
Landulph Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

Public Consultation 5 Residents Survey

Results:
Analysis of responses.

February 2017

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Profile of respondents completing the questionnaire (Demographics)	5
3. Quantitative Questions	6
4. Text Questions	13
5. Open comments on separate sheet (Q36)	14
6. Full set of text responses as submitted	16

Landulph Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

Residents Survey - Analysis and Results

1) Introduction:

The main survey results are presented in a series of tables aligned to the questions and their format. They are presented in order in 4 distinct sections:

1. Profile of respondents completing the questionnaire (Demographics)
2. Quantitative Questions
3. Text Questions
4. Open comments on separate sheet (Q36)

It is intended that the main results can be simply read by looking at the question, reading the brief summary bullet points underneath for part 2 and then considering the tables with the result detail.

Following the main summary report is the full set of text responses as submitted.

The purpose of this supporting narrative is not interpretive but is an attempt by the analysis team to:

- highlight limitations and shortcomings of the process
- explain some of the terminology used in the various report tables
- highlight limitations due to data anomalies
- make observations about validity of the findings.
- prevent potential misuse of the results
- encourage meaningful interpretation

The survey was distributed throughout the parish by hand by volunteers. The completed documents were collected. The number actually delivered is not known to the analysis team so the response rate has not been calculated. By various means the responses found their way back to one central point. At this point although there appears to have been some initial review the completed questionnaires were not logged numerically.

On arrival with the analysis team all responses were numbered and the core data extracted in numerical and text format against the set questions posed. It was noted that there was also a significant number with random comments written in various places on the survey document outside the questionnaire format. This has neither been recorded or commented on in the results. Although such comment can sometimes be interesting and appealing they are single opinions and therefore have no validity in respect to an enquiry where a majority view is sought.

Percentages

Percentages have been used in different ways to help determine opinion against various questions raised.

In most tables the % expressing an opinion is stated. This percentage is calculated using the total number of questionnaires returned compared with the number who actually expressed an opinion.

In some cases respondents were given the option of 'No opinion' but many simply did not answer the question. To some extent both factors can be taken as an expression of the level of interest the respondents have in a particular subject/issue.

Also within the tables percentages are used to show the relationship between answers. It should be noted however that these are calculated only for those who expressed an opinion. What those who chose not to answer were thinking must then be considered, particularly where there are a lot of them.

Comparability quotient

In some cases where multiple options have been offered for consideration against a set scale a comparability quotient has been calculated to try and enable the reader to differentiate between areas of interest. It should be noted that these can only be used within the individual questions as they each deal with inconsistent scales. What the numbers indicate is identified on each table and should enable differing levels of positivity to be inferred.

Although the comparability quotient numbers are expressed clearly the calculation of standard deviation and confidence limits has not been pursued in detail as the overall numbers are small. Care should then be taken, where numbers are close, not to draw conclusions from the small differences.

The comparability quotient becomes most useful in the questions which were multiple factors gauged on a scale of importance. In earlier drafts the suggestion of a priority format of response against criteria was rejected and in some cases the outcome is therefore that everything is important. The comparability quotient then goes some way to indicate the degree of importance in a more meaningful way.

Demographics

The demographic questions (32, 33, 34 & 35) raise some other issues. It is not clear who the responses actually represent. A question about the whole household and who was represented by the response might have been helpful. Similarly although primary school and secondary school numbers were collected the number of pre-school children was not collected.

Free text questions

Some questions (13, 14, 16, 17, 24a & 24b) asked for free text responses to questions. The responses in their totality are included as part of the results. In order to try and overview the answers a crude sorting by theme process has been adopted to take the results into a numeric context. The intention here is to give an indication of the enthusiasm for various responses in broad terms. Although it is always dangerous to consider low number responses as credible, in this case it should be remembered that some may simply be things that others have not thought of and therefore may be valuable for further consideration in due course.

Open comments on separate sheet were invited relating to the plan objectives and policies.(Q36). This attracted very few responses (5). Of these two were an absolutely identical typed script, two responded in line with the question request and one took the opportunity to expand over a range of the previous answers as well. These are all included at the end of this report.

2) Profile of Respondents who filled in questionnaire for self or household

	Where respondents live	Total	%
1	In Cargreen	94	60.6%
2	Just outside Cargreen	29	18.7%
3	Elsewhere in the parish	23	14.8%
4	Outside the parish	4	2.6%
	Did not answer this question	5	3.2%
	Totals	155	100.0%

	Age band of person filling in questionnaire	Total	%
1	18 to 24	0	0.0%
2	25 to 34	5	3.2%
3	35 to 44	24	15.5%
4	45 to 54	27	17.4%
5	55 to 64	25	16.1%
6	65 or over	65	41.9%
7	2 bands declared	3	1.9%
	Did not answer this question	6	3.9%
	Totals	155	100.0%

	Gender of person filling in questionnaire	Total	%
1	Female	60	38.7%
2	Male	78	50.3%
3	Both declared	11	7.1%
	Did not answer this question	6	3.9%
	Totals	155	100.0%

NOTE: Where 'both declared' only 1 is counted in the total

	Children under 18 in household in school	Total households answering	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	Total School Age Children
1	In primary school	14	5	6	3	26
2	In secondary school	22	12	10	0	32

6 households responding had children in both primary and secondary school

NOTE: A request for the number of preschool children was not included in the questionnaire

3) Results of quantitative questions in numerical format

		Did not answer	None		Up to 10		Up to 20		Up to 30		More than 30		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
1	Thinking about a possible number of new homes that could be built between now and 2030, how many do you think is appropriate for our Parish?	5	6	4.0%	47	31.3%	55	36.7%	38	25.3%	4	2.7%	150	97%

A small overall majority indicated the 'Up to 20' option as their preference. There were however significant numbers who indicated the 'Up to 10' and 'Up to 30' options as a preference with the former being the preference of the two.

