. Current developments are of poor quality and poor location, little thought given to the effect on schools, shops, lifestyle of others in the village etc.

As long as can be supported by local infrastructure and buildings maintain the building standards and character in the area

Policy 17 Maintaining Rural Character

If new build have to be done

I strongly support this policy

New developments in building design need to be encouraged in a way that at the same time new build fits in with the local environment.

But please note previous answers.

More space required.

We have enough housing development.

OK as a general aim but is it right to stifle innovation and imagination

What I don't agree with is the signage through the village by developments (yellow signs) when 80% of cars have sat navigation. There are also too many signs (brown signs) by the Shell garage. The amount of signage is spoiling the village. Signage is litter.

Additional tree planting especially oaks which are part of the village character.

Great - but doesn't seem to be happening vis-a-vis housing density.

But no more buildings.

Recently constructed estates hardly meet this policy.

BUT should not stifle good modern design. Even John Douglas was modern once

Too many new developments already.

I am against any more building in this area

I do not support further development in the village

But do the current housing developments match these criteria?

BUT this isn't happening - housing density is NOT consistent with Village. Too much, please stop developers ruining us.

See other comments re poor planning decisions in recent years.

Only if houses must be built.

Do not support further housebuilding in village

Stuck in the past re materials and style

all planning applications must be carefully scrutinised and local opinions respected

Only on brownfield and greenfield devs.

Bovis have crammed the housing in. Right next to each other.

There needs to be an effective enforcement system of approved plans.

Material & styles develop over time and enhance the character of the village which is already a mix of styles.

Don't agree with property being built.

Infill to be supported.

Abstain

See 16

If new developments are approved then they must be in character with the village.

Essential to use materials that bare in keeping with character.

Modern architecture can look great in contrast to older buildings - so long as they are environmentally eco friendly.

No more development needed.

Yes

Impossible to implement 'styles sympathetic to rural character' is purely subjective.

Two new houses adjacent to my road are far too big.

We do not need to facelift our village. Use more flower power, let shops pay

Parking provision must be adequate and realistic.

I do not support any new developments except infill

Take care not to overbuild - Cuddington could lose village appeal

Sympathetic but modern/ new at the same time. No mock Tudor!

Materials and styles are varied now. Uniformity is not necessary.

We already have a diverse assortment of building styles, planning legislation should protect already.

No more

Too many housing estates - Dr, Dentist effected

A very sensible approach.

Why continue to build houses suited to living in the 1950s? Modern materials and design can be sensitive to local aesthetics but I want lower running costs, warm, dry property which is big enough to live in and has space outside for privacy.

Too prescriptive. What about small retirement or starter apartment blocks?

This should apply to any business development as well as housing.

NO - don't build it in the first place

Support is primarily for the use of sympathetic materials and styles.

Note the policy to retain housing density should ideally be based on the average density in November 2016 (including properties to the south of the A556) and not on the minimum density for which planning permission has been granted previously.

I support this but again, current developments do not fit this model. Housing developers must be held to account more closely.

Policy 18 Eco-design and energy saving

They are ineffective

builds that propose eco-design should be encouraged by the parish

Requirements for solar to be considered when lay-out of housing is considered (ie roof ridge orientation).

Local support for people living in poorly insulated building could be given by the local community through mention and general education.

Solar panels on all new builds

Nice to reduce energy usage but great care needed to obtain real costings and transparency

No windmills.

No more buildings.

As above

I do not support further development in the village

NO NEW developments. Don't care what they use.

But not at the expense of the use of traditional building methods which provide character and longevity.
If houses Re to be built.
But no wind turbines
Do not support further housebuilding in village
Only if aesthetically pleasing i.e. no rows of solar panels
Provided not detrimental aesthetically
no new development but extensions to existing properties must comply
Search for 'Project ERIC' for information on an innovative scheme in Oxford.
but solar panels on rooftops are ugly.
More of this and for existing homes = grants
Often eco desings are a very contemporary style and this needs encouraging.
Support development of energy saving for existing properties - need for advice plus provision of grants and/or loans to assist in implementation.
Do not wand turbines in village.
But must maintain design in character with village.
Solar eneregy may not prove economic ultimately. Solar panels are unsightly and spoil the appearance of any home of any age.
Of course.
Covered by Building Regs
Encourages too weak. We need a stronger demand.
I do not support any new developments except infill
Very important.
Should be undertaken if cost justifiable anyway.
Eco design and effective insulation are sound ideas. I am not sure the output versus cost issue of solar panels is yet sufficiently developed, as they currently are only effective to individuals because of government subsidies. Undoubtedly in future this will change. The plan policy must be written with this in mind.
I have solar but it depends on constant (too often not!) mains electricity.
Most definitely.
No don't build any more houses
Preferably using purpose built solar arrays, and not the rather unsightly bolt on varieties. See for example https://www.tesla.com/en_GB/solar?redirect=no.

Housing Development aspiration

They are not cost effective over their lifespan - thats more landfill
National recognition as an 'Eco Village' would be something to be proud of.
Railway to be electric from Altringham to Chester and beyond to (? can't read word)
paricularly transport
without more detail
What is it ? Bow does it work?
WAFFLE
I would support one if I knew what it was.
Not sure what it is..
Essential
Buy ugly
Plenty of schemes available to help people address growing spend on energy
I do not believe solar energy solutions provide an effective and efficient solution to energy needs
Needs more publicity.
But at the expense of spoiling any property aesthetically already impacting on the village ambience.
Provide electric vehicle charging points.
for existing homes

See comment on Policy 18. Village wide replacement of streetlights with LEDS? Eden Grange traffic lights turned off at night?

Not sure.

Solar Panels ugly!!

