

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO3374	Travelling Show People	Comment	Sites for 'travelling show people'. Confine next to 'existing gypsy & traveller sites' on Sandy Lane Industrial Estate.	This requirement is for a Travelling Showpeople site and not for Gypsy and Travellers pitches.
	LPPO895	Policy 19	Comment	<p>Policy 19 – Site Standards for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p> <p>Whilst we support the inclusion of a Policy dealing with site standards for Travelling Showpeople, we believe that the Policy should identify the difference between pitches (Gypsies and Travellers) and plots (Travelling Showpeople). Under the PPfTS, Pitches and Plots are defined and for Travelling Showpeople a Plot is a mixed use which needs to incorporate space or to allow individual plots to be split to allow the storage of equipment on part of the plot and areas for the stationing of Showman's caravans for residential occupation.</p>	Comments noted. We will consider separating the policy.
	LPPO1693	Policy 19	Object	<p>Clows Top site NOT suitable for travelling show people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor infrastructure on approach. • Traffic already heavy • Better sites available • No similar Sites nearby • Poor water pressure. • Policy 35 land at Clows Top (BR/RO/I) is recommended as core site in a rural village. 	Objection and comments noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.
	LPPO1780	BR/RO/1	Object	Objects to all aspects of proposal to locate travelling show	Objection and comments noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>people in Clows Top. The A456 to brow of hill where access to site is situated is a bottleneck for trucks and a fast road for all others. The footpath opposite has been ruined by trucks already turning in and out.</p> <p>The B4202 has become a fast approach to the cross roads.</p> <p>Will visual impact opposite houses in the highest village in Worcestershire be spoilt by this action?</p> <p>The LPR calls for housing to fill the shortfall. Clows top in Policy 35 is designated as a "CORE" site for houses BR/RO/1</p> <p>The plan of this area is incorrect at this time Planning to correct.</p> <p>Should not dominate the nearest settled community CLOWS TOP.</p> <p>Concerned that once site opened up, others may move in without permission.</p>	This site was one of 5 under consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.
	LPPO1784	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Objects to travelling showpeople site on Habberley Road.</p> <p>Concerned about traffic around the safari park as it's already very busy.</p> <p>Concerned about mess that may be left on the site.</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted.</p> <p>This site was one of 5 under consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Suggests brownfield sites as an alternative, e.g. the deserted timberworks on Park Lane and other brownfield sites where factories have been demolished.	
	LPPO1790	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Objects to Habberley Road Site due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on tourism in Bewdley, concerned about locating a travellers site on the edge of town opposite the largest hotel in the area 2. The site is of historic and archaeological value. Questions why a previous small business was stopped from trading there when the business did not harm the land but now it is seen as acceptable to have several tonnes of hardcore laid and a yard full of fairground rides. 3. The site is Green Belt. 4. The site is close to Habberley Valley again a spot in your plan which you wish to promote in the area. 5. The road infrastructure is not sufficient. <p>Suggests the site next to Ceramaspeed as a location with more suitable road infrastructure.</p>	Objection and comments noted.
	LPPO1809	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Objects to Habberley Road Site:</p> <p>With houses having to be built in the near future this is a stupid and ridiculous proposal.</p>	Objection and comments noted.
	LPPO1810	WA/BE/6	Object	Objects to WA/BE/6 Habberley Road Site due to the	Objection and comments noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B4129 is a very busy road and vehicles going in and out of this area would cause traffic issues. 2. Concern about wildlife in this area. 3. Potential ancient burial mound. 	
	LPPO1817	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Believes that this site goes against previous planning advice</p> <p>Heavy vehicles = Highways issues</p> <p>Personal perception that if the site is open to all travelling people there may be potential damage to local business and the local environment. They also believe that it may lead to possible reduction in property values.</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p>
	LPPO1852	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Habberley Road Site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Against previous planning advice • Open to all travelling show people • Potential damage to local business • Highways issues • Damage to local environment 	<p>Objection noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p>
	LPPO1982	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Objects to potential site for travelling show people,</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted. This site was one of 5 under</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Habberley Road, WA/BE/6</p> <p>Believes that the site is not required as there are adequate fun-fair facilities in the area at the Safari Park. Concerned that the site may become a potential eyesore and health and safety risk.</p> <p>Personal perception that the site may not be popular with local community.</p> <p>Believes that there are plenty of brownfield sites that are available, both industrial and commercial.</p>	<p>consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.</p>
	<p>LPPO2479</p>	<p>Policy 19 Travelling Show People</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Believes that the site goes against all previous planning advice.</p> <p>The site will be open to all travelling show people/travellers causing constant movement of traffic on and off the site.</p> <p>The B4129 is a rural road which has become busy over the years and with the potential extra traffic, will make it a very dangerous road with accidents waiting to happen.</p> <p>Personal perception that the hotel and golf club will suffer, causing damage to their businesses.</p> <p>Perception that there may be damage to the local environment and wildlife will suffer.</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING
 ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Believes that some of the residents who live on this road will be affected by the noise and their houses will become hard to sell if they ever want to move on.	
	LPPO2772	Policy 19	Object	<p>We would like to bring to your attention that - perhaps unintended - the emerging policies 8F and 19 appear to be watered down in formulation compared to the equivalent prevailing policies SAL.DPL9 and SAL.DPL10 (titled: Wyre Forest District Council Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan 2006-2026 - Adopted July 2013).</p> <p>Policy 8F</p> <p>As Traveller, Travelling Showpeople, and Gypsy sites are essentially a residential use, the same requirements that apply for residential use, such as appropriate sewage and drainage arrangements, must also be met for this use. However, emerging policy 8F paragraph 8.40 suggests that applicants will only be required to demonstrate they have sought a connection to the mains foul sewer in the first instance and therefore the present wording seems to imply that appropriate sewage/drainage measures to residential standards do not necessarily need to be provided for this purpose.</p> <p>Policy 19</p> <p>Furthermore, it appears to us that the emerging planning permission policy (19) for Traveller, Travelling Showpeople,</p>	Objection and comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING
 ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>and Gypsy use on land that is not currently allocated for this use is much less strictly formulated than the equivalent prevailing policies as certain requirements to balance conflicting interests and to protect the interest of the settled community, such as SAL.DPL9 under i-viii and sequential test and SAL.DPL10 under part 1 sub i-viii and part 3, are not repeated in Policy 19.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would it not be preferable to clarify in Policy 8F that the same requirements that apply to residential development, such as appropriate drainage measures, should also be met when allocating a site for Traveller, Showpeople or Gypsy use? 2. Also, should Policy 8F not be formulated in a way that all necessary conditions should be met prior and not subsequent to such an allocation as a site can only qualify as appropriate if all requirements are met? 3. As per Policy 8F, would it not be preferable to clarify in Policy 19 that this use is predominantly residential with all its consequences? 4. Furthermore, is it not preferable to incorporate all requirements of the prevailing policies SAL.DPL9 and SAL.DPL10 in the equivalent emerging Policy 19 assuming that there is no intention to water down the current criteria in balancing conflicting interests? 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO2798	Clows Top	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site not suitable for large show vehicles due to steep hills either side of a busy crossroads especially in the winter with ice and snow. • Harmful impact on Clows Top Village Hall with regard to parking and increased traffic pulling out on cross road at brow of hill. • No mains sewage connection, the nearest being Rock village. • Visual impact on Green Belt area. • Too many caravan site already allocated in the local area. 	Objection and comments noted.
	LPPO3545	Policy 19	Object	Concerned that the council are considering the travelling showpeople community when they personally believe that it fails to address the needs of it's council tax paying residents.	Objection noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.
	LPPO3872	Policy 19	Object	<p>Objects to the site based on personal perception that there may be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Damage to local environment. 2. Damage to local business. 3. Also objects based on how busy the road can already be. 	Objection and comments noted.
	LPPO4158	Policy 19	Object	Objects to the site based on personal perception that there	Objection and comments noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>may be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Damage to local environment. 2. Damage to local business. 3. Also objects based on how busy the road can already be. 	
	LPPO244	Policy 19	Object	<p>I object to the proposal of a Travelling Showpeople site at the Clows Top former garage. My reasons are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Inadequate facilities to provide them with a good quality of life. No access to mains sewerage and no proposals to access sewerage treatment facilities. 2) The road through Clows Top is a busy one with a 30 mph limit. Access from the direction of Bewdley involves a steep hill leading into the Village. Travelling Showpeople use large lorries to transport their equipment around. If they were approaching from this direction, they would impact heavily on the steady flow of traffic and other commuters/businesses. 3) The reduced speed of their vehicles driving up the hill is likely to cause other drivers to become frustrated and overtake, placing other road users in danger. 4) As drivers reach the top of the hill into Clows Top, their view becomes restricted due to the brow. It is therefore feasible that drivers would be suddenly 	<p>Objection and comments noted. This site was one of 5 under consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING
 ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>faced with these Showpeople lorries in mid manoeuvre. It increases the risk of road collisions both by colliding into the lorries, or swinging out to avoid them and colliding with oncoming traffic.</p> <p>5) Many vehicles already do not adhere to the 30mph speed limit and drive through the village at excessive speeds, in particular motorbikes passing through. The Council would be creating a site knowingly placing Showpeople and all other road users in increased danger.</p> <p>6) Many people park at the Village Hall car park and cross the road to use the Post Office/Shop and Butchers. The presence of regular additional lorries will restrict the view for motorists and pedestrians. This increases the likelihood of road collisions with pedestrians.</p> <p>7) Clows Top is highly vulnerable to inclement weather. The roads can become unusable in severe frost or snow fall. This would provide an obvious impact on travelling showpeople remaining mobile and able to earn a living.</p> <p>8) There are no community facilities for the travelling showpeople's children to play.</p> <p>9) Schools and Doctors are not within walking distance and therefore not easily accessible for the travelling community.</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO283	Policy 19 part ii	Object	<p>Policy 19 part ii states</p> <p><i>"The site layout gives adequate consideration to pedestrian safety, cycle movements and vehicle movements and provides adequate space for vehicles, towing caravans to enter, exit and manoeuvre around the site and for refuse collections."</i></p> <p>My objection to land on Wilden Top Road/Bigbury Lane being used as a site to accommodate travelling show people is based on the fact that there is no pedestrian access/footpath along either Wilden Top or Bigbury Lane.</p> <p>Furthermore the 2011 Baker Report, which initially identified this land as being suitable, is now out of date. In 2011 the report used the following as part of its criteria</p> <p><i>Access to services</i></p> <p><i>3.32 Circular 01/2006 identifies that local authorities "should first consider locations in or near settlements with access to local services, e.g. shops, doctors and schools" (para. 65). In particular, there is a need to provide easy access to GP and other health services and to ensure children attend school on a regular basis.</i></p> <p><i>3.33 Sites should have good means of access to the local highway network but in terms of the availability of transport modes, the Circular states that "local authorities should be</i></p>	<p>Objection and comments noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>realistic about the availability, or likely availability, of alternatives to the car in accessing local services (para. 54).</i></p> <p><i>3.34 Wyre Forest Core Strategy Policy CPO6 states that local community services and facilities should be within easy access from the site by a variety of modes of transport. In addition, there should be safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and sites should be easily accessed by towing caravans.</i></p> <p>The 2011 Baker Report measured from the site on Wilden Top to the local shop as being 300 metres. Sadly the shop it refers too in the report is no longer open and closed in 2016.</p> <p>I strongly object to land on Wilden Top Road being used as a site for accommodation of travelling show people.</p>	
	LPPO440	19.1 BR/RO/1 Land at Clows Top	Object	<p>Wyre Forest policy states:-</p> <p>8.40 Whilst Gypsy and Traveller sites are essentially a residential use, sites for Travelling Showpeople differ in that they need to provide a secure, permanent base which is suitable for storage and maintenance of equipment when it is not in use. Most showpeople need to live alongside their equipment and as such sites need to be suitable for both residential and business use. Sites need to be designed in an appropriate manner which minimises any impacts on neighbouring uses and occupiers. Applicants will be required to demonstrate adequate access for their use and</p>	Objection and comments noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>that they have sought a connection to the mains foul sewer in the first instance.</p> <p>The comment is that there is no mains sewer to connect to in Clows Top.</p>	
	LPPO439	19.2 BR/RO/01 Land at Clows Top	Object	The entrance to this site is on the brow of the hill on the A456 in Clows Top. The entrance to the proposed site is unsighted to traffic travelling up the hill. The proposed use for travelling showpeople would involve long articulated vehicles slowly exiting/entering the site producing a traffic hazard. Also although in a 30mph zone much of the traffic exceeds this limit in both directions.	Objection and comments noted. This site was one of 5 under consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.
	LPPO2670	Traveller Site Habberley Road, Bewdley	Comment	<p>I have concerns over noise, traffic, environmental and visual impact of the area.</p> <p>The proposed site is on one of the main artery's coming into the town. The fairground equipment will be seen on the main approach and opposite the hotel giving visitors their first impression of Bewdley.</p> <p>I'm concerned the noise generated by maintenance and the potential nuisance of flashing lights would effect myself and the other residents in the area. Additionally, the equipment will need to be transported by heavy diesel machines adding to the noise issue.</p> <p>The junction at Catchems End is very busy. As some of the houses at the bottom of Habberley Road have no parking,</p>	Comments noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>cars are often parked on 'half on and half off' the path resulting in larger vehicles not being able to get through which has the potential to cause accidents.</p> <p>I have concerns with these types of vehicles pulling out on this popular footpath. Also, the long and straight Habberley Road is (wrongly) seen as a race track 'especially for motorbikes'.</p> <p>Equipment located on the site would ruin the visual impact and effect property prices.</p> <p>I have witnessed open fires in the area and have concerns that smoke from fires would affect locals' outdoor space.</p>	
	LPPO2673	Travelling Show People Habberley Road	Object	<p>The site has already been turned down for planning permission. Potential Traffic problems amongst other reasons.</p> <p>Concerned that the site would never only be for one temporary user and would be an open invitation to become a permanent gypsy site. Expects that if that happened, the two local businesses would be severely affected as well as having a negative impact on Bewdley Town itself.</p>	Objection noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for Gypsy and Traveller sites.
	LPPO2674	Travelling Show People Habberley Road WA/BE/6	Object	<p>The site has already been turned down for planning permission. Potential Traffic problems amongst other reasons.</p> <p>Concerned that the site would never only be for one</p>	Objection noted. This site was considered for one specific family of Travelling Showpeople who are currently resident in the District. This differs from requirements for