		Did not answer	Very suitable		Fairly Suitable		Not very suitable		Not suitable		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Higher number = lower suitability	
2	Bearing in mind your answers to the previous question, how suitable to you think each of the following are for the location and grouping of new housing in Landulph Parish?	Within Cargreen	18	24	18.5%	56	43.1%	29	22.3%	21	16.2%	7	130	84%	2.81
		Outside Cargreen	25	29	23.2%	71	56.8%	15	12.0%	10	8.0%	5	125	81%	2.39
		On brownfield sites	26	49	39.8%	54	43.9%	7	5.7%	13	10.6%	6	123	79%	2.16
		Redevelopment of other buildings	16	63	47.0%	59	44.0%	9	6.7%	3	2.2%	5	134	86%	1.85
		Developments of small numbers (maximum of 5) in one location	27	33	26.6%	64	51.6%	16	12.9%	11	8.9%	4	124	80%	2.38
		Developments of small numbers (maximum of 5) in several locations	16	40	29.2%	66	48.2%	13	9.5%	18	13.1%	2	137	88%	2.42
		Developments of larger numbers (greater than 5) in one location	18	12	8.9%	26	19.3%	36	26.7%	61	45.2%	2	135	87%	3.77
		Developments of larger numbers (greater than 5) in several locations	18	6	4.4%	18	13.2%	36	26.5%	76	55.9%	1	136	88%	4.12
Infill in and around existing dwellings	13	31	22.3%	64	46.0%	21	15.1%	23	16.5%	3	139	90%	2.68		

Overall there is a small preference for development to be 'Outside Cargreen'.

Overall there is a small preference for development to be the 'Redevelopment of other buildings' rather than using 'Brownfield sites'. 'Infill in and around existing dwellings' was the least favoured option but overall was still seen as suitable by the majority.

The majority thought that 'Developments of small numbers (maximum of 5)' in one location or in several locations were more suitable than other options for more than 5 in a development which the majority saw as unsuitable.

		Did not answer	Need a lot more		Need a few more		About right		Too many already		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher need	
3	What do you think about the current composition of housing in Landulph Parish?	Affordable homes to rent	10	15	12.9%	48	41.4%	46	39.7%	7	6.0%	29	116	75%	2.85
		Affordable homes to buy	8	21	16.8%	70	56.0%	29	23.2%	5	4.0%	22	125	81%	2.52
		Retirement/sheltered homes	13	10	8.1%	47	37.9%	58	46.8%	9	7.3%	18	124	80%	3.04
		Smaller homes (1-2 bedrooms)	14	15	11.9%	55	43.7%	50	39.7%	6	4.8%	15	126	81%	2.83
		Larger family homes (3+ bedrooms)	13	7	5.4%	33	25.6%	75	58.1%	14	10.9%	13	129	83%	3.32
Holiday homes that are rented	12	1	0.8%	3	2.4%	44	35.2%	77	61.6%	18	125	81%	4.43		

'Affordable homes to buy' seem to be the biggest priority with a majority suggesting that a few more were needed.

'Smaller homes' and 'affordable homes to rent' were seen as slightly less important but the differences was minimal.

'Retirement homes' were seen as slightly less a need and 'larger homes' slightly lesser still with a majority saying current composition was about right.

Only very few people thought that there should be any more 'holiday homes that are rented'.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
4	If the opportunity was made available within Landulph Parish would you consider building your own home or a home for a family member, either by self-build or by commissioning builders?	8	68	46.3%	79	53.7%	147	95%

Although not a majority a significant number said that building a home would be considered by them if there was the opportunity.

Of the people who answered Yes to this question 28 were over 65 and 12 in the 55-64 age range

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
5	How important is it to you that new housing in Landulph be designed and in sympathy with its surroundings?	5	127	84.7%	15	10.0%	7	4.7%	1	0.7%	0	150	97%

Only very few people thought that it was not important that new housing in Landulph be designed and in sympathy with its surroundings.

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher importance	
6	When considering new housing development in Landulph how important to you is:	The visual impact upon the surrounding area	7	127	86.4%	17	11.6%	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	1	147	95%	1.22
		The protection or enhancement of existing features such as trees, hedgerows, habitats, views, archaeology	6	124	83.8%	22	14.9%	2	1.4%	0	0.0%	1	148	95%	1.23
		Good house design and good landscaping	7	119	81.5%	25	17.1%	2	1.4%	0	0.0%	2	146	94%	1.26
		A range of styles and sizes in a development	10	69	48.6%	56	39.4%	13	9.2%	4	2.8%	3	142	92%	1.88
		Housing that can be adapted to meet future needs such as bungalows or open plan housing that could accommodate a change in use such as age or disability	9	60	42.0%	56	39.2%	23	16.1%	4	2.8%	3	143	92%	2.06
	Fitting into the landscape and below the skyline	7	112	76.2%	29	19.7%	5	3.4%	1	0.7%	1	147	95%	1.38	

Only very few people thought that any of the factors were not important with a large majority in each case saying they were.

'A range of styles and sizes in a development' was seen as slightly less important than many of the factors.

'Housing that can be adapted to meet future needs such as bungalows or open plan housing that could accommodate a change in use such as age or disability' was seen as a little less important than all the other factors.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
7	Should all new housing have off street parking?	7	142	95.9%	6	4.1%	148	95%

Very few people thought that new housing should not have off street parking.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
8	Is parking a problem for you where you live?	8	40	27.2%	107	72.8%	147	95%

Although the majority said that they did not have a problem with parking a significant number said that they did.

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher importance
9	When considering the design or style of new housing in Landulph how important to you is	1	98	64.9%	43	28.5%	8	5.3%	2	1.3%	3	151	97%	1.57
		12	17	12.4%	29	21.2%	49	35.8%	42	30.7%	6	137	88%	3.46
		10	12	9.0%	24	17.9%	36	26.9%	62	46.3%	11	134	86%	3.80
		11	18	13.4%	32	23.9%	42	31.3%	42	31.3%	10	134	86%	3.41
		8	66	45.8%	57	39.6%	13	9.0%	8	5.6%	3	144	93%	1.99

Most important from the majority was that 'designs reflect locally style, proportion, detail and scale and use traditional local materials such as brick, render, clay tiles, wood and slate'.
Slightly less important but still a majority was that 'designs that aim to be carbon neutral i.e. sustainable energy use and friendly to the environment'.
The other 3 criteria were overall seen as not important by the majority of respondents.