Not clear what this means or involves

No wind farms

No more ugly SOLAR panels whose benefit over time is doubtful. They destroy the appearance of a neighbourhood.

Hideous installations

Depends on what is proposed.

More information required.

We need to do our bit to show our children we care about their future

The design of current solar panels in the village are not sympathetic to local character.

Needs stringent control.

Will need to ensure schemes do not impact on character of village.

As above

Ugly solar panels will become obsolete as new technology(ies) become available.

Don't know what that means

Don't know. I hate solar panels on the houses, eyesores

Energy saving scheme for current housing only. No more new housing

Solar panels on Library?

?Economics

Solar panels are ugly and should be allowed only after careful consideration. They get a huge subsidy from the rest of us. Eco design is ok.

To old to have any benefit from solar panels

Should be undertaken if cost justifiable anyway.

Sorry we don't understand.

Form ticks both support and not support. Comment 'All community buildings should have solar. Think solar panels do not fit into village - look unsightly.

See comments under Policy 18.

Yes.

Can't wait to hear about this.

I think this has real potential - some sort of co-operative energy scheme

Should be extended to other forms of renewable micro generation and to schemes to reduce energy use.

Policy 19 Improved Pedestrian and Cycle Access

The road between the bowling green and waste lane is a death trap making access to the Whitegate way near impossible on foot.

Safe pedestrian + cycle route to/from Delamere Park/Cuddington village essential cycle track required along A556

Only some of these require development, we would not support improved access to schools, shops, play facilities & Blakemere at the cost of green spaces (verges etc).

These areas are already well served for access.

will be difficult as lanes are narrow etc, but there really is a need for better walking/ cycling around the village - and encouragement to do so.

At times the problem is for pedestrians and young cyclists trying to cross some of the access roads (eg Weaverham Road and Norley Road).

Yes, the route to the cemetery is very dangerous for pedestrians. Access to this from the village can be improved by providing a permissive footpath parallel to the road or by putting in a roadside footpath. Methods for slowing down traffic would be good.

A footpath was requested from Del PK to the village 40 years ago. Still waiting

New by pass!!! With parking at junction

Strongly agree. i do not live in Delamere park but sympathise with those who have to walk along Norley road.

Blakemere is not a village - it's a commercial business

Strongly support

Aim is agreed but ambition has to be tailored to costs and legal obstacles. (I am a cyclist and nervous of traffic)

You are not going to have safe cycling till you sort out the volume of traffic through out the village/ speeding , etc.

Safe cycling to Waeverham High School would be great now the us is less frequent/costly.

Yes...but public transport must be the priority.

Road traffic along Norley Road to and from Delamere Park makes it particularly dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. However, I strongly oppose encouraging cyclists to use footpaths. The policy should be to reduce the hazard (i.e. road vehicles), not move the potential victims out of the way.

This is imperative. The road between Cuddington/delamere Park/ Norley is very dangerous for pedestrians/cyclists.

strongly agree that Delamere Park is isolated for pedestrians and cyclists on a busy road without pavement

Important safe pedestrian access to station and village from Delamere Park

Walking from Delamere Park to the Station and t t he Cemetery is hazardous at the moment. However any scheme would need to be sensitive to the rural character of the area - we don't want it urbanised.

Don't see many cyclists!

CYCLE LANE FROM THE ROUND TOWER TO SCHOOL LANE, HARTFORD TO LINK THE LOCAL RAIL LINES.

Pedestrian cross from the end of Trickett Lane to Village hall + play area.

The infrastructure exists for the access mentioned - pavements and paths - but the state of many pavements in the village is disgraceful

Also access to Whitegate Way

No access to Blakemere it's awful and disruptive. What about school bus to Weaverham. Why couldn't we save it. Access to others - yes.

There is a huge cycling community in the Village, more cycleways is a good idea.

Ref: Delamere Park, walkways and clcle tract to and from. Persons buying propert on DP do so with the knowledge of it location and transport issues. Walkways and cycle paths, in my opinion are not required. Extra public transport (bus service) would be desirable. A stopping point would releave some congestion within the village where there are bus stops en -route. Thus no parking of vehicles.

We walk a lot sometimes no pathways not safe from traffic.

Paving stones need replacing.

Safe cycle route to Weaverham High School needed

Safer access for all these areas is urgently required.

A footpath from Delamere Park was earmarked years ago, to do this the trees along Norley Road would have to be felled. There was a bus service but no-one used it. The bus stops are still in place.

Pavements are desparately between Delamere Park and the village shops - it is taking a huge risk to walk as the traffic is horrendous.

Could a cycle path be created alongside the A556 linking Sandiway, Cuddington with Hartford.

Some of the lesser used footpaths could use a little TLC.

Form indicates support for pedestrians. No support for cyclists with the following comment: Having lived on the Cheshire cycle path previously I wouldn't advise against encouraging large groups of cyclists/Clubs passing through the village as they cause huge problems and safety issues.

All new roads and any development should be enforced to provide cycle lanes and

good footpaths. When repairs and upgrading is taking place cycle lanes and good pedestrian access needs to be included. We should even consider having some areas for walking only and no vehicles.

Need for safe cycle paths to weaverham school

Big Tick

Good network of local paths but you have to use narrow lanes with no footpaths to access these from Delamere Park

Particularly Delamere Park to station/village

Yes - very desirable but not if it entails widening of carriageway

Improve access to Whitegate Way?

Not without traffic calming measures to deter speeding motorists from racing through the country lanes. 700 cars a day down narrow twisting lanes round us.

The rural footpaths are not maintained.

Lots of footpaths and rights of way are already difficult to access or are already lost.

Cyclists can only be safe if physically separated from motor vehicles.

