

Feed back on Policy Proposals

October 2014 held at the United Reform Church

Recreation

R1 We aim to protect the existing green spaces and safeguard more

The village must have some thoughtful expansion

The Village (*neighbourhood*) Plan must be used together with the original Village Plan of 2005.

The Green Wedge must be preserved as stated in an Inspector's comments of a previous planning applic (*ation*) for the land off Main Road

Easier access to village hall and parking could be achieved by making the section of road between Dukes ave and East Street one way. This could then be used as parking for the shops too. Half the road could be a parking bay with time limits to stop any unnecessary parking.

The inadequacy of the village hall is mind-blowing! no parking, narrow pavement, difficult access for old people. Something needs to be done!

Any new development must be accompanied by an effective flood alleviation scheme. Priority!!

When the Hickley Park and Ride is finished it will be a "Brown Site"- ideal to develop for a completely up to date, 21st Century "Community Centre"-with a properly equipped kitchen, seating, screen for films, partitioning, etc., etc.,

All above (*R1+R2+R3*) are commendable- however, our desire is that the village community atmosphere not be compromised- by indiscriminate, development.

Finally Cannington is a rural village/not an open plan to make it a town!!!

Why can't ball games be played on green areas? e.g. Oak Tree (Way) Drive. Could the school field be open for football /games during school holidays?

Could the playing field between Northbrook and Main Road become a football/playing field in its place?

Red/ Green dot map-(refers to plan of village used to demonstrate preferences)

Development on the skyline is wrong. Away from the ridge of the Downs should only be allowed

The western approach should be kept Green.

Green RLT areas within the village boundary should be kept that way.

Is not Popham's field an existing green space?

Cannington is FULL

Housing

H1 Priority to sites within the village development boundary

Red/ Green dot map-(refers to plan of village used to demonstrate preferences)

Keep existing village development boundary

DO NOT have more housing. We already have Brownings estate

Required housing could be built on land adjacent to the roundabout at the eastern end of the bypass, next to existing housing estate.

H2 What Development Looks Like

Development should be done on a much more individual basis; not mass housing all alike. This is completely contrary to every human's psyche

I think emphasis should be put on affordable housing and preferably not one large development but smaller ones.

Anything that can be done in respect of traffic and parking would be welcome!

H3 Policy comments

A green wedge to be protected and enlarged, and any new housing by the by pass so it doesn't affect the existing parts of the village detrimentally.

No new housing off the new by pass by Brymore

Local people often have strong after the event (when housing is to be developed). So, their opinions must be sought before planning takes place and, sad to say, as people are all so busy and don't readily attend meetings, it may mean that opinions must be sought by door to door questioning.

No more housing in Rodway and more flood protection at the bottom of Rodway Hill by the playing field.

Affordable housing should be a priority. Family housing essential.

Small developments (,) not estates (,)with green space for play areas.

Take into consideration the flood areas-don't use them!

Once the (*new*) bypass built- traffic calming along Main Road

Despite extensive, past flood relief measures flooding in Cannington has got much worse.

To build even more houses in Cannington would only "increase" our major flooding problems. It would also be an act of "criminal" insanity.

"We cannot stop all development... If we can't then this is NOT a democracy