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
10	How important is it to protect new dwellings for those who choose to live locally all year round?	4	112	75.7%	29	19.6%	4	2.7%	3	2.0%	3	148	95%

Very few people thought that it was not important to protect new dwellings for those who choose to live locally all year round

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
11	Should more business developments be encouraged which could provide jobs for residents of the parish?	5	104	69.3%	46	30.7%	150	97%

Although the majority agreed that more business developments should be encouraged which could provide jobs for residents of the parish a significant number did not agree that this should be the case.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
12	Business development could include more start-up premises or workshops. Would you welcome more of these in Landulph?	8	101	68.7%	46	31.3%	147	95%

Although the majority said that they would welcome start-up premises or workshops a significant number did not agree.

		Did not answer	Strongly support		Tend to support		Tend to oppose		Strongly oppose		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher support	
13	If you answered yes to the previous question, to what extent would you support or oppose new units being sited	Within Cargreen	63	8	9.0%	28	31.5%	32	36.0%	21	23.6%	3	89	57%	3.32
		Edges of Cargreen	58	20	21.1%	56	58.9%	9	9.5%	10	10.5%	2	95	61%	2.46
		Near the A388	53	58	58.6%	36	36.4%	2	2.0%	3	3.0%	3	99	64%	1.66
	Do you have any suggestions for specific locations?(open text)	133	22 respondents gave other suggestions which are detailed elsewhere												

The greatest support expressed was for business development being near to the A388
 Rather less support but still a majority was expressed for business development to be at the edges of Cargreen
 Although supported by a significant number the least popular choice was within Cargreen where the majority opposed business development.

		Did not answer
14	What types of businesses would you support being developed in Landulph Parish? Give examples (text)	74

81 respondents gave suggestions which are detailed elsewhere

		Did not answer	Several times a week		About once a week		About once a fortnight		About once a month		Less often		Never		Don't know	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
15	If there was a pub in Cargreen, how frequently would you use it?	4	35	24.6%	63	44.4%	15	10.6%	14	9.9%	9	6.3%	6	4.2%	9	142	92%

Only a very few people say that they would not use a pub in the village.
 A large majority said that they would use the pub once a week or more often if it was available.

		Did not answer	Gastropub		Small traditional pub		Pub with Bed & Breakfast		Pub with integrated shop		Multiple answers		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion		
16	If you would use a pub in the village, what type of pub do you think would be most sustainable?	15	16	11.4%	40	28.6%	11	7.9%	32	22.9%	41	29.3%	140	90%		
		Other suggestions for the type of pub (text)	135	20 respondents gave other suggestions which are detailed elsewhere												

When considered alongside those who answered with multiple answers it appears that the most popular outcome would be a small traditional pub for the village
 To a slightly lesser extent a pub with an integrated shop would be welcomed.
 Overall the biggest response was of multiple answers. Although not a majority the inference may be that many believe that any pub will do.

		Did not answer	Only on previous site		Elsewhere in parish		Both answers		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
17	If you answered yes to Would you use a pub, where should a pub be sited?	23	114	86.4%	12	9.1%	6	4.5%	132	85%
		Where if elsewhere? (text)	128	27 respondents gave suggestions which are detailed elsewhere						

The large majority who answered this question said they would want the pub to be only on the previous site.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
18a	Would you use a shop in Cargreen?	7	111	75.0%	37	25.0%	148	95%

The majority who answered this question said they would use a shop in Cargreen.

		Did not answer	Up to £10		Above £10 up to £20		Above £20 up to £30		Above £30 up to £40		Above £40 up to £50		Over £50		Total number expressing an opinion	% of Yes to shop expressing an opinion
18b	How much would you envisage spending per week in a shop in Cargreen? (open question)	99	20	35.7%	19	33.9%	11	19.6%	4	7.1%	1	1.8%	1	1.8%	56	50%
	NOTE: Widespread random responses have been averaged to fit a comparative framework															

The question was not answered by a significant number of people.
The majority were almost evenly split in saying they would spend 'Up to £10' or 'Above £10 up to £20'.
A smaller number said they would spend more.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
19	Do you support the building of some Live: Work properties in Landulph Parish whereby residential space is combined with designated work space such as small workshops, studios, office space to encourage home working	11	115	79.9%	29	20.1%	144	93%

The majority supported the idea of providing some 'Live-work properties in the parish.

		Did not answer	Strongly support		Tend to support		Tend to oppose		Strongly oppose		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
20	Do you support	4	8	5.6%	28	19.7%	44	31.0%	62	43.7%	9	142	92%
	More solar farms in Landulph												
	The building of wind turbines in Landulph	8	4	2.8%	35	24.6%	26	18.3%	77	54.2%	5	142	92%

The large majority were opposed to the idea of more solar farms and the building of wind turbines in the parish.
The opposition to wind turbines was slightly greater than the opposition to solar farms.

		Did not answer	Yes		No		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
21	Do you use the free bus service offered by Waitrose?	6	24	16.1%	125	83.9%	149	96%

The majority of respondents said that they did not use the free bus service.

		Did not answer	Once a day		Twice a day		Twice a week on average		Only at weekends		Multiple answers		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
22	Would you, or members of your family, use a scheduled bus service if it ran towards	82	9	12.3%	4	5.5%	39	53.4%	19	26.0%	2	2.7%	73	47%
	Saltash													
	Callington	126	5	17.2%	2	6.9%	15	51.7%	7	24.1%	0	0.0%	29	19%

The majority did not answer this question so potentially are not interested in any local bus service.
There was a greater interest in a service to Saltash rather than Callington.
Of those who did answer twice a week to either destination seems to be the most useful

		Did not answer	None		10% more		25% more		50% more		75% more		100% more		Total number expressing an opinion	% of Yes to shop expressing an opinion
23	Based on your current usage and experience, roughly how much additional traffic do you think the roads in Landulph could absorb if there were improvements to passing places not the access roads?	8	29	19.7%	86	58.5%	22	15.0%	8	5.4%	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	147	95%

The majority suggested that the maximum extra traffic which could be absorbed would be 10%
A significant minority however said there could be no more traffic absorbed whereas a slightly smaller number went the other way and suggested 25% extra would be acceptable.