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				temporary user and would be an open invitation to become a permanent gypsy site. Expects that if that happened, the two local businesses would be severely affected as well as having a negative impact on Bewdley Town itself.	Gypsy and Traveller sites.
	LPPO2795	Mecure Heath	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only planning applications with exceptional circumstances should be permitted within the Green Belt and I don't feel this application has exceptional circumstances. • The B4129 is a very busy road and will create highway and traffic issues. • There is a high risk that this site will create environmental issues. • This site could be a risk to local businesses. • The cumulative impact on the site would harm the character or appearance of the area and result in an unacceptable impact, especially on the Habberley Valley. 	Objection and comments noted. This site was one of 5 under consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.
	LPPO2802	Clows Top	Object	<p>I do not feel this site would be appropriate due to highways issues - I understand fairground equipment may be stored there. The approach from Kidderminster is up a very steep hill and access to the site would be difficult for large, heavy vehicles.</p> <p>I also feel it would be a pity for such a beautifully located site to be used in part for storage of equipment, housing would be a better use of the site.</p>	Objection and comments noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 19: PROVIDING ACCOMMODATION FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO659	Policy 19 Clows Top	Object	<p>The site is not suitable for accommodation. Poor access and highway visibility. Situated on a blind summit with traffic constantly passing at speeds well in excess of the 30mph speed limit in both directions.</p> <p>Drainage: Clows Top is built on clay which is impermeable. Sewage disposal is a problem there are no main drainage schemes proposed as likely in future, any development will cause serious problems with foul and rain water runoff.</p> <p>Legality: A public enquiry some years ago ruled that the site returned to its original contours, after large scale earthworks created a 'yard/storage area' from the top of the hill. Reinstatement never took place. If it had there would be nowhere for occupation.</p> <p>AONB: The village falls within an area of outstanding natural beauty and would suffer blight from the showmen's equipment. On inspection of the current site at Callow Hill gives an indication of the impact, visually that the application would have upon the area.</p>	<p>Objection noted. This site was one of 5 under consideration for a specific Travelling Showpeople family.</p> <p>Not an area of AONB.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPP0163	Policy 20A	Comment	Policy is supported, this is particularly important in rural areas given the limited amount of public transport and I would like to see this policy firmly applied in such locations.	Comments are noted.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPP0954	Policy 20A - Sub Section A	Comment	<p>The two sentences of part A appear to be contradictory, and would not allow for the relocation of existing facilities, along with combining with other compatible or similar uses to a new site or sites.</p> <p>The reference to the NPPF sequential test in Subsection A of this policy needs to be clarified. Amend:</p> <p>The provision of new community facilities or the enhancement of existing facilities will be permitted, particularly where the proposals have resulted from neighbourhood planning, subject to satisfying the sequential test in the National Planning Policy Framework, where applicable. Applicants will be required to consider whether the combining or rationalisation of facilities would be more appropriate than the provision of a new facility in accordance with the criteria set out in Part B of this policy. <u>Proposals for new community facilities which can offer an increased overall provision or combines compatible facilities will be supported.</u></p>	Policy 20A has been amended taking into consideration responses received.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPP0955	Policy 20 A - Sub Section B	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To provide clarity to this policy. B. Any proposal that would result in the loss of a site or building currently or last used as a community facility will only be permitted if <u>one or more</u> of the following criteria are met: Change to the wording so that accessibility is not the determining criteria. 	Policy 20A has been amended taking into consideration responses received.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>i. An alternative community facility which meets needs to at least the same extent is, or will be, provided in an equally or more <u>accessible appropriate</u> location; or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow flexibility in this policy. Add new sub para: <u>B. ii. The existing community facility is not compatible with adjacent uses and planning benefits will arise from its relocation or loss.</u> 	
Sport England	LPPO214	Policy 20A	Comment	Generally welcome the policy and reference in the RJ to the emerging Built Facility and Playing Pitch Strategies. A little confused as to why the PPS is ref. under a policy for built community facilities as these are generally regarded as open space/green space assets.	Amended to read community facilities.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPPO1349	Policy 20A	Comment	The title of this policy should be changed from "Built Communities" to "Community Facilities".	The title has been amended to Community Facilities.
Theatres Trust	LPPO356	Policy 20A	Support	<p>The Theatres Trust welcomes and supports the inclusion of Policy 20A in regards to the promotion and safeguarding of cultural infrastructure.</p> <p>The Policy reflects guidance in para 23, 70 and 156 of the NPPF on planning for culture and cultural activity in local plans.</p>	Comments are noted and welcomed. The Chapter has been updated with relevant paragraph numbers from NPPF 2018.
	LPPO629	Policy 20A	Support	Support for Policy 20A	Support for Policy 20A is noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO860	Policy 20A	Support	Support for Policy 20A.	Support for Policy 20A is noted.
Sport England	LPPO215	Policy 20B	Comment	There is no ref. to NPPF Par 74.	Chapter has been updated with relevant paragraph numbers from NPPF 2018.
	LPPO603	Policy 20B	Comment	Green spaces and footpaths that are currently of value to local communities for recreation and their well being should be protected.	Agree that they are important for local communities, comments are noted.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPPO964	Policy 20B	Comment	To allow provision of buildings associated with community/recreational uses. B. Development of areas allocated as Green Space will not be permitted unless the following exceptional circumstances are demonstrated: i. The proposal is for a community/recreational use <u>and/or associated facilities</u> that does not compromise the essential quality and character of the Green Space; or...	The wording has been amended to paragraph 97 NPPF.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	LPPO1069	Policy 20B	Support	Support this policy and the welcome protection it gives to green space. Pleased to note that GI brought forward under Policy 14 will be designated as green space for the purposes of this policy.	Comments are noted.
	LPPO631	Policy 20B	Support	Support for Policy 20B.	Support for Policy 20B is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO861	Policy 20B	Support	Support for Policy 20B.	Support for Policy 20B is noted.
Sport England	LPPO216	Policy 20C	Comment	The new Playing Pitch Strategy will include an Action Plan	The Policy has been rewritten.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>and mechanism for calculating playing field contributions and provision. It is unlikely to recommend local standards as Sport England do not think that local standards are appropriate when planning for playing field provision as set out below. I note the policy details are to be informed by the PPS and BFS and this is welcomed, as is ref. to those strategies.</p> <p>The advice set out below re. local standards may be of relevance and interest to help shape your final approach:</p> <p>Limitations with using standards of provision</p> <p>Standards are sometimes used to help quantify the need that may be generated from a development. However, as set out below there are some risks and weaknesses with their use that should be highlighted:</p> <p>The NPPF does not advocate the use of local standards for assessing the needs or providing for sporting provision (unlike PPG17 (2002) which it replaced). In terms of planning for sport and recreation it advises that specific evidence of the need for provision should be provided along with clarity of what provision is required (NPPF paragraph 73). The Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) points to Sport England's guidance on assessing needs for sporting provision. Rather than advocating the development of standards this guidance (see footnote to the Introduction above), takes the requirements of paragraph 73 of the NPPF and helps the</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>user develop this more specific evidence.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existence of a local standard in a Local Plan, or other development plan document, does not necessarily in itself justify the requirement to seek provision for a specific facility type from an individual development. It would need to be underpinned by a robust assessment of need and developed further to provide a specific local requirement (e.g. an identified project or contribution to an identified project) informed by appropriate feasibility studies, costings etc. 2. If the underlying evidence base, and how the standard has been developed, is not robust and up to date then it may be difficult to justify their use. 3. Standards propose a certain amount of new provision for a given population. This level of new provision may not be necessary and may not relate to identified needs and actions as set out in a supporting evidence base document. For example, improving the quality or accessibility of existing provision to increase its capacity may be a more appropriate way to meet the need generated by a development. 4. Standards do not provide details of the needs that may be generated for the actual use of a facility. Standards therefore have limitations when seeking to improve existing provision to increase its capacity. 5. Standards can be too generic with a single standard 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>covering a number of facility types (e.g. x hectares for outdoor sport as opposed to a local assessment that may identify a shortfall of cricket and youth football pitches but adequate provision of adult football pitches). Such standards do not reflect the range of needs for different facility types that fall under a generic heading, or provide any certainty as to what specific needs will be generated from a development and therefore what provision is necessary;</p> <p>6. Applying a standard without robust evidence that existing provision, within a reasonable catchment of the individual development and in its current condition, is unable to meet the additional need will fail to demonstrate that the provision sought is necessary.</p>	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO941	Policy 20C	Comment	New open space should be capable of providing recreation facilities. Surely threshold should be 11 or more as this would tie in with affordable housing threshold. For developments of 11-25 dwellings, it may be better to ask for contribution towards off-site provision so that usable space is created.	Amendment has been made to the wording regarding number of dwellings. Comments have been noted.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPPO966	Policy 20C	Comment	<p>To clarify the nature of this proposed policy and how it will apply. Amend:</p> <p>Policy 20C - Provision for Green Space and Outdoor Community Uses in <u>Housing</u> Development</p>	Amendments have been made to Policy 20C taking into consideration responses received.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Miller Homes	LPP0987	Policy 20C	Comment	<p>Our client wishes to reserve final comment on the requirements for development proposals exceeding 11 dwellings to make provision for Green Space and outdoor community uses until the provisions of the emerging Open Spaces, Built Facilities and Playing Pitch Strategies have been accepted by Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) and made available. This information is necessary to understand what the proposed standards of provision are, and the justification for them, but also to better understand the interrelationship between this provision and the green infrastructure provision requirements of proposed Policy 14.</p> <p>Our clients also request the inclusion of a ‘subject to viability’ clause within the policy wording, as WFDC has proposed for proposed green infrastructure Policy 14. Whilst Part B of proposed Policy 20C identifies that there are instances where developer contributions will be sought towards off-site provision, this should also recognise that the scale of the financial contribution should not, in combination with the other infrastructure burdens, render the development unviable.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework) NPPF requires that:</p> <p><i>“Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be</i></p>	Policy 20C has been amended taking into consideration responses received.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable”.</i></p> <p>1 NPPF Para 173.</p>	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01350	Policy 20C	Comment	<p>We suggest that the first paragraph in this policy is more appropriate for a reasoned justification.</p> <p>New large-scale development can put strain on the existing public rights of way network which may not be fit for the increased use developments can bring. Some new developments may necessitate new public rights of way to be dedicated to link with the existing network, or necessitate improvements to be made to the existing network which we would expect developers to address.</p> <p>Future applicants should obtain a Public Rights of Way Search for development sites, including a check of the Public Path Orders list and the Modification Orders register, in order to ascertain the location and status of any public rights of way recorded on the Definitive Map that may be affected and to check for any claims or changes to the</p>	Policy 20C has been amended taking into consideration responses received.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>public right of way network in the area.</p> <p>Any future applications should demonstrate how the proposals will protect and enhance public rights of way and access in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>If it is necessary to divert/extinguish/create public rights of way in order for permitted developments to take place, this should be completed to confirmation stage before any development affecting the public rights of way is started. Application should be made to the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Applicants should note paragraph 75 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that "planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access". Applicants should note that all public rights of way crossing or adjoining a proposed development site should be marked on the plan to be submitted with the planning application, while the information supplied by an applicant should make clear how the potential development will impinge on any rights of way.</p> <p>Developers should also be aware of the Department of Environment Circular 1/09 (part 7) which explains that the effect of development on a public right of way is a material consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission and that the grant of planning consent does not entitle developers to obstruct a public right of way.</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>We would hope to see the above matters addressed in any future applications, along with information on how applicants have considered the following obligations toward any affected public rights of way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • · No disturbance of, or change to, the surface of the paths or part thereof should be carried out without our written consent. • · No diminution in the widths of the rights of way available for use by the public. • · Buildings materials must not be stored on the rights of way. • · Vehicle movements and parking to be arranged so as not to unreasonably interfere with the public's use of the rights of way. • · No additional barriers are placed across the rights of way. No stile, gate, fence or other structure should be created on, or across, a public right of way without written consent of the Highway Authority. • · The safety of the public using the rights of way is to be ensured at all times. <p>If developments cannot be carried out without temporarily closing public right/s of way for the safety of the public during construction, application should be made at least six weeks in advance to the Mapping Team of the Countryside Service at Worcestershire County Council.</p>	
Gladman	LPO1391	Policy 20C	Comment	Any expectations for the provision of new open space or	These comments are noted

