**ALVINGTON NDP AREA**

**NDP 1ST CONSULTATION EVENT SUMMARY**

# General Comments

* The event took place on Sunday 23rd October 2016 between 10.00am and 4.00pm and held as a drop in session at Alvington Memorial Hall

* The NDP event outlined the history of the area with photographs, local history information and maps dating back to the 19th century. There were themed displays: Housing, Transport, Traffic and Road Safety, Flooding, Environment, Work and Infrastructure themed information. Reports, planning documents and character assessments of the area could also be viewed.

* The event was advertised through:

The Alvington Parish website and newsletter which reaches every household in the Parish

Posters on the Parish noticeboard and in the village hall. Flyers were available in the local pubs and village hall Email invitations to key stakeholders and partners.

* 109 people signed in with a non-obligatory signature but obligatory postcode. The average time people spent at the event was 45 minutes- 1 hour.

* A questionnaire was given to every attendee and also available online. Many people filled in the questionnaire over refreshments where they had the opportunity to discuss issues. Members of the Steering Group and the Glos Rural Community Council Community Adviser were on hand to answer questions and encourage comments.

# Consultation

Attendees were consulted on the following:

* Distinctive character.
* Housing, Transport, Traffic and Road Safety, Flooding, Environment, Work and Infrastructure.
* What people liked about Alvington and what could be improved
* Priority topics
* The comments were analysed externally

**Questionnaire**

76 questionnaires were completed from a wide postcode area. The age range was as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AGE | up to 11 | 12- 17 | 18 - 25 | 26 - 59 | Age 60+ | No age ticked |
| Nos. of respondents | 5 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 35 | 3 |

**Key Points from the Questionnaire**

Respondents generally liked the quiet, peaceful rural countryside and friendly community. There were some comments about accessibility for commuting.

Improvements were mainly around road safety, traffic and the A48. Other improvements were the general look of the village and facilities. Lack of broadband and mobile phone coverage were the major infrastructure comments but general infrastructure considerations when developments were permitted were a concern.
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Numbers of comments by topic

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1.What do you like?** | | |  |  | **2. What could be improved** | | |  |
| **Countryside/ scenery** | **peace & quiet** | **Community** | **Small size** | **Access** | **A48/**  **traffic** | **facilities/ tidiness** | **transport** | **Infra structure** | **Develop ment** |
| **25** | **10** | **7** | **19** | **13** | **40** | **27** | **11** | **8** | **16** |

Priorities from the questionnaire in order of importance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very important | % | Quite important | % | Not important | % | No opinion | No  reply |
| a) traffic/Road safety | 50 | **61%** | 22 | **27%** | 0 | **0%** | **2** | **8** |
| r) Footpaths | 42 | **51%** | 26 | **32%** | 3 | **4%** | **1** | **11** |
| b) Local character | 41 | **50%** | 29 | **35%** | 3 | **4%** |  | **9** |
| g) Environment | 37 | **45%** | 32 | **39%** | 0 | **0%** |  | **13** |
| f) Public Transport | 33 | **40%** | 28 | **34%** | 7 | **9%** | **3** | **11** |
| o) Fuel station/ store | 33 | **40%** | 27 | **33%** | 8 | **10%** | **1** | **13** |
| c) Buildings design | 30 | **37%** | 32 | **39%** | 8 | **10%** | **2** | **10** |
| k) Education | 27 | **33%** | 23 | **28%** | 10 | **12%** | **7** | **15** |
| q) Pubs | 26 | **32%** | 26 | **32%** | 10 | **12%** | **6** | **14** |
| d) Heritage | 26 | **32%** | 35 | **43%** | 5 | **6%** | **3** | **13** |
| n) Facilities for young people | 26 | **32%** | 31 | **38%** | 6 | **7%** | **6** | **13** |
| p) Church | 24 | **29%** | 24 | **29%** | 15 | **18%** | **8** | **11** |
| i) Health Facilities | 22 | **27%** | 29 | **35%** | 14 | **17%** | **2** | **15** |
| m)Facilities for older people | 22 | **27%** | 39 | **48%** | 3 | **4%** | **6** | **12** |
| e) Sports | 21 | **26%** | 31 | **38%** | 11 | **13%** | **5** | **14** |
| l) Affordable Housing | 19 | **23%** | 25 | **30%** | 15 | **18%** | **9** | **14** |
| j) Employment | 18 | **22%** | 28 | **34%** | 17 | **21%** | **5** | **14** |
| h) Arts | 5 | **6%** | 19 | **23%** | 28 | **34%** | **14** | **16** |

# Key Points from Comments

People were asked what they value under specific headings: Housing, Transport, Traffic and Road Safety, Flooding, Environment, Work and Infrastructure.

Housing: Issues around sustainability alongside no building on farmland and better infrastructure for existing homes as well as infrastructure considerations for new developments.

Transport: Necessity for car ownership and lack of good public transport. Use of train with a bus service to the station.

Traffic and Road Safety: Too much traffic, size of lorries and speeds of vehicles. Safety issues and need for an A48 crossing. Safety issues around Clanna Lane and A48 junction. Parking issues especially around the Goble pub.

Flooding: Flooding has worsened over 20 years. Do not build on ‘flood plain’. Issues around specific areas at Swan Hill and Clanna.

Environment: Extend the conservation area to include Knapp Lane. Comments on footpaths and better maintenance. Village environment- control of signage.

Work: No comments

Work and Infrastructure: Lack of mobile phone coverage and poor broadband. Better drainage at Clanna.
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