			Did not answer	
24	If you have views you would like to express on the following subjects below please do so here	Village car park (open text)	92	63 respondents expressed views which are detailed elsewhere
		Hedge trimming (open text)	85	70 respondents expressed views which are detailed elsewhere

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher importance	
25	Looking at the natural features below, how important is it to protect or conserve each of the following?	Pattern of fields and hedges of farming industry	7	89	61.0%	49	33.6%	6	4.1%	2	1.4%	2	146	94%	1.62
		Farm buildings	6	64	43.5%	63	42.9%	17	11.6%	3	2.0%	2	147	95%	1.95
		Footpaths	5	127	85.8%	21	14.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	148	95%	1.19
		Bridleways	7	112	76.7%	28	19.2%	5	3.4%	1	0.7%	2	146	94%	1.37
		Cornish hedgerows	6	119	80.4%	24	16.2%	5	3.4%	0	0.0%	1	148	95%	1.31
		Views of the River Tamar	6	131	88.5%	14	9.5%	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	1	148	95%	1.19
		Access to the River Tamar	6	129	87.2%	15	10.1%	3	2.0%	1	0.7%	1	148	95%	1.22
		Dark skies/no street lighting	5	97	66.9%	36	24.8%	8	5.5%	4	2.8%	5	145	94%	1.59

Across all the options the majority suggested they were all important. Compared to other areas the 'pattern of fields and hedges of farming industry' and 'dark skies/no street lighting' were seen as slightly less important and 'farm buildings' very slightly less so again.

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher importance	
26	Looking at the Designated Areas below, how important is it to protect or conserve each of the following?	AONB	5	136	90.7%	13	8.7%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	150	97%	1.13
		SSI	7	121	82.3%	24	16.3%	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	1	147	95%	1.27
		area of great scientific value	6	117	79.1%	30	20.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	1	148	95%	1.30
		Country wildlife site	6	108	75.5%	30	21.0%	4	2.8%	1	0.7%	6	143	92%	1.38
		Cargreen conservation area	6	119	80.4%	24	16.2%	4	2.7%	1	0.7%	1	148	95%	1.31
		SPA	6	118	80.8%	25	17.1%	2	1.4%	1	0.7%	3	146	94%	1.29

Across all the options the majority suggested they were all important. Very few disagreed. Although there is very little difference overall the AONB appears to be seen as slightly more important than the other factors.

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher importance	
27	How important is it to protect or conserve each of the following:	Rectory room	7	58	40.3%	58	40.3%	20	13.9%	8	5.6%	4	144	93%	2.13
		Cricket field	7	76	53.1%	53	37.1%	13	9.1%	1	0.7%	5	143	92%	1.76
		Millennium Cross	8	71	49.7%	50	35.0%	20	14.0%	2	1.4%	4	143	92%	1.89
		the pub on the quay	8	106	73.1%	25	17.2%	9	6.2%	5	3.4%	2	145	94%	1.53
		Penyoke playing field	8	121	84.0%	20	13.9%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	3	144	93%	1.24
		The quayside	7	121	82.3%	26	17.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	147	95%	1.24
		Slipways	8	122	83.6%	24	16.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	146	94%	1.22
		Methodist Church	7	67	47.2%	56	39.4%	13	9.2%	6	4.2%	6	142	92%	1.94
		Parish Church	8	86	60.6%	48	33.8%	6	4.2%	2	1.4%	5	142	92%	1.62
		Memorial Hall	7	134	90.5%	13	8.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	0	148	95%	1.14
		Cargreen Yacht Club	8	91	63.2%	37	25.7%	13	9.0%	3	2.1%	3	144	93%	1.67

Across all the options the majority suggested they were all important. However a few disagreed on some areas. Although important to the majority the degree of enthusiasm is least for the 'Rectory Room' followed by the 'Methodist Church', 'Millennium cross' and 'cricket field'. Greatest importance is attached to the Memorial Hall followed by the slipways, quayside and playing field.

		Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
28	How important is access to the river to you?	6	82	56.2%	39	26.7%	18	12.3%	7	4.8%	3	146	94%

Only a small minority said that access to the river was not important to them.

	Did not answer	Once a week or more		A few times a month		A few times a year		Only in the summer		Never		Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
29	8	82	55.8%	29	19.7%	19	12.9%	12	8.2%	5	3.4%	147	95%

A small majority said that they use the river or riverside once a week or more with a further large contingent using it a few times a month. Very few never use the river or riverside.

	Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion
30	6	136	91.3%	12	8.1%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	149	96%

Only one person said that the countryside was not important to them and the majority said it was very important.

	Did not answer	Very important		Fairly important		Not very important		Not important		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion	Comparability quotient Lower number = higher importance			
31	How important to you individually or as a family living in Landulph is each of the following?	Village activities/community groups		8	89	61.0%	41	28.1%	15	10.3%	1	0.7%	1	146	94%	1.67
		Quiet village/parish		8	104	72.7%	30	21.0%	7	4.9%	2	1.4%	4	143	92%	1.47
		Easy access to the countryside		9	123	84.2%	20	13.7%	3	2.1%	0	0.0%	0	146	94%	1.24
		Easy access to the river		8	106	72.1%	28	19.0%	11	7.5%	2	1.4%	0	147	95%	1.51
		Familiarity with the area and people		9	95	65.5%	44	30.3%	6	4.1%	0	0.0%	1	145	94%	1.51
		Rural atmosphere		10	118	81.4%	27	18.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	145	94%	1.25
		Village identity/feeling part of a community		8	100	68.0%	44	29.9%	3	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	147	95%	1.45
		Beautiful environment		9	132	90.4%	13	8.9%	1	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	146	94%	1.14
		A sense of well-being		7	131	88.5%	15	10.1%	2	1.4%	0	0.0%	0	148	95%	1.17

Across all the options the majority suggested they were all important. However a small number disagreed on some areas. Although important to the majority the degree of enthusiasm is least for 'village activities/community groups'. Greatest importance is attached to the 'beautiful environment' and 'sense of wellbeing'.