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Developments Limited				outdoor community uses should be considered in the context of local evidence that has been produced to assess the current availability, quality and quantity of the various typologies of green space provision. Reference to 'green' space should be changed to 'open' space. Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation make important contribution to health and well-being of communities. Associated policies need to be based on robust and up-to-date needs assessment.	and the points raised will be taken into consideration when the pre-submission plan is formulated.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPO1212	Policy 20C	Comment	Presentationally - Para A needs to be broken down/sub-divided. Under Para E - You'll need to seek clarification but my understanding is that despite what the policy is saying, the Council will not wish to have additional, new, open space etc transferred to them as this is an extra financial burden. The Parish/Town Council's may wish to do so, but the suggestion that the Council will take on responsibility in due course appears to contradict what we have been told repeatedly by Cultural Services colleagues.	Policy has been amended taking these points into consideration.
Stanmore Properties Ltd	LPO1516	Policy 20C (iii)	Object	Objection is made to part iii that requires new development to make up an existing shortfall. This is not justified and provision of open space should relate to the need resulting from the new development.	Comments noted.
	LPO632	Policy 20C	Support	Support for Policy 20C.	Support for Policy 20C is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPO862	Policy 20C	Support	Support for Policy 20C.	Support for Policy 20C is noted.
Place Partnership Ltd	LPO1092	20.2	Support	WP, WMP and HWFRS welcome and support the recognition of the emergency services as part of the	Comments are noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				facilities needed to support sustainable communities and development. This is supported by numerous appeal decisions by the Secretary of the State and Planning Inspectorate (see Appendix 2).	
Sport England	LPO05099	20.3	Comment	Par 20.3 should really refer to NPPF Pars 73 and 74 as well as those mentioned given they seek to inform/protect sports facilities.	The Chapter has been updated with relevant paragraph numbers from NPPF 2018.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPO0958	20.3	Comment	It is assumed NPPF para 70 is the correct reference here (para 28 is concerned with rural economy). Amend wording: This policy is consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 28 70) and provides more detail.	Chapter has been updated with relevant paragraph numbers from NPPF 2018.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPO0961	20.5	Comment	To allow flexibility: In situations where a facility may be redundant, <u>no longer fit for purpose, and/or incompatible with existing neighbour uses</u> , a robust assessment should have taken place, as appropriate.	Policy 20A has been amended taking into consideration responses received.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPO0963	20.6	Comment	To ensure consideration of both quality and quantity of relevant community facilities. Amend: In the case of any proposals that would result in the loss of a community facility, a satisfactory assessment should be undertaken (using recognised national methodology, e.g. Sport England), that proves there is an excess of similar provision <u>or the facility is not of suitable quality</u> in the appropriate catchment area for that particular facility and the site or building is not needed for any other community service / use.	The chapter has been amended taking into consideration responses received.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 20: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Sport England	LPP05100	20.6	Comment	Par 20.6 should also acknowledge the other criteria in NPPF Par 74 re any loss of open space/sports facilities relating to mitigation etc. (not only surplus). Policy 20A also needs to ensure it is fully reflective of NPPF Par 74 and Sport England's policy to protect playing fields. I don't think for example it really addresses NPPF 74 bullet 3.	Chapter has been updated with relevant paragraph numbers from NPPF 2018. The Chapter has been amended taking into consideration points raised.
Sport England	LPP05101	20.10	Comment	There is no ref. to NPPF Par 74.	Chapter has been updated with relevant paragraph numbers from NPPF 2018.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPP0965	20.12	Comment	This paragraph proposes to identify on the Policies Map the Green Spaces to which policy 20B will apply. We reserve the right to make further representations in the light of the publication of the policies map and Open Space Audit.	Comments noted.
Sport England	LPP0217	20.15	Comment	The strategies will identify shortfalls but also it will identify what community sports assets need protecting and which need improving. It may be that development should fund qualitative improvements instead of quantitative provision and this needs to be allowed for within policy/RJ. The policy should help to address deficits by improving both quantitative provision as well as quality.	Amendments to wording have been made.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 21: EMPLOYMENT LAND

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO2247	Policy 21A	Comment	<p>Industrial Development and Work Opportunities</p> <p>There is any indication of ways in which job opportunities, to replace the fading carpet industry, can be generated. There is no point in building factory units to stand empty. There are still units at Easter Park standing empty. Are more to be built to join them as they wait?</p> <p>The plan should include specific indication of industrial regeneration and employment in the area, otherwise young people will continue to leave the area for more desirable opportunities elsewhere.</p>	It is considered that the policies in the emerging Local Plan will encourage employment into the District or for existing employment in the District to expand, as well as ensuring that there is enough employment land available.
	LPPO633	Policy 21A	Support	Support for Policy 21A.	Support for Policy 21A is noted.
Homes England	LPPO816	Policy 21A	Comment	<p>This policy supports employment development on sites which are not specifically allocated for employment uses in the Local Plan. Outside of allocated areas, employment uses on previously developed land is to be prioritised. It is considered that the proposed development of the former Lea Castle Hospital supports this policy through the redevelopment of a redundant brownfield site for housing, as well as the inclusion of a shop/café/community space and 3,500sqm of employment B1 uses. These employment uses would be delivered in a sustainable location close to the main settlement</p>	Comments are noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 21: EMPLOYMENT LAND