Our priority would be cars not cyclists or pedestrians. Delamere Park access by car needs improvement.

Would be good to see the development of the pavement alongside the Village Hall/ park/ cuddington shops. Pavement is very narrow & hedges overgrown.

Parking at Mere Lane shops needs to be taken into account. Not enough parking for amount of shops.

All identified need improvement.

There is a definite need for cycle routes, cycle racks and a SAFE walking route or lower speed limit from Delamere Park via Norley Road to the train station.

Better pedestrian access to Cuddington village

Also need a bus service for aging population on Delamere Park

I support - but in the meantime cyclists must be kept off pavements

Parking is difficult in Cuddington and Sandiway and it is not easy to find a solution to this. Safe cycling too would be nice.

But do not create potential motor vehicular traffic problems by giving cycles undue priority.

Delamere Park to Station provision for pedestrians, cyclists. Pedestrian/ cyclist access to cemetery & Gorstage Lane terrible. Cut left hand hedge to 1 m height.

Cycle path from Delamere Park to Cuddington and Sandiway - safe paths to schools.

Pedestrian crossings at the playing fields and to Blakemere Village would assist greatly with pedestrian safety as well as additional footpaths to Delamere Park and Gorstage Lane cemetery.

Yes

Walkers should be given precedence over cyclists.

Yes

Next they will want street lights all the way from Delamere Park to the Railway Station

We live on Delamere Park and would welcome an improved walking route to the village

There are cycle racks now publicised on the village website! How realistic is improved routes for cyclists to Delamere Park and to cemetery. What can developers be asked to do to help? Support measures to improve access to others particularly Blakemere.

Must be priority with lighting.

WE NEED A FOOTPATH FROM DELAMERE PARK TO RAILWAY STATION

a BUS WOULD BE EVEN BETTER

Some footpaths are in a lamentable state. E.g. between the Church and Round Tower - narrow and rutted. This is a path to the bus stop. Cutting of hedges should be enforced.

As a resident of Delamere Park I consider pedestrian safety to be great danger for DP to Railway station

Safe pedestrian access from Delamere Park to Rail Station would need new/upgraded footpaths

Lots of old people on Delamere Park. We need buses to even get down to village. Delamere Park is part of the village yet access is totally unsafe between the two. Absolutely ridiculous that there is no footpath whatsoever between the two meaning that cars have to mainly be used to go back and to. Presently it is totally unsafe to try and walk along the lanes avoiding traffic. (or cycle for that matter). It would be good to be able to walk safely to the village and back.

Cyclist areas needed. When will cyclists learn that riding their bikes on footpaths is Breaking the Law! But the police simply do not need to know. Do we have to wait for someone to be killed first!

Fully support, but not at the expense of removing school bus services to Weaverham HS and other distant locations.

Although roads are already very narrow. Roads, pavements and cycling lanes need to be expanded without losing existing limited space.

Too many roads lack pavements!

Even where cycle ways and footpaths are in place they are overgrown or in poor condition it is essential to ride/walk on the road.

Doesn't affect me or my children

Again, what about routes to Hartford and Weaverham being made safe for school and amenity access, to save road traffic.

The first two listed are particularly important and have been the subject of local debate for decades. We need good access to Whitegate Way from the Cuddington end. Pity the historic route from the Round Tower to Whitegate was closed by Sandiway Golf Club!

However, the new provision should not be at the expense of existing pedestrian or vehicular road users.

Walking paths are also important along major roads

Policy 20 Parking Standards

Parking at Define wine and by residents on School Lane who have parking behind their homes is a major issue.

Increased parking at school, doctors and railway station also required.

No parking on pavements or green areas

This is essential

Parking outside Define Wines new development is inadequate and has contributed to congestion at School Lane/A556 junction at peak times. Parking at local shops a joke. Note parking at village centre should be free - certainly for residents and ideally for visitors.

inadequate; not necessarily 'totally inadequate'

It is very noticeable that the "affordable" houses in St John's Way were not provided with adequate space for parking at the time they were built and there is a major parking problem in that area, and they are not small cars!

Parking is a problem

This needs to be addressed to avoid accidents and altercations

Parking on pavements needs to be controlled. The village suffers greatly from this.

More education is needed plus some clear signs particularly on Norley Rd on the stretch beside and near to the playing fields. Often there is not enough room for pedestrians to stay on the path particularly if they have pushchairs for wheelchairs or if walking aids are in use.

We need a lot more Parking Places, and quickly.

Too many vehicles for the current space due to lack of building foresight

See plan enclosed.

It is vital that parking areas be integrated in a way which does not ruin the appearance and character of the village e.g. landscaping.

New developments in the village already do not have adequate parking

Village car parks are always full now.

To be made compulsory

This is a long standing requirement but overtaken by car growth and reluctance to pay for it

New developments are squeezing to build more properties than parking spaces i.e. affordable housing would be low income families, kids live at home, have their own car plus work vehicles. Go and look for yourself Golden Nook, amount of off road parking - affordable housing.

MLJ 'I can't understand what is being said!' Comment is 'As long as this does not social housing and leaves adequate leisure place.'

Parking outside shops will never be enough unless you destroy the character of the village centre. If we have to pay for the bus and train, why not for parking?

Don't think this is achievable. How can you accommodate visitors? We can't manage parking at the shops where most cars only stay a short time.

STOP PEOPLE PARKING ACROSS PAVEMENTS AND BLOCKING PAVEMENTS.

Essential

But not too many developments.

The current parking situation is bad. It will only get worse with all the building going on. I see no solution.

Parking around the local shops and schools is completely shocking and a serious accident waiting to happen

Ensure spaces are large enough for SUV sized cars. Paint lines on school car park to avoid wastage of space by awful parking.