Questions 32 to 35, the demographics, are presented on a different page

	Did not answer	Agree with this		Disagree with this		No opinion	Total number expressing an opinion	% expressing an opinion		
36	Indicate whether or not the policies reflect your opinion. Comments on separate sheet									
	HP1	Housing growth sustaining facilities	18	110	86.6%	17	13.4%	10	127	82%
	HP2	Housing to be in keeping with local character	14	131	97.0%	4	3.0%	6	135	87%
	HP3	New developments and parking	14	129	95.6%	6	4.4%	6	135	87%
	HP4	Housing and AONB	17	126	96.2%	5	3.8%	7	131	85%
	EP1	Protection of natural, built and historic aspects	14	137	99.3%	1	0.7%	3	138	89%
	EP2	Sustaining the existing thriving rural Parish	15	133	97.1%	4	2.9%	3	137	88%
	EP3	Footpaths	13	138	99.3%	1	0.7%	3	139	90%
	EP4	River beaches and slipways	15	132	99.2%	1	0.8%	7	133	86%
	R1	CIL usage in relation to roads and footpaths	19	120	93.8%	8	6.3%	8	128	83%
	R2	Development and volume of road traffic	17	124	91.2%	12	8.8%	2	136	88%
	T1	Monitoring the need for public transport	15	120	93.0%	9	7.0%	10	129	83%
	B1	Conversion of existing buildings for business use	16	117	88.0%	16	12.0%	6	133	86%
	B2	Construction of buildings for business use	16	105	79.5%	27	20.5%	7	132	85%
	ER1	Renewable energy schemes	14	113	83.1%	23	16.9%	5	136	88%
	HWB1	Open, green and blue space	15	135	98.5%	2	1.5%	3	137	88%
	HWB2	Existing community facilities	14	134	98.5%	2	1.5%	5	136	88%
	HWB3	Community assets	15	134	98.5%	2	1.5%	4	136	88%

Across all the options the majority agreed with the policy outlined. However a small number disagreed on some areas. Although agreed by the majority the level of disagreement is highest for the 'construction of buildings for business' use followed by 'renewable energy schemes' and then 'housing growth sustaining facilities'. Greatest agreement is expressed with regard to 'footpaths' and 'river beaches and slipways'.

4) Summary of free text answers where questionnaire specifically requested them

13 Do you have any suggestions for specific (Business Development) locations?

Location	Number suggesting
Pasty Shop / Elbridge	10
Long Orchard	4
Opposite Memorial hall	3
Brownfield	3
Paynters Cross / Vinegar Hill	2
Landulph Rise toward church	2
Old greenhouse other/ not specified	2
Hatt	1
Carkeel Saltash Callington	1
Stockadon	1

Other comments summarised
 Mixed residential and office suggested
 Parking, access for vehicles and roadways a concern
 Plenty of empty business premises, farm buildings and stable yards locally and in nearby places so why build more

14 What types of businesses would you support being developed in Landulph Parish?

Type	Number suggesting
Retail - shop restaurant pub	24
Agriculture, Mkt Gdn, Farm livery, farm produce	22
Crafts pottery art studios	19
Work at home, small offices & supportive hub	15
Woodwork electrical light industrial small work	15
Technology Web design Consultancy Research	10
Marine / riverside leisure	7
Any local employment employing locals	7
Catering Bakery	3
None needed / wanted	2
B&B	1
Campsite	1

Other comments summarised
 Community ventures, family businesses
 Home based but 'invisible'
 Small, unobtrusive
 Non polluting, no more traffic, quiet

Key word Small - multiple mentions

16 If you would use a pub in the village, what type of pub do you think would be most sustainable?

Type	Number suggesting
Food	12
Do everything and anything	4
Integrated shop	2
B&B	2
Community run	2

Other comment
 Traffic concerns if successful
 Boat friendly
 No food
 Update needed to flat roof section

17 If you answered yes to Would you use a pub, where should a pub be sited?

Location	Number suggesting
Anywhere in village	10
Rectory Rooms	3
Existing	3
Greenhouse site	2
Vinegar Hill	1
Village Hall	1

Other comment
 New build infill site, top of village
 Walking distance of current
 Somewhere with adequate parking
 Converted house in Cargreen
 Opposite cricket ground
 One of the farms

24a Village Car Park

Category	Number commenting
Needed - particularly Fore St problem	28
But will not be used if not close	10
Needed but where?	7
Not needed	7
New housing at least 2 spaces each/ sufficient	4
Memorial hall	3
Memorial Hall should not be used	2

Other comment
 Yellow line to Fore Street
 Car park in Crumple Park
 Rent spaces in memorial hall
 On old glass house site
 Small cost secure pay car park
 Farmer market on car park
 Would be an eyesore
 Needed for pub and shop
 Solutions next to residents homes needed
 Compulsory purchase quay
 No good without toilets
 Opposite village hall site
 Use quay if eventually only residential
 Stop inappropriate street parking
 What about the school?

24b Hedge trimming

Category	Number
More cutting needed	38
OK - Frequency	11
Concerns over birds, wildlife and flowers etc	8
Road safety problem - high risk of accidents	5
More consistency required	4
Less cutting required	3
Trimming are a mess left behind	3

Other comment
 Elbridge needs trimming annually
 Growing hedges slows traffic
 Too severe - wild flower destruction
 Should be community activity
 Regular assessment needed
 Use for wood fuel - 'Cordiale Project'
 Landowners should be charged if they do not do it
 Beautiful hedges being ruined by 'hacking'
 Ignore flowers and birds. Road safety priority

5) Open comments on separate sheet (Q36)

Respondent 31 and Respondent 149 (identical sheets)

Business and Economic Objective B1 and B2

Whilst I can understand that there may be a case for encouraging tourism, agriculture, horticulture, marine and leisure within the constraints set out in the plan, I strongly oppose the establishment of any further light industry in the Parish.

The existing units sited on the road to the Church (on the left past the school) do nothing to enhance the residential qualities of the neighbourhood.

There is no established need for light industry to be located in residential areas. There is plenty of opportunity for these to be sited on more suitable existing and future industrial estates outside the Parish. Further the trading and manufacturing activities which are necessarily undertaken by these entities, are inevitably detrimental to the quality of the adjacent residential areas in terms of increased traffic, noise, litter etc.

PS Could I take the opportunity of saying thank you very much to all for the hard work which is being put in and for doing such a good job on our behalf!

Respondent 92

Q1: We have ticked "up to 20" but we strongly feel that no more than 10 should be in the village and the other possible 10 on the brownfield site adjacent to the A388 where there is a bus stop and public transport, as any more in the village will increase traffic problems.