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				and adjacent to residential development, to enhance job opportunities within the area.	
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO872	Policy 21A	Support	Support for Policy 21A.	Support for Policy 21A is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO874	Policy 21B	Support	Support for Policy 21B.	Support for Policy 21B is noted.
National Farmers Union West Midlands Region	LPPO1124	Policy 21B	Comment	<p>Concerned that this section focuses on the diversification of businesses away from agriculture and does not recognise the many opportunities for businesses to develop within the agricultural sector. The NFU would like to see a considerable strengthening of the support shown for the rural economy in this document. Many thriving agricultural businesses in the area will be disadvantaged by the lack of specific support for the continued development of the rural economy in the current draft. The section on diversification of farm businesses states that; “the proposed new use does not detract from or prejudice the existing agricultural undertaking or its future operation”. In our experience it is much more likely for a neighbouring development to prejudice an existing agricultural business for example by putting housing at close proximity to an existing livestock unit.</p> <p>Could you also give more information on what is meant by active marketing before conversion to</p>	<p>Policy 21B has been amended adding a new bullet point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture is an important industry in rural areas within Wyre Forest District both for the production of food and for employment. Support will be given for the sustainable growth and development of agricultural and other rural businesses that are in conformity with the other policies in the plan. <p>More information regarding marketing will be incorporated into the Local Plan pre-submission document.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 21: EMPLOYMENT LAND

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				alternative uses? Marketing has become an issue where demand for a new business has not materialised and residential use may be the next best option for a rural building which may provide housing accommodation.	
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO875	Policy 21C	Support	Support for Policy 21C.	Support for Policy 21C is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO876	Policy 21D	Support	Support for Policy 21D.	Support for Policy 21D is noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	LPPO1215	Policy 21D	Support	The introduction of the percentage split is to be welcomed.	Pleased that this split is supported.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO877	Policy 21E	Support	Support for Policy 21E.	Support for Policy 21E is noted.
Hurcott Village Management Committee	LPPO1627	Employment land requirement	Comment	Do we need so much land zoned as industrial and if not shouldn't some of these sites be re-zoned as residential?	Wyre Forest District Council commissioned an Employment Land Review (ELR) in 2016 to assess economic development needs across the District. In the 2016 ELR up to 40 hectares of employment land was required and therefore if employment sites were zoned for residential employment sites would need to be found elsewhere in the District. In 2018 an updated ELR has been commissioned, which will give an updated amount of employment land that will be required across the District.
	LPPO3925	21.1	Object	All available vacant employment units should be occupied before proposing more. A third of the	There are nine units at Easter Park, seven of

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 21: EMPLOYMENT LAND

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>units at Easter Park have never been taken up. Building more units will blight the environment. I do not support these statements. Simply paving over green belt will not solve issues but create them.</p>	<p>these are occupied.</p> <p>Wyre Forest District Council commissioned an Employment Land Review (ELR) in 2016 to assess economic development needs across the District. The findings were that up to 40 hectares of employment land was required within the District. In 2018 an update to the ELR was commissioned to ensure that the requirement for employment land is up to date.</p>
	<p>LPPO4657</p>	<p>21.6</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>The burden on the transport infrastructure could be reduced by more home working. This will also help to solve the aging demography problem. The Council's efforts to attract businesses to the area and redress the demographic imbalance is excellent. Section 6.44 discusses the importance of sustainable living in rural areas. It continues, 'measures that cut down commuting and improve the work/life balance should be encouraged'. Policy 24A discusses the need for improved telecommunications and broadband. This will provide concomitant benefits such as reduced traffic congestion and reduced pollution. The government released guidance for how to deliver community-led broadband infrastructure in March 2017, which I am confident will be followed up.</p>	<p>Agree that more home working could reduce the amount of traffic travelling to places of work.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO2776	Policy 22A	Comment	If the aim is to regenerate Kidderminster, why are the planners not devising schemes try make the town itself more attractive, a place that people would like visit and to spend time in? The centre is a run-down area of empty shops, or a plethora of charity shops. There are several unsightly areas where buildings have previously been destroyed or demolished, and there seem to be no plans for these. The town at night provides no entertainment, with pubs and the Town Hall concerts being the notable exceptions.	Policy 22A has been amended so that where appropriate, other uses such as residential, recreation and leisure will be supported to bring vitality into the town centre of Kidderminster as retail patterns have changed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO942	Policy 22A	Comment	<p>Report below - This encourages the clustering of non residential uses in area beyond primary retail frontages.</p> <p>Retail: a strategy for smaller centres Successive plans have provided for new retail space to be provided, often the ultimate result has not been enlarge the retail area, but to move or shift its centre, so that the core primary frontage declined to secondary frontage or worse. This is likely to be exacerbated with the rise of Internet shopping, whether mail order or click and collect. This has happened in Kidderminster, where Weavers Wharf has led to a lot of empty shops on the eastern side of the centre. We have passed peak retail. This raises the question of what to do with lesser centres, whether the declining part of the strategic centre, the other towns (Bewdley and Stourport) or</p>	Policy 22A has been amended so that where appropriate, other uses such as residential, recreation and leisure will be supported to bring vitality into the town centre of Kidderminster as retail patterns as you point out have changed.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>district and village centres. This is a means of managing retail decline productively. The key to this is clustering uses other than retail that have traditionally been found in town centres. Uses appropriate for clustering are ones where clients (patients, customers, etc.) need to visit the business (or at least are likely to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail (obviously) • Financial services: estate agents, insurance brokers, solicitors, banks • Personal services: gyms, hairdressers, beauticians, tanning salons, tattoo parlours • Medical auxiliaries: dentists, doctors, chiropodists, physiotherapists, etc. <p>A person visiting the dentist may at the same time visit a conveniently located shop, and so on. Conversely, these uses should be discouraged in residential areas. Ground floor residential uses in town and district centres should similarly be discouraged. However, it may be appropriate to have zones on the edge of these mixed use areas, where a transition to residential uses would be permitted. Another class of potential town centre use can be added, but the nature of this probably makes it incompatible with residential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leisure/evening economy: restaurants, night clubs, pubs, and ancillary kebab and pizza shops <p>Towns should have a modest core with protected primary retail frontage. This is probably not</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				necessary for district centres (which are smaller).	
Bewdley Town Council	LPP0835	Policy 22A	Support	Support policy 22A which limits use classes in the "Primary Shopping Frontage". The Neighbourhood Plan is broadly in line with this but limiting A classes to A1, A3 and A4. The emerging Plan will also include C1 as it is important for a town focussed on tourism to have opportunities for centrally located visitor accommodation.	Support for Policy 22A is welcomed and noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPP0879	Policy 22A	Support	Support Bewdley at the end of the sequence.	Support for Policy 22A is noted.
Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited	LPP0630	Policy 22H	Object	<p>1. Policy treats all hot food takeaways in the same way. This is unfair and ignores efforts individual hot food takeaway operators might make to improve the nutritional value of their menu.</p> <p>2. Food of high energy density or poor nutritional value is sold from a range of premises including many in Class A1, such as coffee or sandwich shops, bakeries or, simply, supermarkets, or in Classes A3 or A4.</p> <p>3. No evidence of a causal link between proximity of hot food takeaways and incidence of obesity or overweight. In order to be useful, there would need to be evidence of a particular distance below which harm occurs or is noticeably greater. There is no such evidence.</p>	Comments are noted; however the Council is concerned that the effect of fast food consumption on children's diets and eating behaviour can add to health problems related to obesity. A proliferation of hot food takeaways within walking distance of locations where children and young people congregate, particularly schools can be seen as a contributing factor to rising levels of childhood obesity. 400 metres is considered to be equivalent to a 10 minute walk when taking account of physical barriers, rather than as the crow flies. 400 metres distance is considered sufficient to deter school children from walking to takeaways during their lunch break or after school. (Source NHS Healthy Urban Development)