Although villagers need to be encouraged to walk.

Schools need to be included in this.

Need whole new parking at shops on an angle not as is, then get more in. Put a little car park next to the library which is currently grass. Stop new developments and people having caravans and vans on side of street.

See my answer to previous question.

The parking at the shops is inadequate with a result of this people park illegally with no care for others. This also has an effect where we live as people park on the road outside our property which leaves us nowhere to park as we don't have a drive or garage.

Very important for safety of all users

Without impacting on the feel of the village

But must avoid parking charges. Winsford is free and nearby and charges would send people there.

And should be planned with appropriate with appropriate landscaping to enhance this vital necessity. Existing inappropriate parking should be made more suitable/easy to maintain.

Widen the roads. Fir Lane is a good example.

Using the green area adjacent to the library would alleviate part of the problem of parking by the shops.

Parking very inadequate near shops etc **PRIORITY.**

Also better parking provision around congested areas of housing.

Road can be widened near some shops where pavement is excessively wide.

I would also add parking restrictions on Sandown Crescent and East Lane as cars and vans are constantly parked on pavements and grass verges.

Certain current developments now causing more and more roads reduced to dangerous levels. Nobody does anything about it and it will cause some serious accidents. Lack of forethought by planning and not taking into consideration the people who live here.

Big Tick

A major priority

Parking on pavements, where it reduces the pavement to less than 1.5 m should be prohibited (I understand the government is consulting with local councils regarding this - it is illegal in London to park on pavements except when the local council permits it for certain streets - Why not us?)

Parking at Cuddington School and a drop-off area are vital - particularly when they expand.

People should be encouraged to walk within the village. There is a log of non essential parking.

The Bovis and Grange estates seem to fail on these benchmarks

Essential.

Central grass areas within housing areas (for the enjoyment of all residents) should ban parking of selfish residents who choose it as their car park.

People should be encouraged to walk to the shops. Most of the time there are plenty of spaces. Only parking problem at certain times of day.

More parking Mere Lane

Parking at the Post Office and Sandiway shops requires and planning and improvement,

Address congestion due to parking on School Lane, Mere Lane shops and Sandiway school.

Sandiway shops a real problem for parking

Mere Lane imperative.

A total rethink is required at the library & shops area. The ridiculous tarmac pedestrian way on dentists corner could easily accommodate 5 or 6 cars or more. Mere Lane verges need renewing for proper parking. Don't the vehicle owners have space on their own drives?

Not 'seek' DEMAND adequate parking at Cuddington/ Sandiway shops.

This should also include expansion of Cuddington Primary School drop off area.

Looking forward to new carpark & safer parking at Sandiway shops 'well done'. Now need to get cars off verges and pavements - its got to stop.

Additional parking to Sandiway shops is urgently required to benefit the businesses there and their customers who struggle to find safe places to park. Pedestrian safety is a real issue in this area and needs to be addressed urgently.

Strongly support

Especially around Cuddington School and Ash Road.

Very good

If there is not adequate parking then new houses should not be built!

Put the community first not the green of the developers

Where appropriate developers should be asked for contribution to improve parking provision elsewhere in the village

No new development please. The only parking issues are in Sandiway in the area of the library and people are too lazy to park in the adjacent car park

Totally agree!

Must prioritise Sandiway shops

Too late. New estates terrible for parking.

I use a pavement mobility scooter and have found on many occasions that it is very difficult to pass cars that are parked (all four wheels) on the pavement

Parking around village centres is very tight and difficult.

Strongly agree

The policy should require that new developments (any size - including a single house) use local statistics of car ownership, rather than national ones. Because of our isolated geography and poor public transport links, this part of Cheshire has one of the highest car usage levels in the country, but all recent developments have used national

statistics for their applications, this there will be pavement-parking even in the newest developments.

Some residents convert their garage (if they have one) to a living room then park on the often narrow roads.

Paving outside houses blocks access at junctions and causes hold up and back log onto main roads - such as entry to school lane off Norley road.

Absolutely!

Tell them to walk. No more digging up green spaces for a concrete village. Oh and if the 'rich snobs' off delamere park didn't park there cars at the shops then catch the bus on Ash road to Chester we wouldn't have this problem would we!!

Parking is not to bad.

There is a lot of parking on grass verges, which is making the village look very scruffy and untidy.

Note that for the viability of the village centre, parking provision should be free. It should certainly be free for parish residents, but it should also be free for visitors to the parish.

Policy 21 Traffic Impact of New Development

Any new development needs to have an environmental impact analysis. Any additional access to busy roads creates additional danger to traffic and pedestrians.

Already have problems

We have enough housing development.

when will the Council (CW&C) listen

Strongly

Nice thought but unrealistic. Traffic problem is national, not local

10 is too harsh. 20 - 25 fairer and more realistic

Commute around village not through it.

No more buildings.

What do you do with the assessment, just make provision for the extra traffic?

I think this should be *every* development, not just over 10.

Seems a bit like a sledge hammer and doesn't account for cumulative effects and should seek to have any necessary improvements funded by the developer

Surely the planners should be able to assess this, especially when residents give feedback/and or objections. The residents are the experts, who are most aware of the traffic problems the village faces.

Should be no developments of over 10 homes!

Not too many new dwellings.

Too much new development

The new development already built have resulted in traffic chaos in the village at peak times

Ensure environmental impact is given greater weight - e.g. new lights at Eden Grange cause pollution and decrease fuel efficiency due to HGVs and vehicles moving at high speed having to stop and accelerate back up to speed again.

No new developments too much traffic.

Limit number of dwellings

The cumulative effect of having several developments must be taken into account.