Q2: "Within Cargreen" fairly suitable for 10

Q8: Yes - but if other people parking in the road

Q9: Very modern design should only be considered on isolated sites. "standard house designs" not a good idea at all

"innovative plans" not a good idea

Q11: Yes - but it should not proportionally increase traffic

Q12: This is a pointless question you cannot answer as frequency and timing of a service would be critical, and this is not indicated

Q23: Certainly not more than 5%

Q24: Village car park

There just does not seem to be a suitable location, though obviously it would be nice to get the cars off Fore Street. Two people suggested "on the land behind Tony Channing's bungalow"!!

Hedges

This is a major road safety matter. We feel that there should be at least one more cut in the early summer to keep visibility on the road each side of Two Pines, and on the road out of the village past Stockadon Barns

Road signs

We consider it desirable that there is a road sign on the approach to the village warning of single track road in places with passing bays.

Q27: This question does not mention the school and the memorial clock. it should have done. Very important to protect.

P1: Disagree. This statement appears to give indiscriminate approval to almost any development and we have only very limited facilities at the present time.

EP: Too much development would swamp rather than sustain our "thriving rural community"

R1: "Community Infrastructure Levy". This statement gives the impression that we will receive such a "windfall" levy, and we understand that at this time Cornwall Council have yet to decide their policy on implementing the levy. It may be that no levy would be applied to some of the potential developments in the Parish.

Respondent 118

We both agree with the whole of the last paragraph in the green book (in italics). Very important.

Respondent 131

ER1: Many will feel that wind turbines are an unacceptable blight on the landscape. however the importance of all forms of renewable energy is such that we feel that must take precedence. There will be no landscape to protect if we don't make a big switch to renewables!

We feel perhaps as part of our energy policy we could get electric cables buried and their pylons removed. It is interesting how people who object to wind turbines don't seem bothered by the hideous pylons!

6) Free text answers where questionnaire specifically requested them

13 Do you have any suggestions for specific (Business Development) locations?

Vinegar Hill area. Areas below Landulph Rise, old milk parlour etc towards church
up by Hatt roundabout or near Pentillie entrance
the old pasty shop. The site towards Landulph church. The site opposite Landulph Memorial Hall
the former pasty factory site. A mixed residential and craft workshop/office development
Parking of work vehicles important
only that good access should be available
on current brownfield sites
old pasty site
old pasty shop. Rosehill greenhouses. Dorothy Cloake greenhouses
old greenhouse site Cargreen
Long Orchard, site of old pasty shop
Lanes not suitable for the traffic increase more development (business) may bring
Land already for development at Carkeel. Empty shops in Saltash & Callington. And easily accessible by A388
extend mini industrial estate near cricket field
Ellbridge
Elbridge, Stockadon
Elbridge area
Currently unused or redundant farm buildings
Cloaks nursery site. Existing industrial estate at Landulph Cross. Former pasty shop site on A388
by Cottons bus depot. Nursery opposite the memorial hall
Around the Cross; the Pasty factory; electric sub-station
Any unused farm or stable yards?!

- 14 What types of businesses would you support being developed in Landulph Parish?
Give examples

agrarian; traditional one-man or family businesses. Marine
Working from home type business /nothing which involves a 'shop front'
Work at home hub. Technology. Cafe or shop
Woodworking. Furniture making and repair. Electric/electrical repair. Web design
Within existing premises eg local empty pub. Post office and shop run by volunteers as in St Germans
very small scale
type of business is not so important as the integration of the business location into the landscape and community and lives
Traditional crafts and market gardening
Those that are non-polluting
this is a rural area and I don't think more business is needed
There is already too much traffic for the lanes
the ideal is the maximum number of jobs per square metre of building and the minimum number of vehicle movements
technology, light industrial
support for farm developments that help to maintain the natural environment. Also new developments would increase
specialists horticultural/organic produce
SME. Tech/IT based
small work at home
small start ups. Agricultural support activity. Live/work small business
small self contained. Smoke free. No lorry parks
small scale manufacturing, small offices, local crafts, small shop, pub, B&B, catering
Social enterprise schemes
Small local craft house based businesses
small live/work units for small business entrepreneurs
small less than 10 employees, techno, scientific etc , craft
small handcrafted manufacturing, work with wood, sewing, textiles, bakery. They need to be non polluting and quiet
ideally
small family run businesses which could employ local residents
small fabrication units
small enterprise units
small businesses: arts/agricultural
small businesses - not using large lorries and such . Maybe craft/pottery etc should be encouraged
small business - 5-20 staff. Mixture of local crafts, development of software. Research programmes
small artisan businesses/workshops/artists studios
shop, restaurants/cafe, pub
Retail, pub., office-based

Pub/shop. Retirement home. Craft workshops (not noisy though). River based leisure eg canoe hire, small sailboats, kayaks
pub. Small restaurant
Pub. Post office/store
pub. Local shop
pub, restaurant, small village shop
Organic farming. Low impact eg online services
open up the nursery that is at present closed
ones that do not involve a lot more big lorries on the lanes. Boat/river related? Pub/restaurant
Not heavy industrial. Creative studios/workshops or collectives. Remote IT working/small office. Small units for start ups.
As long as housed in sympathetic/converted buildings and not like an industrial estate
none except existing agriculture and horticulture only. There are far more suitable sites for industrial or commercial use
close by and outside the parish
Non industrial. IT/Design, Office based, Studio based
Micro brewery, knitwear/crafts, village shop/post office, village pub, tea shop
Market gardening. Livery. Pub
local shop
local product - cheese making, local flowers. Local shop - milk, newspapers etc
Local food outlets/suppliers. Fuel eg logs/coal. Craft or wool stockists. Animal grooming
Live: work properties
limited use of home as office or studio without potential for material numbers of parked cars. Also without detriment to
the residential qualities of adjacent buildings ie noise, loss of privacy
Light industry/manufacturing. Farm shop and destination cafe ie for cyclists/walkers/locals. Crafts
Light industrial. Commercial. Horticultural
IT, PR, Design and any business not requiring a constant supply of delivery vans and couriers
IT based

Horticulture. Arts & crafts. Nautical activities

horticulture, marine

Horticulture

horticultural

farming. Pub. Local shop/coffee shop. Artist

farming

Doctor, dentist, chiropodist, hairdresser, taxi services, assembly work, metal work, office work

craft workshops, repair workshops, home work offices, farm shop/deli/takeaway

country crafts using local skills and materials. Agriculture support. Workshops for local tradesmen

cottage industries. Offices. Pub

consultancy, IT for example. Probably only small businesses eg owner operated that would not necessitate more traffic.