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>4. It may be better to rely on objective evidence in a retail study to set maximum proportions of hot food takeaways. Whilst these are primarily directed at protecting the retail health of centres, there is scope to widen their application to provision outside centres, such as standalone or parade units.</p> <p>5. As it is impractical to apply a maximum frontage proportion outside centres, the suggested 400 m distance could be applied, within which the proportion (rather than number) of units, be they in- or out-of-centre, used as hot food takeaways would not be permitted to exceed the same threshold.</p> <p>6. In adopting such an approach, optimal proportions of all retail uses that could contribute to healthy centres or to a healthy offer generally, whether in- or out-of-centre, should be considered instead of focussing on particular uses considered to be a problem for wider social reasons.</p> <p>7. If the policy remains specific to particular use classes, then it should clarify how development that contains only an element of hot food takeaway use (for example, a restaurant and hot food takeaway with neither one predominating) would be considered and whether other factors might be considered.</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>8. The inclusion of primary schools is particularly problematic, as it is clear that their pupils are not permitted to leave the premises or travel to or from school unaccompanied. Outside school time, children’s diets are quite properly the responsibility their parents or guardians.</p> <p>9. Consequently, it is unclear how refusing permission for hot food takeaways near primary schools could ever be justified. This was the view taken by a Planning Inspector in an appeal (APP/P4415/A/11/2159082) against refusal of a restaurant and hot food takeaway in January 2012.</p> <p>10. A further difficulty of using simple distance radii is that it takes no account of real barriers, either physical or perceptual, so that premises on the other side of a line feature such as a canal or busy road could be affected despite in reality being more than that distance walk away.</p>	
	LPP04033	Policy 22H	Object	<p>“Outside of designated centres, hot food takeaways will be resisted where the proposal is within 400m of the boundary of a school or youth facility.”</p> <p>The number of takeaways in Kidderminster is excessive and I don’t believe that limiting them to within 400m of schools etc. is going far enough. After investing significantly in the new Wyre Forest Leisure Centre, no less than four new takeaways</p>	<p>A minimum of 400 metres is considered to be a 10 minute walk, from a school or youth facility. This distance is considered to be a sufficient distance to deter school children from walking to the takeaways during their lunch period or after school.</p> <p>Policy 22F does try to address problems such as</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>have appeared very close by, all of which have drive-through facilities. It's parents that have the purchasing power and fast food is just far too accessible.</p> <p>In addition, fast food outlets have significantly contributed to appalling levels of litter along Stourport Road which is only set to get worse if the council chooses Option B which will channel yet further traffic along this route.</p>	litter.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO943	Policy 22B	Comment	This should be cross-referenced to Policy 6A, which says that no new comparison retail is needed.	Policy 6A Development Needs indicates that no further retail development is required as found in the Retail and Commercial Leisure Needs Study (2016). However if planning applications for retail development are submitted they would need to comply with policies found in Policy 22.
Horsefair Traders Partnership	LPPO570	22E	Object	<p>We represent businesses in the Horsefair Local Centre.</p> <p>Very concerned that the proposed policy does not include the threshold of 280sqm net for neighbourhood and village destinations.</p> <p>The Horsefair Local Centre is currently protected by a limit of 280sqm net for new retail development and we believe that this protection should remain in</p>	Wording of Policy 22D Local Shops has been amended limiting retail development to 280sqm to include neighbourhood and village centres.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>place for local centres in Kidderminster.</p> <p>A limit of 280sqm net would serve to safeguard and protect the vitality and viability of local centres, many of which are already finding it difficult to sustain a flow of trade into the centre in the face of multiple alternative options (including online) now available to consumers.</p> <p>Local centres provide a diverse and convenient range of products and services to the local community, usually within walking distance. If larger scale retail development is allowed to take place nearby, this can result in a direct, adverse impact on existing retailers in the centre. The impact can quite easily have the effect of drawing footfall and trade away from the local centre, making it difficult for existing retailers to continue trading successfully. If stores then are forced to close, a downward spiral of malaise will very soon become established where reduced footfall and trade leads to store closures and as shops become empty, this leads to a further reduction in footfall and the closure of yet more businesses. It is a cycle of decline that is difficult to reverse.</p> <p>Paragraph 23 of the NPFF encourages local planning authorities to define a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes and a strong network of vibrant</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>local and neighbourhood centres, performing a complimentary role to the higher order centres, form a key component of such a hierarchy. Local and neighbourhood centres provide a range of local shops, services and community facilities that perform a vital role in meeting the day to day needs of the local population and thereby enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments as acknowledged by guidance contained at paragraph 70 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Other local authorities have the limit of 280 sqm net on development near local centres and we would strongly urge Wyre Forest to maintain this protection for Horsefair and other local centres.</p>	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01351	Policy 22F	Comment	<p>For the first point under main bullet point four, it should be noted that development in the green belt is subject to strict tests. The issue of visual amenity is included in the NPPF in relation to the enhancement of beneficial uses. As drafted, this element of the WFLP policy seems to slightly twist the NPPF approach to one of guiding the appropriate location for certain developments. Proposals for development in the green belt should be tested against the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 88 and 89, which state that, subject to limited exceptions, new buildings in the green belt will be inappropriate and will need to demonstrate very special circumstances. The WFLP bullet point, as</p>	The wording of the policy has been amended.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 22: RETAIL

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				drafted, could be seen to suggest a weaker level of protection.	
	LPP0635	Policy 22G	Comment	Amenities are required but night licenses must be restricted.	Comment noted.
	LPP0253	22.2	Comment	The town centre has moved away from Worcester Street, residential development/conversion should be in Worcester Street, in retail units such as the former Woolworths. Car parking is available behind Bromsgrove Street, facilities for living are all within walking distance. Residential development would help the town centre, and may help increase footfall to the existing shops.	Policy 22A has been amended so that where appropriate, other uses such as residential, recreation and leisure will be supported to bring vitality into the town centre of Kidderminster as retail patterns have changed.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01378	22.19	Comment	Suggest deleting "roadside" from "roadside petrol stations".	The wording has been amended.
	LPP03706	Retail	Object	Vacant retail outlets in Kidderminster and in Worcester Road. No evidence that new commercial outlets proposed will be not be in the same position.	In the Local Plan no additional retail units are proposed.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 23: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO639	WMSP	Comment	The already agreed PP for the water park was flawed and road infrastructure MUST be improved for any increase in visitor numbers. This essential for residents and visitors alike.	Comments noted.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPPO967	Policy 23A	Comment	The club attracts visitors and supporters and is an important local contributor to the district's tourism. The football club is an important multi-functional facility as a tourist attraction as well as an educational, and sports facility. Add to the list of Major Tourist Attractions.	Reference is now made to Kidderminster Harriers in the section Supporting Tourist Attractions. Those listed in the major tourist attractions are those that the first role is tourism, Kidderminster Harriers first role is as a football club.
R & D Turner Charitable Trust	LPPO1179	Policy 23A	Comment	Requests The Arley Estate has a standalone reference within the tourism policies. The Arley Estate incorporating the Arboretum is considered a key and growing asset within the district. It promotes the local and regional economy and creates employment. The creation of new tourism buildings could include a café/restaurant or holiday lodges. Development could be controlled by a master plan, allowing the asset to grow within the constraints of the Green Belt without compromising the sensitive historic landscape. The Arley Estate has seen continued growth in recent years in terms of visitor numbers.	Policy 23A supporting Major Tourist Attractions under the heading Arboreta list the two arboreta located within the District. It is not considered that the arboreta should be listed separately.
	LPPO2783	Policy 23A	Comment	Design Kidderminster to be an attractive and pleasant centre for tourism, taking advantage of	The Local Authority is trying to ensure that Kidderminster is seen as an attractive and

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 23: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				the presence of The Severn Valley Railway; The Safari Park; Carpet heritage trail; and the various sporting opportunities.	pleasant centre for tourism that attracts visitors to visit the many attractions the District has to offer.
West Midland Safari Park	LPP01330	Policy 23A	Support	<p>The WMSP makes a special contribution to the local economy. It is important that appropriate policies are provided that create a positive framework for facilities at WMSP to be upgraded and improved in order to sustain visitor numbers and boost the economic prosperity of the park and local area as a whole. We considers that Policy 23 A achieves these objectives, and supports the Policy. We particularly welcome reference in the Policy itself and in the supporting text to the Masterplan approved by Wyre Forest District Council in 2013.</p> <p>The focus of the Masterplan was the future development of the Hotel, Conference Centre and Waterpark, however, the Masterplan will continue to provide a framework for considering future development of the site, to ensure that development takes account of the potential wider impact it may have. Given the projected lifespan of the Local Plan, it is important that the Policy is sufficiently flexible to enable the evolving plans and aspirations of WMSP to be reflected in an updated or amended Masterplan, and the reference in the Policy to “any other similar agreed document” appears to give this flexibility. On this</p>	Support of Policy 23A is noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 23: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				basis, and with the particular characteristics of WMSP considered, this general tourism policy for Wyre Forest District as a whole making specific mention of the WMSP as one of the most important tourist attractions within the region, is welcomed.	
Historic England	LPPO1281	Policy 23B	Support	We support Policy 23B, though we consider that there could also be an opportunity to include a clause for heritage tourism within this policy.	Support for Policy 23B noted, the policy has been amended to read "Heritage assets and their setting should be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced to encourage heritage tourism within the District".
North Worcestershire Water Management	LPPO915	Policy 23C	Comment	<p>It is currently stated that "For sites that are located within the floodplain, consideration should be given to relocating the chalet(s) to an area of lower flood risk and it must be demonstrated that the development can be made safe for the lifetime of the development."</p> <p>It is not clear to me in what situation this consideration should be given: when a holiday chalet is being replaced by a permanent dwelling only or also when there is a like for like replacement? It might be worth rewriting this policy as per policy 28B.</p>	The policy has been removed from section 23, the policy relating to chalets is now found just at 28B.
Wyre Forest District Council	LPPO1216	Policy 23C	Comment	Re: Chalets - What's the difference between bullet points 2 and 4. It seems to amount to the same thing.	The policy regarding chalets has been amended and is now moved into Chapter 28 (28B).