A 'realistic' assessment.

Do we need over 10 dwellings - when people are building in their gardens.

See the above comment all developments need to have traffic issues are the heart of the planning and not (as at the moment) an afterthought.

Traffic lights should be avoided as environmentally unfriendly, cause additional noise etc.

We need to ensure that lights at new junctions for estates do not have priority

A pity this wasn't done earlier to avoid lanes used as rat runs.

I worry about the infrastructure. Will we have power cuts and flooding.
No developments should be permitted if traffic signals will be required.
Taylor Wimpey must landscape the verges they have churned up on the A49
I would think that this desirable for any new dwellings
No new development therefore no further impact
No more
No more traffic lights.
There should not be any developments of over 10 dwellings in this parish for a long time, as we are already overburdened with new development. However, in the longer term, this is a sound idea.
Extend 40mph limit on A49 to Bryn/Eden Grange development.

Turning left into Eden Grange when lights on green can be dangerous due to vehicles speeding up down hill, especially heavy goods vehicles.

Consider pedestrian control from car park across A49 to White Barn.
New developments near Davenham (A556), Cuddington (A49), and Hartford all get new traffic lights!
The nature of the area with narrow rail and canal bridges means additional traffic slows everything down. Alternative transport schemes would be beneficial - why not shift more lorries onto rail? Open more railway stations and link lines to allow better connections. I can walk to a railway station at start and end of my work journey but the lines do not connect! My car could be removed from the road actually saving me money and the environment of the vehicle.
What?? Doesn't this have to happen anyway
Surely if we are planned, we can use this investment to fund appropriate safe routes between villages
Traffic conditions throughout the county are becoming intolerable, and further housing developments will only make the situation worse.
Why have such a high limit before the assessment is required? It is perhaps more important to have a policy which requires a developer to contribute to infrastructure improvements if the impact is excessively negative.

Policy 22 Traffic Calming Measures

Often traffic calming schemes are usually intrusive and affect the character of a location.
School Lane is a village disgrace. We should be focussing on parked cars and putting in double yellow lines.
No speed humps. Speed limits to reduce current speeding by traffic.
But no more road bumps with the vibration and damage these cause to vehicles and property.
Traffic jams with chicanes - no 20mph as appropriate
Due to inadequate parking, speeds rarely exceed 20mph as it is.
Traffic calming penalises everyone, more emphasis should be on enforcement & education.
We do not see that it would help. In fact may lead to increased congestion and will increase pollution.
I agree with traffic calming but it is also important to keep traffic flowing and not to create queues.
This should not be at the expense of attempts to minimise through traffic, other than on the A class roads.
20mph speed limits need to be set on all residential roads and all roads from the borders of the villages need to be a maximum of 30mph.

The corner of Trickett Lane Moss Lane is very dangerous when people park both sides of the road, when there is a lot of people using the Village Hall, Playing fields.

I support speed restrictions, but not chicanes which can cause holdups, or speed bumps which can cause car damage.

If this can make a difference

No sleeping policeman (no speed bumps)

Parking at roundabouts and bus stops. See plan.

Reduce speed limits!!

Weaverham Road isn't particularly bad for people speeding. An in-depth traffic survey should be carried out. Need to ensure roads don't get blocked up with traffic.

Already have speed bumps

A49 from Shell garage to Weaverham roundabout should be 30 Or 20mph. because of pupils walking and cycling and because of increased traffic lights.

Qualified. Be careful what you ask for. 20mph limit must be selective/intelligent not blanket.

Should be chicanes School Road & Weaverham Road so diverts traffic around village by 20/30%.

Restricts the access of emergency vehicles. Use speed cameras. Better lighting for zebra crossings.

Please introduce 20mph speed limit on Norley Road.

Speed limits should be enforced. Chicanes cause mechanical problems.

Yes - quickly.....talked about but no obvious action.

Speed limits are useless unless enforced, and I see no prospect of that happening.

Ash Road in particular due to school.

We already have traffic calming measures in place close to schools and shops. I don't see the need to spend further money on this. The roads are so congested most of the time that driving over 20mph isn't normally possible anyway!

With a caveat - we need reduced speed limits and auto-signs/cameras that flash more than we do chicanes and bumps.

I strongly object to methods such as chicanes which I perceive to be dangerous to local and non local drivers

Controversial suggestion. Norley Road from Trickett Lane to Sandiway school, using white paint, turned into a single carriageway, foot path on road by the bungalows, bollards used as a chicane, so that traffic going out of the village gets priority. Possibly a cheapish solution to the speeding vans dashing over the bumps !!!

Speed bumps don't appear to work!

Priority.

20MPH ZONES ESSENTIAL, INCLUDE CHICANES ON POPULAR RAT RUNS.

Not 20mph Limits

Chicanes are dangerous and unsightly. As our minor roads are not salted in winter, chicanes would prove hazardous. Driving is difficult enough

Strong support of need to slow traffic to 20mph if needed. Cameras and speed measures work - chicanes etc are a pain

Would prefer average speed cameras rather than humps and chicanes - keep traffic moving, minimise stop/start traffic, lower impact on vehicle suspension. 20mph limit for village centre is sensible, if enforced.

We live on Forest Road and the amount of HGVs is increasing. They travel over the speed limit and it is extremely dangerous. the pathway is also narrow due to overgrown hedges.

Should be 20mph around the schools and shops.

Need pedestrian crossings and stop awful parking with houses who have no drives.

The whole Village should be 20mph.

A mini roundabout is required at the junction of School Lane and Weaverham Road.