Poor broadband is a major limiting factor however. Home-office business should be encouraged

commerce

Clerical business from home

Care/support. Catering. One stop pub/PO/shop/coffee/tea/snacks/library

businesses which could support working parents

Any than provided local employment for all age groups

any small business that does not pollute the environment

any businesses that give young people a start in life - apprenticeships/workshops/crafts. Ones that support local people (of any age or gender)

any

all businesses

Agriculture/market gardening, food production

agriculture. River based businesses eg shipwrights and other marine work. Alternative energy. Craft. Food. Cafe/shop.

Pub/shop

a shop. Public house

a pub with village shop included. Anything that may bring better broadband. Perhaps a small business centre eg a couple of workstations that could be used by people who usually work from home and alone but could do with support from other workers - perhaps in the pub/memorial hall

a little shop within Cargreen itself. Outdoor activities or holiday clubs for children eg canoeing, den building, forest schools. Canoeing/kayak hire- tours. Small campsite with wigwam hire. Vegetable and fruit farming

16 If you would use a pub in the village, what type of pub do you think would be most sustainable?

we would also use the pub if it had an integrated shop

We need a pub with good quality B&B and food good enough to make it a "destination pub" either by road or water. If a village shop is unsustainable on its own then an integrated pub/shop is answer

traditional pub but with restaurant facilities

there is a need for all, the parish could consider look at opening a community pub with the skills there are within the

The Carew Arms Anthony is a good example

Serving food! However would worry about traffic etc if it were proper/sought after gastro pub

really good food please

possibly with food

One also that encourages boats to stop for food

Keep the pub as it is but update the flat roof restaurant side

Just like The Riser! No food

gastro pub with B&B

gastro pub family oriented with integrated shop

could be 'gastro pub' with local facilities. Needs to offer good food and drink to be viable business

community run?

Care/support. Catering. One stop pub/PO/shop/coffee/tea/snacks/library

any of the above

Any of above

and bar food

A lovely local pub that offers food, events/gatherings

17 If you answered yes to Would you use a pub, where should a pub be sited?

within Cargreen village

What about using the Rectory Rooms?

Vinegar Hill area/access in and out etc

village hall or old snooker room

undecided

Three Corner Meadow, or joking aside, on an infill site, new build at top of village (Landulph)

there are various possible sites including the existing pub location, development of the yacht club or a more contemporary

idea of incorporating the village park

the previous site would be favourite but not essential and possibly given the limited parking another site within walking

distance would be preferable

Spaniards

somewhere with adequate parking

Rosehill site - Ellbridge - previous site

Refectory

redundant greenhouse sites

Rectory Room

opposite the Cricket Ground

one of the farms could convert to gastro-pub possibly with a few rooms for B&B - would have plenty of parking

no other practical site

no idea

location not important but the type of business providing a service the customer wants is

I'm not really sure if a pub is needed. The old pub site is too crowded and no real parking. Perhaps it could be on one of

ideally on the quay but somewhere else could be better than none

House converted within Cargreen

either on previous site or elsewhere . I have no preference

either - previous site is stunning but there are other places with similar great views and less flooding/parking issues!

Perhaps near footpath would also encourage less people to drive to a pub!

anywhere within the parish. No preference

anywhere in Cargreen

24 If you have views you would like to express on the following subjects below please do so here

24a Village Car Park

It's necessary to avoid current congestion at the bottom of Fore Street. On some days, near the telephone box, the corner of the house on the south side and vehicles parked on the north side are so close together that a fire engine would struggle to get through
yes, but where!
yes village could do with a car park
yes if land is available
yellow lines in Fore Street off street parking only. Car park in field below (to the east) of Cumble Park. Entrance/exi from Coombe Drive
would consider
Would be very useful
within any new development allocated parking spaces. Also annual rental for allocated spaces in hall car park, would also produce much needed income to village funds to be used within the community
where? Main congestion is in Fore Street so unless you provide a car park there then its not going to get used. No point putting it at the top of the hill
Where would this be put? Couldn't people use Memorial Hall car park if desperate or Spaniards Car Park?
What would be the purpose as most people prefer to park as near as possible to their place of residence
we need one . Not enough parking. We also need street lighting
we need one
Waste of money unless you are prepared to build between Fore Street & Church Lane
Very much needed for the centre of Cargreen
this would be a great advantage
There's enough traffic using the lanes now especially the speed they drive
there should be a village car park
the village definitely needs one
the problem is people have to use it and they tend to want to park by their houses
Suggest: area of disused glass houses to relieve pressure on Fore Street + junction Coombe Lane
subject to acquiring a suitable site strongly support the addition of a village car park
shouldn't be necessary if you don't build too many houses
should be open to people who don't have off street parking but at a small cost and secure (gate). Small market every month farmer style
see attached
Really! Where?
People wouldn't use one apart from pub car park in Lower Fore Street
people like to be near their car and I cant envisage anyone using the car park. They could use the hall car park overnight but how many do?
Parking on Fore Street and Coombe Lane adjacent to Fore Street causes obstruction and dangerous corners,, therefore an off street car park would be good but where?
Parking is an issue in the narrow streets but a tarmac car park would be an eyesore
parking for possible shop and pub
not sure where this could go or why people would use it? If next to a pub with some of it reserved for residents then good.
If just a car park at the top to provide additional parking for residents then its a long way for most people to walk ... Better to try and find more parking solutions for residents next to their homes
not sure this is necessary
not required
not needed. New housing must include at least 2 off street parking
no thank you
no requirement if all new houses have off road parking
no available space therefore unrealistic aim
no available site for a car park. Note: Landulph Memorial Hall car park is a PRIVATE car park for users of the hall only and NOT for general public parking
Nice idea but if it is not close to houses, shop, pub etc it will not be used. I cannot think of a suitable site except the pub car park
need more parking places as when I am on a late shift I can never get a parking space and have to walk quite a way in the dark with lots f bags
need car park desperately
necessity
Narrow road need to be widened. We already have passing places!
most likely useful for residents in Fore Street
May encourage walkers. But no good without toilets or pub. In the summer I met two men who had canoed from Saltash wandering round in hope of a drink