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 23: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO640	Policy 23C	Support	Support for Policy 23C.	Support for policy is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO880	Policy 23C	Support	Support for Policy 23C.	Support for this policy is noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO944	Policy 23C	Support	This needs to be more closely related to 18E and 28B. Many of the sites to which this policy is intended to relate are in fact permanently occupied for 11 months of the year. We support the objective that the policy appears to be seeking to achieve.	The policy relating to chalets has been removed from this section; the chalet policy is now just situated in section 28 at policy 28B.
	LPPO636	Para 23.1	Support	Support for paragraph 23.1.	Support is noted and welcomed.
	LPPO250	Question	Comment	<p>Tourism is a very important contributor to the local area.</p> <p>Why has all but 1 toilet block has been closed in Stourport? Even this 1 toilet block was closed for refurbishment at the start of the tourist season!</p> <p>This impacts on the tourists and on the local residents as well.</p> <p>If tourism is so important why is there no provision in Stourport for coaches to park?</p>	<p>Toilets are not a planning issue and therefore are not covered by the emerging Local Plan. Provision of public toilets is not a statutory obligation for Wyre Forest District Council to provide.</p> <p>Comments regarding coach parking are noted.</p>
	LPPO4060	Paragraph 23.2	Comment	Bewdley has a lot to offer as a tourist destination, a historic town with many attractions. If some of the proposed greenfield development took place the impact on the town could reduce its attraction as an historic tourist attraction that benefits the	The Local Authority does not wish Bewdley to become less attractive as a tourist destination, however Bewdley does have a need for additional dwellings and therefore some development is required.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 23: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				whole of Wyre Forest District.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	LPPO1070	Paragraph 23.8	Comment	The term 'Special Wildlife Site' (SWS) has now been replaced with 'Local Wildlife Site' (LWS). The two are synonymous but for clarity we would recommend replacing all references to SWS with LWS.	All references to Special Wildlife Sites (SWS) have been replaced with Local Wildlife Sites (LWS).
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPPO973	Policy 23A Reasoned Justification	Comment	To recognise the importance of Kidderminster Harriers as a visitor destination, and its contribution to the local economy. It regularly attracts around 1,800 –2,200 (home fans) and various visiting teams' spectators (100 – 500) throughout the football season. Add at 23.9 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs). Kidderminster Harriers The football club was formed in around 1886 and has operated under various names and management since then. It regularly attracts around 1,800 – 2,200 (home fans) and various visiting teams' spectators (100 – 500) throughout the football season. As such the club is an important destination and adds to the cultural, social and tourist offer within the district.	Reference is now made to Kidderminster Harriers in the section Supporting Tourist Attractions. Those listed in the major tourist attractions are those that the first role is tourism, Kidderminster Harriers first role is as a football club.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPPO1379	Paragraph 23.10	Comment	"passangers" should be "passengers".	This has been amended.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 23: SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO361	Paragraph 23.18	Comment	Indeed, there are species found in the Wyre Forest that are found practically nowhere else (e.g. the terrestrial caddis fly, <i>Enoicyla pusilla</i>). There are also species new to the area migrating in: just over the Clee Hill are Red Kites and also the Pine Marten, so it is reasonable to assume that these may colonise the Wyre Forest area in the not too distant future.	Comments are noted.
	LPPO605	23.18	Comment	The use made of the Forest by pedestrian visitors to Bewdley should also be taken into account and encouraged. Walkers enjoy the circular walk along the river, into the Forest and returning on the footpath across the fields from Dry Mill Lane, this being a manageable length walk with plenty of variety & interest, with wonderful views on the last section.	Comments noted.
	LPPO362	Paragraph 23.21	Comment	Don't forget the arboretum in the main forest, where the 'Whitty Pear' tree is nearby.	The section has been updated and makes reference to the 'Whitty Pear' tree.
	LPPO5117	Tourism	Comment	You say that most visitors to the area are day visitor and that you wish to encourage overnight stay. Overnight visitors here stay on the caravan parks mainly to escape the Birmingham and Dudley areas. They come for an escape to the country which building up our area will ensure it loses its appeal.	The Local Authority is supportive of tourism within the District and would not wish tourist attractions to be negatively impacted however additional residential development and employment land is also required.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01352	Policy 24A	Comment	<p>Worcestershire County Council have made some suggested amendments to policy 24A to better align the policy to the Worcestershire Local Broadband Plan and central government's national commitment to providing 10mbps broadband speeds as a minimum.</p> <p>Broadband and Mobile Infrastructure: A. New development should be provided with ultrafast broadband infrastructure or alternative superfast solutions, where appropriate: e.g. mobile broadband, fixed wireless and/or Wi-Fi. Wherever practicable, ultrafast broadband capacity should be incorporated to agreed industry standards (15). Developers and infrastructure providers (16) should work to deliver the highest specification possible for each individual site.</p> <p>i. Developers of new developments (residential and commercial) will be expected to facilitate the provision of a Full Fibre Network infrastructure (Fibre to the Premises (FTTP)). suitable to enable broadband service for all occupiers and to act as 'backhaul' for other technologies e.g. for mobile operators through network carriers that can design / provide materials for a bespoke duct network, for the development.</p> <p>Telecommunications and Broadband: B. When</p>	Policy 24A has been amended taking into consideration responses received.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>considering telecommunications development proposals, developers will be expected to facilitate state of the art mobile coverage (up to and including 5G) and capacity for all occupiers of the development. The following factors will be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Operational requirements of the telecommunication networks and the limitations of the technology, including technical constraints on the location of telecommunications apparatus. ii. The need for ICNIRP Guidelines (17) (and/or any other relevant guidance in place at the time of the application) for safe emissions to be met. iii. The need to avoid interference with existing electrical equipment and air traffic services. iv. The potential for sharing existing masts, buildings and other structures. Such evidence and justification for any new site should accompany any application made to the local planning authority. v. Development should also consider the provision of in-building solutions. vi. The impact of the development on its 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>surroundings with particular regard to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The siting and appearance of the proposed apparatus and associated structures should seek to minimise the impact on the visual amenity, character, landscape or appearance of the surrounding area, particularly if is proposed in a Conservation Area. • If on a building, apparatus and associated structures should be sited and designed in order to seek to minimise the impact on the external appearance. • When choosing a suitable location for the apparatus ongoing access at appropriate and suitable times should be considered. 	
Gladman Developments Limited	LPPO1394	Policy 24A	Object	Policy 24A requires all development to have superfast broadband. Evidence base will need to set out how telecommunications industry will secure connectivity across the district. Move towards superfast broadband is admirable ambition but Gladman consider that this should not unduly impact on ability to meet housing needs across area as a whole. Availability of broadband is outside control of house builders and strict application of such a policy could mean	<p>Objection to the requirement for all new development to be served by superfast broadband is noted.</p> <p>Some infrastructure providers have agreed to provide FTTP infrastructure to new developments of a certain size at no cost to the developer and for a contribution if below a certain size e.g. Openreach; whilst others will provide and deliver materials at zero</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				settlements being left in a 'sustainability trap' unable to meet day to day needs of residents.	cost to the developer e.g. Virgin Media. Ideally, to encourage competition and future appeal of their site, a developer could choose to deploy at least two infrastructure providers on a site.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPP0881	Policy 24A	Support	Support for Policy 24A.	Support for Policy 24A is noted.
	LPP0591	24B	Comment	Proposals for wind turbines should be resisted as the green credentials and efficiency of this technology appears to be increasingly under question. Damage caused to the environment, and to bird and insect life by these devices now appears to outweigh their benefits.	This comment is noted.
Miller Homes	LPP0993	Policy 24B	Comment	Request clarity on the implications of footnote 18 on the interpretation of proposed Policy 24B. Footnote 18 of the Local Plan consultation document states that the Policy should be considered in the context of an “energy hierarchy”, whereby energy demand is reduced through energy efficiency and low energy design before meeting residual energy demand, first from renewable or low carbon sources and then from fossil fuels. This approach implies that Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) is willing to apply a ‘fabric first’ approach to reducing energy demand, which is an approach supported by our client and the	Amendments have been made to Policy 24B taking into consideration representations received. It is considered that both improvements to the energy efficiency of the building as well as provision of energy from renewable sources will be required. Whilst the Deregulation Bill 2015 indeed sets out that local authorities should not set additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout, or performance of new dwellings, a key exception to that general rule was that until amendments were made

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>wider housebuilding industry. However Part B of the Policy wording includes a specific requirement for all new developments of one or more dwellings to incorporate the generation of energy from renewable or low carbon equivalent to at least 10% of predicted energy requirements, unless it has been demonstrated that this would make the development unviable. The Policy wording therefore does not include a specific allowance for a fabric first approach to be used to contribute towards achieving a 10% reduction in predicted energy demand, as implied by the footnote, and this needs to be rectified.</p> <p>The approach to renewable energy set out in the new Plan should reflect the relevant national standards. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires Local Planning Authorities to set any local requirements for a building’s sustainability in a way that is consistent with the Government’s zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally prescribed standards.</p> <p>WFDC currently has a policy to seek 10% of energy requirements from renewable sources in major new developments, but also note that WFDC has encountered difficulties in implementing this, mainly relating to financial viability. This raises uncertainties over the ability of this policy to be</p>	<p>to section 1 of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 by the Deregulation Bill 2015, local authorities retained the right to set and apply policies in their local plans which required compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations. Those amendments have not been brought into force.</p> <p>The Planning and Energy Act 2008 states that:</p> <p>A local planning authority in England may in their development plan documents, [F1a strategic planning panel may in their strategic development plan,] and a local planning authority in Wales may in their local development plan, include policies imposing reasonable requirements for—</p> <p>(a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development;</p> <p>(b) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy from sources in the locality of the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>implemented and raises uncertainty over whether such a policy would be effective in the future if included in the emerging plan.</p> <p>More importantly, the DCLG Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) issued on 25 March 2015 stated that <i>“From the date that the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings”</i>. The Deregulation Bill was given Royal Assent on 26 March 2015.</p> <p>The WMS also identifies that for the specific issue of energy performance, local planning authorities can continue to set and apply policies in their Local Plans which require compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the energy requirements of Building Regulations until the commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008. The Government has stated that the energy performance requirements in Building Regulations will then be set at a level equivalent to the (outgoing) Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Until this amendment into account</p>	development

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				the DCLG expects local planning authorities to take this intention into account.	
Historic England	LPP01282	Policy 24B	Comment	Policy 24B it would be useful to include a section within the policy on where renewable energy is appropriate/ inappropriate for heritage assets and a set of criteria by which to assess planning applications that relate to renewable energy and the historic environment.	Policy 24B has been amended taking into consideration responses received.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	LPP01323	Policy 24B	Comment	The “Vision” section of this document states that by 2034 residents and businesses rely increasingly on energy from locally generated renewable sources. This is quite an ambitious target. In contrast this policy seems very unambitious particularly the requirement for a minimum of only 10% of on-site renewable energy. The policy also states “unless it has been demonstrated that this would make development unviable”, without stating who would decide that it was non-viable.	Wyre Forest District Council is trying to drive more energy usage from locally generated renewable sources. In the Vision section this is an aspiration. Policy 24B states that this should incorporate the energy from renewable or low carbon sources equivalent to at least 10% of predicted energy requirements, unless it has been demonstrated that this would make the development unviable. Viability issues would be submitted to the Local Authority in the form of a viability assessment.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01354	Policy 24B	Comment	Neither the policy nor the supporting text refers to the move towards smart technology, including smart meters and smart grids. Part B requires new developments to include	Policy 24B has been amended and includes much of the suggested amendments.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>renewable or low-carbon energy generation. Where renewables are not installed (for reasons of viability or practicability), consideration could be given to allow for this renewable technology at a later date. Housing and associated infrastructure can be expected to be in use for 50 years+ and should continue to remain fit for purpose.</p> <p>Part C requires large-scale development proposals to examine the potential for a decentralised energy and heating network. The plan does not explain, however, how this potential should be examined and what evidence should be provided to say whether or not a scheme is feasible. A stronger statement could be provided to determine the level of examination required to ensure heat networks are given due consideration. If a district heat network already exists, there could also be a requirement to connect to the network unless evidence demonstrates this is not practicable or viable.</p> <p>Part E refers to appropriate consultation with the community regarding renewable energy. This could also be extended to consider the options for community shares in renewable energy schemes, offering members of the community opportunities to invest in local energy schemes. This could help with the funding of the installations and could</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				improve community involvement in energy projects.	
Wyre Forest Green Party	LPP01470	Policy 24B	Comment	The “Vision” section of this document states that by 2034 residents and businesses will rely increasingly on energy from locally generated renewable sources. This is quite an ambitious target. In contrast this policy is very unambitious particularly the requirement for a minimum of only 10% of on-site renewable energy. The policy also states “unless it has been demonstrated that this would make development unviable”, so even the 10% target can be ignored	Comments noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	LPP01546	Policy 24B	Comment	Policies should not accelerate beyond requirements of building regulations, without evidence to support that such requirements are deliverable and will not prevent the delivery of housing.	The Deregulation Bill 2015 sets out that local authorities should not set additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout, or performance of new dwellings, a key exception to that general rule was that until amendments were made to section 1 of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 by the Deregulation Bill 2015, local authorities retained the right to set and apply policies in their local plans which required compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations. Those amendments have not been brought into force.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					<p>The Planning and Energy Act 2008 states that:</p> <p>A local planning authority in England may in their development plan documents, [F1a strategic planning panel may in their strategic development plan,] and a local planning authority in Wales may in their local development plan, include policies imposing reasonable requirements for—</p> <p>(a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development;</p> <p>(b) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy from sources in the locality of the development</p>
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01565	Policy 24B	Comment	Council aspires for sustainable features to be integrated into all development, new or existing and requires that all development must provide at least 10% of energy from the generation for renewable or low carbon sources. This is a further onerous requirement set by the Council and it is unclear why such measures for new build are necessary, when standards set as part of evolving	The Deregulation Bill 2015 sets out that local authorities should not set additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout, or performance of new dwellings, a key exception to that general rule was that until amendments were made to section 1 of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 by the