RAT runs, Norley rd en-route to Warrington . A disgrace. Traffic light 'Jumping' @ A49 junction. Disasterious accidents waiting to happen. A lot of traffic in direction of

Warrington . Further on the Sandiway estate thro roads.
 Strongly support. Poplar Close is like a by-pass and dangerous. Car's been clipped twice now in four years.
 Already more than adequate. Any more would make life unbearable.
 I approve of traffic calming measures but I hope that it will NOT be a combination of speed bumps and 20mph as is the case on London Road Leftwich
 Self regulating speed signs
 Calming bumps needed from the A556 along Weaverham Road to the cross roads
 I remain wholly unconvinced that sleeping policemen and 20 limits increase safety
 Enables children to walk to school/ and others to access local amenities safely. NB to 20mph policy a comment has been added ' plus speed cameras which actually work to deter.
 Prefer chicanes to speed bumps.
 Any traffic calming measures that make the village safer.
 Enough chicanes - cause hold ups.
 Yes to reduced speed limits. No to chicanes.
 Norley Road between cross roads and Delamere Park by Brook Farm and Brook Cottages IS A DEATH TRAP.
 Definitely NOT. Locals should not suffer such primitive and useless solutions which only waste tax payers money
 We are in favour of traffic calming but not of speed humps. They do long term damage to vehicles even at low speeds.
 Weaverham Road (where the yellow lines are) - cars travel at 40mph plus on here.
 There is a school!!!. Speed camera required.
 Clearly Norley Road has become a rat run and should be 20mph because of school, village hall and concealed entrances.
 All caused by poor planning and no thought for the overall effects of whatever is being built.
 With reservations as tyres wearing on insides with presents ones in Norley Road
 Reduced speed limits rather than physical measures
 Does not slow down larger vehicles. Usually flouted. Not needed during school hours
 Speed bumps are ruinous to tyres and do not make cars go much slower
 A49 Cuddington crossroads to traffic lights at Eden Grange should be 30 mph (not 60mph)
 Doesn't limit volume of traffic which is the issue
 No to chicanes, no to traffic calming. Average speed cameras covering 20 mph area?
 Speed bumps in Norley Road are ineffective. We need chicanes and 20mph. we also need cameras on traffic lights on A49/Norley Road
 not speed bumps - create noise and increase wear and tear on tyres
 Chicanes and speed humps are a pain and increase frustration. Do they really achieve anything?
 All roads inside the A556, A49, Norley road should be 20mph
 Not sure about this one. Chicanes could add to the problems ,
 No sleeper bumps please.
 You have allowed 3 sets of traffic lights on A49 & Chester Road creating rat runs down lanes such as Cuddington Lane & Mill Lane.
 If there is a village 20mph measure it should be enforced not by the use of chicanes and traffic calming obstructions.
 I oppose these.
 Not a fan of road calming schemes. But 20mph round schools essential.
 Chicanes are good idea. 20mph needs policing to work.
 Weaverham road/School Lane needs addressing. At peak(pm) times in winter there is a collision on average each week! Speeding and near miss while I try to cross the road & aggressive drivers towards residents trying to get off drive.
 Please no more speed humps. Reduction from 40mph on Norley Road would be

appreciated.

No chicanes!

From Delamere Park via Norley Road to the station. Cqrs drive at high speed despite the walkers.

Weaverham Road: reduced speed and wieght limit urgently needed on the 'rat run'.

Speed is still a killer so all these proposals should achieve a result.

Support the introduction of 20 mph outside the schools but LIMITED to school start and end times - like Delamere school.

traffic calming yes. 20 mph NO

Do not help - Just cause a potential hazard. Would like to see traffic cameras (and enforcement) at White Barn as too many "jump" the lights

Country lanes have too much traffic at speed eg Cuddington Lane - now on SAT NAV route A49 to A556.

Enough measures in place already.

Agree with reduced speeds but please NO HUMPS

Speed limits yes, but not those awful sleeping policemen

This has a negative effect as encourages false sense of safety.

Both chicanes and very low speed limits cause more problems than they solve.

All except 20mph, do not feel this is of use.

Excessive speeds on Norley Road and Weaverham Road need addressing.

20 mph impossibly frustrating - humps better

But please no sleeping policemen as on Norley Road.

Increasing numbers of driving school cars contribute to congestion around shops and on East Lane, West and Moss Lane.

Not really sure it is feasible.

I don't feel we need more sleeping policemen or speed bumps

This is the most definitely needed aspect of the survey.

Address and name provided on form. Comment Speed limit Round Tower to Church X roads 30mph. Mini roundabout at X roads before I or you have a serious accident.

Do NOT use chicanes - they just cause traffic jams and frustration or speed humps - they wreck cars and buildings

But not sleeping policemen which can damage cars. I try to avoid Norley Road

No speed bumps as a traffic calming measure

Speed limits and 'humps' ok. Chicanes can cause problems e.g. York, etc. Derbyshire

As I live on the 'rat run' which is School Lane, I hope School Lane will be included in any proposes 20mph speed limit.

Redesign speed bumps to reduce vehicle damage

A 20 mph speed limit is needed on Weaverham Road. It is a speed track. There are nor traffic lights or pedestrian crossings.

Privided that measures don't make it more dangerous e.g. chicanes.

Only the areas adjacent to the schools need this provision.

Agree to spped limits

Walk everywhere - finding it hard to cross roads

Support speed limit reduction but not chicanes or speed bumps as they impede flow.

Only if required

No speed bumps to ruin cars. Chicanes, speed limit much better.

As long and the measures are not "speed bumps"; these produce more noise, nuisance and damage (structural via vibration) than speeding cars.

20 mph zones are sensible, as long as they are very small, and for a particular reason, outside a school for example. Whole swathes of 20 mph zones are regularly ignored. I would prefer better enforcement of 30 mph zones.

