

urban imprint

Consultation Report

Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan

November 2016



Project name and Number:
16-010 Thrussington NP
Document Name and Revision:
Consultation Report
Prepared by:
JM
Reviewed By:
Date of Issue:

Contents

1. Introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2. Initial residents consultation.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3. Initial residents survey	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4. Conclusion	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Consultation Report

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This document sets out the methodology and actions taken for each step of consultation held for the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan.
- 1.2. Each chapter represents a different stage of consultation and the key findings and outcomes from these stages are summarised in the chapters.

2. Initial Residents Consultation

Consultation Report

What was carried out?

- 2.1. An initial consultation for the Thrussington Neighbourhood Plan was held with residents on 2nd July 2016. Residents were informed of the consultation via leaflets, which were sent to all homes in the village. Copies of the flyers are contained under **Appendix A**.

Presentation being given to residents



- 2.2. At the start of the consultation, a presentation was given by Urban Imprint to inform residents of the neighbourhood plan process, its purpose, and how they can get involved with it.
- 2.3. Residents were then asked to fill in SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis diagrams regarding key issues in their village and suggested solutions to the issues identified. Six subject areas had been previously chosen for the Thrussington Neighbourhood plan, which residents gave their views on during the consultation event.
- 2.4. After the event, residents comments on the subject areas would then be analysed in order to identify key issues in the village. These would help develop the next stage of consultation; the residents survey.



Tables set out with maps and diagrams for residents to leave comments on

Summary from the consultation

- 2.5. The following sections summarise the key findings for the six subject area:

Housing

- 2.6. A lack of bungalows and smaller, more affordable housing for young families was identified. Residents wished for development projects to cater specifically for what the community needed. Concern was raised that too much development would encourage migration from cities, which could potentially ruin the community and exacerbate transport issues.

Transport

- 2.7. Residents raised issues of speeding through the village. Safety issues were also identified with regards to Hoby Road and the junction

Consultation Report

between the A46 and Seagrave Road due to lack of proper footpaths. Parking was also raised as a serious issue in several locations around the village, which again had impacts on the safety of pedestrians as well as other road users. Suggestions were made for cycle paths, extension of bus services, and parking deterrents.

Business and economic activity

2.8. Poor mobile and broadband services came up as a common issue, while it was felt that other local services were adequate. Residents commented that more community events could be held in the village in order to improve cohesion in the village.

Environment

2.9. There was generally a positive attitude towards the current situation of the village's surrounding environment. Several complaints were made about the sewage system. Concerns were raised that development projects may harm the surrounding environment and spoil the natural beauty of the area, as well as possibly contributing towards surface run-off and flooding.

Leisure and recreation

2.10. In general, residents were satisfied with the current leisure and recreation in the village, however there was a strong consensus that more could be provided for children and young people. The safety of children around the village because of parking and traffic issues was raised here.

Design and heritage

2.11. Residents felt a strong sense of community in the village. Issues identified here were aimed at potential developments impacting on the character of the village. Road and pavement design was raised again as a safety issue.

Conclusions from the consultation

2.12. The most common issue identified in this consultation session was the severity of traffic and parking in the village, along with mobility of pedestrians and their safety. There was strong support for the creation of more recreational areas for children. There was also much support for improvements to be made to the river and river banks.



Consultation Report

3. Initial Residents Survey

What was carried out?

- 3.1. In summer of 2016, a resident's survey, designed by Urban Imprint, was sent out to all homes in Thrussington. The survey contained questions on the six subject areas identified and previously discussed during the initial consultation. These questions had been tailored through the initial consultation responses, as well as through further discussions with the steering group, so that they could deliver a better understanding of the key issues which the neighbourhood plan should address. A copy of the survey can be viewed in [Appendix B](#).
- 3.2. Overall, 148 responses from the survey were gathered, which represents a 25% response from the total population of the parish, however this is likely to be much higher due to many surveys being completed on behalf of the household.
- 3.3. The responses in the completed surveys were then collated and the results were analysed. A summary document of the survey was produced and sent to the Steering Group, as well as the raw data sheet showing the full combined results and comments.

Summary from the survey

Age demographic

- 3.4. The survey results showed that the largest age brackets of those in the village were people between 51-64 and 65+. Over half of the population were of working age (20-64yrs).

Housing

- 3.5. Mixed views were held over housing, with many residents feeling that there was no need

for any new housing and that any additional homes would spoil the character of the village. There was also a significant number of residents who felt that there was a need for smaller sized affordable homes, bungalows and retirement homes.

Transport

- 3.6. As with the initial consultation, the resident's survey also brought up the issue of traffic and parking in the village. Several problematic sites were identified from the comments received.

Business and economic activity

- 3.7. The existing local services and pubs were strongly supported by residents. Poor broadband quality was an issue voiced by the majority of respondents in the survey.
- 3.8. Residents felt satisfied with the current facilities in the village, yet expressed the need for more facilities for children and young people.

Environment

- 3.9. Residents expressed a strong desire to protect the conservation area surrounding the village. Public open spaces were also sought to be protected from development/change. The most comment open spaces sought for protection were; the Green, the Village Hal, and the Church.

Leisure and recreation

- 3.10. Suggestions were made that current facilities in the village could be made better use of. Those facilities most desired by residents included a Post Office, cash machine, and a playground.

Consultation Report

Design and heritage

- 3.11. Views around the village and on entering it from the various road networks were highlighted by residents as highly valued assets which should be preserved.
- 3.12. Protection of heritage assets was also sought after by residents.

Conclusions from the Survey

- 3.13. The high response from this initial resident's survey provided a good understanding of the key planning issues in Thrussington.
- 3.14. It was clear from the survey that most residents would oppose large developments, however there was a notable desire for smaller scale development which offered affordable homes and bungalows.
- 3.15. Any new development would need to respect the views expressed by residents in the survey, as well as not impact upon open spaces and the conservation area.
- 3.16. Open spaces around the village which residents wanted to conserve were identified by the survey.
- 3.17. Due to the disparity between residents on housing requirements, it is likely at this point that further consultation would need to be taken on the best housing strategy for the parish.
- 3.18. The survey provided enough significant information on the other five subject areas in order for draft policies to be drawn up for these in the next phase of the neighbourhood plan process.



Urban Imprint Limited
16 -18 Park Green
Macclesfield
SK11 7NA

01625 265232
info@urbanimprint.co.uk
www.urbanimprint.co.uk