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Building Regulations (Part L).</p> <p>Consider that a more effective way to increase energy efficiency and low carbon sources would be to implement an energy hierarchy, including a 'fabric first' approach before considering the requirement for renewable energy on site, which can be significant cost implications. This would ensure a limit on the CO2 produced from the construction stages and in the later operational stages of the development. Agree that viability should a consideration when implementing these policies.</p>	<p>Deregulation Bill 2015, local authorities retained the right to set and apply policies in their local plans which required compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the requirements of the Building Regulations. Those amendments have not been brought into force.</p> <p>The Planning and Energy Act 2008 states that:</p> <p>A local planning authority in England may in their development plan documents, [F1a strategic planning panel may in their strategic development plan,] and a local planning authority in Wales may in their local development plan, include policies imposing reasonable requirements for—</p> <p>(a) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development;</p> <p>(b) a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy from sources in the locality of the development</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					It is considered that both improvements to the energy efficiency of the building as well as provision of energy from renewable sources will be required.
	LPP02198	Policy 24B	Comment	Environmentally sustainable systems should also be introduced and built within dwellings from the outset i.e. solar panels to avoid the current unappealing streetscapes with copious unsightly pieces of solar kit on roof elevations. Perhaps large sites should accommodate areas for solar panels to support energy conservation and sustainability.	Agree that it would be better if solar panels are incorporated into the build when dwellings are built. However on dwellings where this is not the case and they need to be added later it is still a form of energy that is sustainable.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP0945	Policy 24B	Object	Policy does not consider impact on landscape and heritage of renewable energy schemes. Solar farms should be limited to grade 4 & 5 farmland and where landscape impact is slight.	Agricultural land with solar panels can also at the same time be used to graze animals. The land is therefore being used for agricultural purposes. Limiting the use to grade 4 and 5 agricultural land would not be appropriate. Policy 24B has been amended taking into consideration responses received.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPP05156	Policy 24B	Support	Support for Policy 24B.	Support for policy 24B is noted.
	LPP03820	Low carbon technolo	Comment	The plan makes little provision for low carbon technologies. How will Wyre Forest move forward if it doesn't require 'green technologies and low	Policy 24B has been amended to make to ensure that new development proposals should consider location, design, siting and