Please ensure that there is not a proliferation of lumps in the road as these can damage cars and nearby buildings

Note A49 extension of 40mph limit as policy 21 comment.

Consider reduced speed limit on Eden Grange development, 20mph?
Traffic lights are required at the crossroads (Weaverham Road & Norley Road) by the church, where there have been many accidents.
All residential areas where there are care homes, schools, shops, and railway stations should be protected by 20mph zones. This would help people crossing roads, support cyclists at junctions and reduce severity of any collisions.
I do not support a 20mph speed limit but more steps should be taken to enforce existing restrictions
Weaverham Road/School Lane needs both traffic calming measures- it is a main walking route towards Sandiway school. Also the cross roads junction at Weaverham Road and Norley Road is a high hazard requiring some form of control e.g. mini roundabout.
Oh my goodness!! Yes finally, can you do a 20mph down Ash road. Its the 60mph zone at the minute for the residents off the new estate racing down. My child was nearly ran over!!
The amount of traffic in the village is very manageable unless there is a major issue on the A49 or A556, enforcing 20mph zones with no police present, chicanes cause more misery than already have.
Junction of Weaverham Road and Norley Road needs attention.
Speeding on Norley Road passing the bowling green.
The road network within the A49/A556/Norley Road triangle should all have a very much reduced speed limit, particularly Weaverham Road which is a walking route for schoolchildren and regularly sees excessive speeding.
There is already a sporadic problem with congestion at the existing pinch points within the Parish. Adding more pinch points will not prevent people from using the route, it will just add to the congestion.
No more speed bumps please. They are a nuisance.
In support of 20mph limits in the village and housing areas but against the introduction of more speed bumps etc

Travel and Movement aspirations (1)

The Delamere park service was cut due to lack of demand
I think extending hours buses run would be better.
Only if it does not increase current journey times on existing routes or decrease current frequency.
I have not heard good things about the local bus service, in particular the Chester service.
village requires bus service with more frequency too.
Services to Delamere Park are less important, as residents bought those houses in the knowledge there was no public transport there at the time.
I work in Winsford and would use public transport

But I need to get either 2 buses or 2 trains
The timing of busses needs to be synchronised with the times of the trains running into and out of railway stations.

Bus routes on the A49 North and South would be a big improvement.

Trains leaving Chester at a later hour would reduce traffic into Chester and open entertainment possibilities for the local community.
we need a bus service near the shops and station in Norley Road. We haven't had one for years.
The previous MP tried and failed. So must persist again

Don't waste money

2 or 3 electric buses to circulate frequently within Sandiway and Cuddington with periodic trips to Hartford Station and Delamere Park.

This measure would stop Delamere residents from parking opposite the shops.

I hold a bus pass. I cannot use 3/4 mile walk to the nearest bus stop - I am disabled Strongly. Weaverham circular to include up to D. Park. Weaverham residents need the bus up and down the A49 to the station and we need it for school and shops in Weaverham. Now there is no free school bus there could be a small business opening for a local circular early morning and mid afternoon extra continuous service - mid-day late evening less frequent

Only if viable (a) in terms of usage (b) if extra council tax acceptable will never ever get used - uneconomic - perhaps dial a ride better?

Unfortunately the local Councillors are retired and in bed at 07.00. The worst of the traffic is commute traffic not school run. Worst speeding volume of traffic 06.00 to 07.30, School Lane/ weaverham R8ad.

We do need an improved bus service particularly after (afternoons?) and evenings It should be combined with restrictions on car parking.

Strongly agree.

Probably impractical financially to include DP but certainly including the station in the route would be sensible.

+ Weaverham High School.

Essential other villages have better services

No opinion - never use a bus

Remove local parking and traffic.

Need more buses. Shelter replaced in School Lane.

Is there any hope of returning to a half hourly service between Northwich and Chester If public transport was CLEAN and RELIABLE we would reduce cars on the road - AS IMPORTANT!!

See comments under Policy 19.

Alter the bus route via station for odd hours e.g. 09.00, 11.00 etc.

A bus service to Weaverham would be useful

Increasing number of elderly non drivers on D.Pk with no buss link

Unlikely to use this ourselves, however we support the idea but others likely to use it.

With a family on the park from 2-75 years a bus service would benefit all

Please improve train service between Cuddington and Manchester

The age of bus services has gone. Let it die. Extend rail/tram ways.

VERY STRONGLY SUPPORT THIS POLICY

For folk with mobility problems the local bus service is non-existent in many lanes.

Only if commercially viable.

Community bus fare issued and paid centrally (everyone pays). Extra support through charge on Parish rates.

Bus services are poor compared to Weaverham.

Excellent idea. There is a need for this, I am very supportive of this. Greener ways.

Section of road from Define wines to Blakemere is where we need speed cameras.

Not an F1 track!

Strongly support this

Bus services require urgent attention to improve current situation.

Can we have adequate services for existing areas first.

But the bus service is unreliable at the present time - could this be improved

Absolutely

There used to be a bus service to Delamere.

Definitely

Please

Delamere Park. There is no public transport - Please remember non-drivers

Definitely

Public transport and safe walking routes to Delamere Park are vital
We need a bus service in Delamere Park

Yes

A MUST HAVE IN MY OPINION

The new No 82 bus service is very poor - no Sunday service. Weekdays start late and finish early plus long intervals (1 hr or more) between buses. As well as extending bus service we need a better main bus service. If extended bus service is infrequent it will be little used.

People on Delamere Park rely on friends to give lifts to shops and buses if they do not drive.

No longer drive - stranded!!

Should be private investment and undertaken upon justification

Much needed/ required.