land opposite village hall - space for at least 100 vehicles to be used as overflow for events at hall and also to alleviate issues in lower village
it would have to be centrally located as people are lazy and wouldn't walk far. There should be no new building without parking for 2 cars
in favour if near to Lower Fore Street
Important for villagers in Lower Fore Street
I think the village hall car park could be used for visitors
I think a lot of folk presently use LMF for this purpose. The problem with that is when there is an event running perhaps an overflow facility is required but apart from that is there further need?
good idea, for example on quay if compulsory purchase order introduced

good idea, but where? If the Spaniards was no longer a pub, but residential, their car park might suffice for public use

encourage residents who have off street parking to use it and not park on the he street. Discourage yacht owners from leaving cars in the oldest part of the village for weeks on end when they go sailing. Pub could charge cars to park or residents have permit to park in older part of village. parking near the school can be dangerous for children and road users. yellow lines around school area including lanes either side to prevent any parking. school walking bus?

could solve Fore Street's difficulties but would residents use a car park distant to their home?
could be useful

cars ruin Cargreen when they fill Fore Street

better parking required for the school

an essential requirement to alleviate current blocking of Fore Street (and allow unrestricted pedestrian access as a direct result)

all new housing must have its own car space

a small car park would be of possible use as long as it is in an appropriate setting

a great idea - but where?

24 If you have views you would like to express on the following subjects below please do so here

24b Hedge trimming

yes but after spring flower and nesting season and where it affects traffic
yes
would not like to see any less hedge trimming
would like the road at Ellbridge to be kept trimmed every year
would be a decided plus if those concerned could be persuaded on a more frequent regime
when the hedges are growing traffic slows down
We're always grateful when the roads become clear and easy to use again
We at Vinegar Hill have had our hedges trimmed x1 in 5 years, only then after repeated requests
We are extremely fortunate that our hedges are beautifully tended and are grateful to those that do it
very poor this year. Has increased risk of accidents significantly for walkers, horse riders and motorists. Had several near misses on foot
Very important to allow clear lines of sight to lanes
VERY important for road safety, additional if possible during summer months
very important - especially at the narrows
Twice a year
Too severe and too frequent. We have lovely wild flower hedges that do NOT need to be cut more than once a ? - which came first: hedgerows or the motor car?!

this should be mandatory for farmers and land owners to ensure good traffic visibility
This should be done a lot more in certain places and it would relieve a lot of problems
think of nesting birds - cut accordingly
they need trimming
summer months can be dangerous especially the narrows just north of Wayton. But there is an ecological reason for not trimming the hedges more often so I believe
Sometimes it is left a little too long before it is cut, particularly in the narrows, and it can become quite dangerous, although I do appreciate this can be due to weather conditions, nesting birds, time of year etc
some required
Should be regular, more controlled and less random
should be kept at the current standard with due regard to NOT disturbing wildlife as much as possible
should be done when needed NOT after first few accidents
should be done a lot more. Road extremely dangerous during summer months
should be cut so oncoming cars can be seen
should be a community activity supervised by the Parish Council
see attached
Regularly in season
Parish Council need to put in place hedge cutting for visibility during the summer months before skid marks and glass appear in the road. At present farmers/land owners are unable to cut hedges during March-September but councils can under health & safety rules
Once a year is sufficient. Maybe teach people not to worry about scratching their car ha ha
ok as current
Not frequent enough in the summer. Difficult to see oncoming traffic
not done often enough. This year it has been left to overgrow making it dangerous to drive due to poor visibility and causing damage to vehicles paint with scratches. Absolutely disgust3d at how badly the hedges have been maintained or to be more exact they haven't!!
Needs to be more frequent
needs to be assessed regularly
needs doing more often. Shocking mess always left behind total mess!
needed to be done more often in growing season
necessity
necessary for sight lines on the eh narrows on a regular basis
more timely hedge trimming. Lives are more important than protecting a few flowers. High hedges can be dangerous for horse riders/runners/cyclists/dog walkers
More should be done
more often than twice a year especially round road signs
More maintenance
managing and using the hedges for wood fuel similar to the 'Cordiale project'
main route out of village towards Pentillie and Stockadon needs cutting more often
landowners are responsible and should be charged for cutting if they do not maintain themselves
keep regular trim in the narrows only/around to Highdown area to keep visual ability from one end to the other
it needs to be done more frequently so that speed limit signs are not covered up particularly the 20mph
it makes such a difference to visibility that it should be more often

In favour of existing regime

Important on access roads and needs to be done a little more frequently

if there were to be extra traffic into the village hedge trimming needs to be far more frequently to see cars ahead and to give more room on the roads

I think frequency is about right

I contacted council to enquire about having a hedge trimmed that is not on my land. Their reply was they only do it if it is a hazard to traffic. Most hedges seem well kept by local farmers

Highdown needs trimming in May each year and topping whenever visibility top to bottom and vice versa is obscured by growth - road safety

Hedge trimming should be done more frequently

hedge trimming is carried out to a high standard at the moment. More effort could be made not to disturb wild life from March to June

hedge trimming is an essential feature of land management and no extra imposition should be placed on land occupiers who carry it out for the benefit of the wider community

Hedge trimming at dangerous parts (eg High Downs) important to do for safety

happy with existing arrangements

fine

far too much hedge trimming, in the 2 years I've lived in Cargreen the farmers have started to ruin the look of the countryside. No hedge needs to be cut 4-6 times a year (by cut I mean hacked). Just look at Holland near Bodkin it looked beautiful once but 10-20 year of over zealous hedge hacking ruined it

Extra hedge trimming needed during the summer at 'the narrows' on leaving Cargreen

excellent job being done

Essential, as is the requirement for the land owners concerned to clear up the subsequent trimmings

Cut hedges twice as often as currently

annually and timed not to impact wildlife, nesting birds etc. contractors should clear up better afterwards (Roadside) ignore flowers and birds. Road safety is the priority