Fine at the station (which needs extending) but schools are already very busy at peak times and don't need long term parking. Needs more consultaion.

Also to include Cuddington

Sunday buses

Long overdue

Form ticks support for buses but not support improved parking

Not sure

This would ease parking. The sation should haave a bus service

An improved bus service (#82) is required between Northwich and Chester. This, plus another, is the only way to get to Leighton hospital and they don't (or didn't) connect in Northwich for a return journey (should you be lucky enough to survive the hospital!).

A left turn out of Cuddington railway station into Norley Road is nearly 360 degrees!

Once you get in the car you want to stay in the car. Better to not use the car at all.

Good for travel into Chester but little else.

Increased parking at railway station might be helpful.

Would rather see improved parking at schools for staff to get cars off the roads. Can school buses be made affordable to reduce number of parents transporting individual children to school by car? Travel in school holidays is not easier because parents are off work - only a few have term time work contracts....

It must be proved that there is viable demand for additional bus services otherwise the cost falls upon the council tax payer. Unless the village becomes a giant car park, there is no space for significant additional parking. It is quite easy to walk to all locations in the village

Okay, so at school time, its a ten minute manic time. Ten minutes of chaos. Don't care that people block me in for ten minutes. Again, just leave the village as it is. Or open the gate at the back of Cuddington Primary school so the people dont drive round, they can walk straight from the new estate into the school playground. But yet again that was another PUCK up wasn't it because the gate has to be manned and the school don't have someone to stand there. What a balls up!!! The gates been locked for a year. Thick people, thick professionals who are dumber than dumb.

Any attempt to increase public transport usage to help relieve the roads must be encouraged.

Improved public transport options are always welcome. However more important is to increase the frequency of provision, extend provision to earlier in the morning (for commuters) and later in the evening (for the evening economy, especially public houses) and reduce journey times. Simply extending the routes of exisitng buses to include extra stops would be detrimental to all of the objectives (except of course to the miority who are currently too far from a bus route). We need more buses, and more

bus drivers, and more shifts. Comfortable and clean buses also help encourage bus use, as does appropriate pricing which reflects the shared nature of the transport (that is, lower cost than driving yourself).

I note that the existing bus service (no 82) has been reduced in the last month, cutting frequency from half hourly in the day to hourly and cutting the Sunday service entirely. Hardly a step in the right direction.

Yes, but they must run regularly and on time!

Faster trains into Manchester would encourage more people to use. Currently it is quicker to drive

Can the frequency of the train service be increased between Chester/Manchester. Possibly with an express service calling at less stops.

Travel and Movement aspirations (2)

No bus service to the north of Cuddington station to cover the OAP's who live north of A49

More parking at railway station essential if we ever get extended bus service

Very important.

With the number of children proposed for Cuddington School more parking will have to be provided - but where?

Parking at ash road during school drop and pick up times are dreadful, double yellow lines should be extended to reduce this problem.....

depending on where and how implemented.

Including use of the existing bus service.

Double yellow lines on Weaverham road beside the school and beyond would help in reducing congestion and danger for pedestrians.

Although not a high priority for Budget spending.

Better transport from DP to alleviate parking problems in village

Cuddington School needs extra parking to ensure safety of children.

Much needed.

The linkage between parking and use of buses needs to be demonstrated

Motorists don't use the bus, they drive. Improved parking at the railway station will not make much difference as only about a maximum of 25 cars are parked there.

Strongly agree. On weekdays the railway station car park is often full after the morning commute making it difficult for residents who do not live within walking distance but who would otherwise use the train to travel to other locations such as Chester and other major centres to avoid having to park in those places.

Include the churches.

These car parks are already busy/full.

NEW CYCLE PATHS SO NO CAR PARK REQUIRED.

No opinion

Parking at station and schools is adequate

People using the bus service are much more likely to be walking or being dropped off, so parking provision isn't a priority. For the station, more parking would probably be useful, but where it would be located is questionable.

Locals need to walk to local amenities

I don't feel that parking in/around the Village has ever been an issue.

New parking at both schools priority.

And so should be in consultation with providers.

Schools yes.

Unclear where land for car parking would be found. Encourage walking?

Very urgent at Cuddington School.

See above - unlikely to use so neutral opinion

Paint lines in Sandiway school car park. The quality of parking and wasted space is horrific.

Essential

Car parking needs to be free

A noble objective but is this a realistic possibility?

Residents should be able to access bus stops on the extended bus service unless disabled. Short car journeys should be discouraged. The whole purpose of an extended bus service is surely to reduce car use where a viable alternative is offered. Once again not sure. Locals could walk to the schools, stations and community buildings instead of going by car. A healthier and cleaner way of getting there. I accept sometimes a car is essential but not always

People should be encouraged to walk more for their general health and wellbeing. Unlikely to be deliverable.

Parking round shops more important.

More parking for Cuddington Primary School.

Cuddington School is expanding. Pupils come from Winsford & Northwich. Need a drop off lane.

Need a reliable bus service.

Stop parking outside schools

Excellent idea - extended bus service will be a great improvement

The 82 bus route must be improved. Why produce a timetable!!!

At the same time penalise on street parking adjacent to the schools by those who are too lazy to use the car park.

YES, YES, YES

Need MUCH more emphasis on public transport.

But economically uneconomic for more buses - more parking yes

Should include along Ash Road and surrounding roads.

Yes - maybe that would make people use trains, etc.

Feel we should be aiming to reduce car usage and encourage walking to these locations.

Cuddington School, Ash Road, and also Mere Lane shops.

Viable?

People should walk more to these places. School cars a problem.

Where is extra parking - old goods yard Cuddington Station? Note Acton Bridge site for big car park.

Much needed!