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		gies		carbon design' as intrinsic to all schemes?	orientation to maximise the use of natural heat and light and the potential for renewable energy micro-generation and should also include electric vehicle charging points.
	LPP0641	Para 24.1	Support	Support for paragraph 24.1.	Support for paragraph 24.1 is noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01353	Paragraph 24.2	Comment	<p>Please amend 3rd sentence to read "Increasingly the demand is for ultrafast FTTP broadband".</p> <p>We propose two additional reasoned justification paragraphs which relate to the addition of paragraph i. under section A of the policy.</p> <p>Some infrastructure providers have agreed to provide FTTP infrastructure to new developments of a certain size at no cost to the developer and for a contribution if below a certain size e.g. Openreach; whilst others will provide and deliver materials at zero cost to the developer, e.g. Virgin Media. Ideally, to encourage competition and future appeal of their site, a developer could choose to deploy at least two infrastructure providers on a site.</p> <p>In some exceptional locations outside urban areas, an equivalent alternate solution may be acceptable if developers are unable to facilitate an FTTP solution, although FTTP is the preferred option and</p>	<p>The first point has been rewritten and is no longer in its original form.</p> <p>The second two points have been incorporated into the reasoned justification.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 24: TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				the burden of proof lies with the Developer as to why an alternate solution is required. In any case Developers must, as a minimum, make sure that broadband services that meet the standards of the European Digital agenda are made available to all premises, at market prices and with a choice of UK service providers.	
	LPP0642	Para 24.6	Support	Support for paragraph 24.6.	Support for paragraph 24.6 is noted.
	LPP0589	24.8	Comment	This target can be ignored as we will no longer be part of the EU in 2020.	It is not known at this time if the UK will retain EU energy and climate targets after Brexit and therefore until this is changed this is still relevant. Even if the UK does not retain EU targets there will still be relevant targets.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01380	Paragraph 24.9	Comment	The explanation in brackets in the first sentence seems superfluous.	The wording has been amended.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPP01355	Paragraph 24.12	Comment	Although the plan does refer to the "then" Department for Energy and Climate Change, it should note that this issue now falls under the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy.	This has been amended.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Horton Estates Ltd	LPPO865	Policy 25	Comment	We support this policy insofar as it applies national Green Belt policy to the local context. However, the wording of bullet point v. is not considered to be wholly compliant with NPPF para. 89 because it fails to refer to "limited infilling" as being acceptable. In addition the word "identified" is unclear because it is not made explicit how and where such sites should be identified. There is no specific requirement in national policy for PDL sites in the Green Belt to be specifically identified; para. 89 of the NPPF applies to all PDL sites in the Green Belt and, moreover, Policy 34 includes windfall sites so it is unnecessary for Policy 25 to seek to confine this provision to "identified" sites. It is therefore requested that bullet point v. include reference to "limited infilling" and that the word "identified" be deleted.	Comments and suggestions are noted. The 'identified' PDL sites are those set out in Part C of the Plan and will be shown on the Policies Map.
National Farmers Union West Midlands Region	LPPO1126	Policy 25	Comment	We welcome the support shown here for new buildings for agricultural and forestry enterprises. Agricultural business located within Green Belt have to respond to the same pressures to comply with higher welfare and environmental management standards in the same way as those businesses located in other areas of the county. It would also benefit the rural economy if you would recognise the need for new small-scale economic development in	Comments and suggestion is noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				the Green Belt and for farm diversification schemes.	
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPPO1252	Policy 25	Comment	In Policy 25 (Green Belt) at bullet ii we refer to "...or for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt". As COU has been specifically removed from National Planning Policy Framework not sure inclusion would be in conformity. We have been determining COU application in the GB in accordance with the NPPF rather than SAL.UP1 for this very reason. There are a whole host of court cases that support the NPPF approach not to include COU unless in VSC.	Comments are noted and will be considered further as policy work progresses.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPPO1390	Policy 25	Comment	In Policy 25 (Green Belt) at bullet ii we refer to "...or for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt". As COU has been specifically removed from National Planning Policy Framework not sure inclusion would be in conformity. We have been determining COU application in the GB in accordance with the NPPF rather than SAL.UP1 for this very reason. There are a whole host of court cases that support the NPPF approach not to include COU unless in VSC.	Comments are noted and will be considered further as policy work progresses.
	LPPO2801	Policy 25	Comment	Not enough thought given to facilities and extra traffic.	Comment is noted.
	LPPO5110	Green	Comment	The focus so far on our objections and	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Belt		observations of the Local Plan has centred on the lack of justification to build dwellings in both Option A and Option B. There are, however, also serious reservations on the assumption made in the Plan that the developments required justify utilising a percentage of Green Belt.	the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out the alternative options that have been considered.
	LPPO643	Section 25	Comment	There will need to be amendments to the Green Belt but the 3 towns must remain distinct from each other.	Comment is noted and agreed.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPPO975	Policy 25	Comment	To reflect the wording and intent of national Green Belt policy set out in NPPF particularly paragraphs 87–90. National Green Belt policy (NPPF) is not worded such that new developments (either within or conspicuous from GB) are to avoid visual amenity harm due to siting design etc. The proper test for development is in relation only to the openness of Green Belt land. Amend policy as follows: Within the Green Belt, as shown on the Key Diagram, development will not be permitted,	Comments and suggestions are noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>except in very special circumstances, unless one of the following applies: <u>Within the Green Belt as shown on the Key Diagram/ Policies Map inappropriate development comprising new buildings will be resisted, exceptions to this are;</u> [retain sub para’s i.– vi.]. <u>vii. Development at the land south of Kidderminster as identified on the Policies Map for the centre of sporting excellence and associated facilities.</u> <u>viii. And those forms of developments listed in Para 90 of NPPF (or as to be amended in future revisions of NPPF). Other forms of development should be allowed only in very special circumstances.</u> Proposals within, or conspicuous from the Green Belt, must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, by virtue of their siting, materials or design.</p>	
	LPPO3605	Policy 25	Object	<p>I cannot see a plausible reason to build on Greenfield sites. Brownfield sites should be built on first, and half of Kidderminster town centre is vacant - a golden opportunity for regeneration is there.</p> <p>Wyre Forest has a population growth BELOW the national average and within the Guidance on the Housing & Economic Development Needs</p>	<p>Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Assessments 2015, it states that "Assessing development needs should be proportionate and does not require local councils to consider purely hypothetical future scenarios, only future scenarios that could be reasonably expected to occur". I and many others feel that catering for population growth over and above that which is actually required is wrong, especially when it involves using the Green Belt for it and such developments could potentially affect some sites of special scientific interests (development around Hurcott for example).</p> <p>The figures used to calculate the housing requirement have been deliberately maximised to produce the highest possible number of houses required. There is absolutely no need to round the figures upwards. The use of 4.5% vacancy is out of date and should not have been used. The population growth figure taken by the OAHN has no basis in the reality of Wyre Forest. 2.1% is a far more realistic figure.</p> <p>The proposed area in Spennells/Stone is a natural habitat rich in species diversity and home to some endangered species such as Skylarks and Corn Buntings. The land is a natural habitat for birds, bats and other mammals, amphibians and insects that need to be protected.</p> <p>What about the impact on local roads, increased</p>	<p>sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out the alternative options that have been considered.</p> <p>There are policies in the emerging Local Plan which address wildlife and transport issues. Policies in the emerging Local Plan have been informed by evidence base studies and will continue to do so as the plan progresses. These evidence base studies will include transport modelling and green infrastructure concept plans and ecology appraisals.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>traffic and air pollution, where has this been taken into consideration?</p> <p>The council itself has stated "We've already identified on here many brownfield sites around Kidderminster which could be used but do we have any information on whether the owners of these sites are willing to sell for development", why not pursue these avenues first rather than make the big housing development companies richer for no real reason?</p>	
	LPPO2637	Policy 25	Support	We support Policy 25 Safeguarding the Green Belt	Support of Policy 25 is noted.
	LPPO4857	Policy 25	Support	Support Policy 25.	Support for Policy 25 is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO882	Policy 25	Support	Support for Policy 25.	Support for Policy 25 is noted.
	LPPO2199	Green Belt	Comment	<p>It is essential that the Green Belt be safeguarded.</p> <p>There may be opportunities to support infill development within existing settlements and I ask that any sites including windfall possibilities be considered as residential prospects in addition to the other uses cited in the policy.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. We already do count windfall sites to the housing land supply and have done for some time as it is inevitable that windfall sites will arise during the plan period. The emerging Local Plan Policy 18B considers infill development.</p>
	LPPO4120	Policy 25	Object	The seriousness of Green Belt loss together with the numerous benefits Green Belt provides to humans, animals and countless other creatures	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>cannot be overstated.</p> <p>The use of every piece of 'Brownfield' and other non-essential land should be developed before any reduction of Green Belt is contemplated.</p> <p>The 'Eastern Relief Road' referred to should not be viewed as any form of benefit compared with the massive impact that even small areas of Green Belt loss has on all living creatures. I do have serious concerns over the increased pressure that will result on the infrastructure - roads, traffic, NHS, etc., from the increase in population in the additional dwellings.</p>	<p>Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out the alternative options that have been considered.</p> <p>Infrastructure is a key issue that is being addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Further infrastructure will be delivered through financial contributions and local or health authority investment to address any issues arising, where necessary and appropriate. Ongoing discussions with health authorities and education providers are being had as the Plan progresses.</p>
Ramblers Association	LPPO4131	Policy 25	Support	<p>Not only is walking healthy it is also enjoyable. That enjoyment is stimulated in large measure by the beauty of the surroundings to which it gives access. The Wyre Forest District is particularly well endowed. It is therefore natural that Ramblers supports policies such as those contained in Section 11 and Policy 25 which</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 25: SAFEGUARDING THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>reflects the concept of the Green Belt to restrict urban sprawl. We therefore look to the District Council to maintain strong policies and a determination to implement them vigorously. We would not wish to see these prospective policies watered down as a result of this local plan process.</p> <p>We also regard these comments as relevant to all other policies and statements which have environmental implications. These include among others, Objectives 1, 6 and 8 in Section 3 (Plan Objectives), Paragraph 5.4 of the Reason Justification in Section 4 (Sustainable Development), Policies 6B and 6F in Section 6, Policy 8C in Section 8 (A Desirable Place to Live), Policy 14 in Section 14 (Strategic Green Infrastructure), Policy 21B (Rural Employment), Policies 23B and 23C in Section 23 (Sustainable Tourism), Policies 24A and 24B in Section 24 (Telecommunications and Renewable Energy), Policy 26 (Safeguarding the Historic Environment), Policy 27A (Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness), Policy 27E (Wyre Forest Waterways) and Policies 28A and 28C in Section 28 (Rural Development).</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 26: SAFEGUARDING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPP01217	Policy 26	Comment	Isn't there a case for combining Policy 26 with Policy 11B? Some duplication of intentions here.	The splitting up of Historic Environment policy into two sections (where Policy 11B is an over-arching Historic Environment Policy more aligned to the previous Core Plan and Policy 26 is more specific to Development Management and covers those parts of policy formerly contained in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD) follows the model adopted recently within the South Worcestershire Local Plan.
Historic England	LPP01283	Policy 26	Comment	<p>Policy 26A Safeguarding the Historic Environment - we recognise the improvements from our earlier comments and we appreciate the amendments. We would encourage that Clause A is amended to reference an appropriate qualified professional. Consider re-wording the second part of Clause B as it is currently unclear. We continue to raise concerns over including the term 'enabling development' within a Local Plan policy and we are currently awaiting the production of Good Practice Advice Note 4 Enabling Development, which we will forward onto you when it is completed later this year. We recognise the improvements to Clause D.</p> <p>We would continue to recommend the inclusion of a paragraph about Heritage Statements and what the Council expects to</p>	<p>Support for Policy 26 noted.</p> <p>Amend Policy 26 Section A to read:</p> <p>"Proposals likely to affect the significance of a heritage asset (including the contribution made by its setting or any important vistas or views) should be accompanied by a description of its significance in sufficient detail to allow the potential impacts to be adequately assessed by an appropriately qualified professional. This will usually be in the form of a Heritage Statement. Where there is....."</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 26: SAFEGUARDING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>see included within these assessments to provide greater certainty and clarity.</p> <p>We support Policy 27A and we welcome the reference to views and vistas within this policy. It may also be useful to include a sentence on this within Policy 26A and the role of views to setting and significance.</p>	
Gladman Developments Limited	LPP01396	Policy 26	Comment	<p>Gladman note the inclusion of Policy 11B and Policy 26, which together provide policies relating to the historic environment. These policies must reflect guidance in NPPF paras. 126-141. paras. 133-134 sets out need to assess significance of designated heritage assets. Where there is less than substantial harm, this should be weighed against public benefits of proposal. Where there is deemed to be substantial harm, then the proposal would need to achieve substantial public benefits to outweigh that harm. Non-designated assets - policy should reflect para 135 - a balanced judgement should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset. In addition, any policy requirements for landscape protection should be fully justified as part of the council's proportionate evidence base and balanced</p>	<p>Local Plans should not repeat sections of the NPPF. Policy 26 B refers to significance being assessed against the NPPF criteria. There is no benefit in this policy referring to specific paragraphs of the NPPF as these are liable to change in the future.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 26: SAFEGUARDING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				criteria based polices drafted	
Bewdley Town Council	LPP0831	Policy 26	Support	Policy 26 is to be supported, and in particular the importance of preserving Bewdley's setting, open spaces and views of the town.	Support for Policy 26 noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPP0883	Policy 26	Support	Point D should provide the parameters to consider subsequent extension to barn conversions.	Support for Policy 26 noted. Policy 26 part D relates to heritage assets generally, specific building types are not defined within this Policy, the Council's stance on extensions to barn conversions is contained within Policy 28A.
Canal & River Trust	LPP01019	Policy 26	Support	Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal is a designated conservation area. Also several designations along the network plus non-designated heritage assets. Trust welcomes protection afforded to all these assets within policy/supporting text.	Support for Policy 26 noted.
	LPP02638	Policy 26	Support	We support the following: Policy 26 Safeguarding the Historic Environment	Support for Policy 26 noted.
	LPP04422	Policy 26	Support	We wish to support policy 26 safeguarding the historic environment.	Support for Policy 26 noted.
	LPP04858	Policy 26	Support	Support Policy 26.	Support for Policy 26 noted.
Historic England	LPP01284	26.3 and	Support	We support the local list the Council has produced and referenced in paragraph	Support for the local heritage lists and paragraphs 26.3 and 26.4 noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 26: SAFEGUARDING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		26.4		26.3. We further support the inclusion of paragraph 26.4.	
Bewdley Civic Society	LPP0892	Safeguarding the Historic Environment	Comment	Additional Suggestions and Omissions: Suggest a specific policy to ameliorate and support the improvement of and prevent the dereliction of Buildings at Risk, specifically Ribbesford House, Bewdley Bridge and the Old Workhouse.	The Local Authority already has discretionary and statutory obligations to use its powers to address the issues raised in the consultation response, some of which are related to planning but others are related to environmental, housing and building legislation. These are subject to change and fall outside the scope of the Local Plan to define.
	LPP0644	Section 26	Support	Support for Section 26.	Support for Section 26 noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	LPP01171	Section 26	Support	Fully supports Section 26.	Support for Section 26 noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPPO994	Policy 27A	Comment	As per NPPF: Add as appropriate, throughout the Policy <u>the need for developments to be accessible for all users, including those with disabilities.</u>	Comments on Policy 27A noted. Policy 27 A Section B to be amended to identify <u>the need for developments to be accessible for all users, including those with disabilities.</u>
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPPO1218	Policy 27A	Comment	Para B - Fine, but there is no statutory requirement for Design and Access Statement other than for major/heritage related development.	Comments noted, however Policy 27 A paragraph B does not prescribe a Design and Access Statement, allowing for other supporting evidence to be submitted. Paragraph B to be clarified by the following: "...through a Design and Access Statement (or other supporting evidence proportionate to the development proposed)...."
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPPO1356	Policy 27A	Comment	Part A of this policy promotes high levels of sustainability. It is important that developments remain fit for purpose over their lifetime as the climate changes. Consideration could be given to long-term suitability, taking into account the risk of higher temperatures and the possibility of overheating and excess rainfall. There may be opportunities for slowing excess water through the use of green infrastructure, and wider guttering can help to cope with higher-intensity rainfall. The risks infrastructure posed by changes in climate need to be considered to ensure continuity of	Comment on Policy 27 A noted. Amend Policy 27 A reasoned justification as follows: 27.8 It is essential that full consideration is given to achieving sustainable development which counteracts anticipated climatic variations over the lifetime of a new building or development through the choice of location, design and materials. It is also important to address ecological integrity and there may be opportunities for slowing excess water through

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>services and to limit risks of disruption. Further advice and guidance can be sought from the UK Climate Change Risk Assessment, which covers risks to infrastructure and the built environment.</p> <p>Part B (x) of this policy could consider the provision of electric vehicle infrastructure. The plan focuses on the road network and car travel, with the proposal for an additional highway to support housing development. Current government policy is to support the move to electric vehicles, as referred to in the 2017 Queen's Speech and the Industrial Strategy green paper. Government targets are for all new cars and vans to be ultra-low emissions by 2040 and all cars and vans on the road to be ultra-low emissions by 2050. This will be achieved through moving to a range of alternative fuels, including hydrogen and electricity, which can support improvements in air quality. Electric vehicle technology is more advanced and the number of manufacturers producing plug-in electric vehicles is increasing each year. The WFLPR doesn't appear to support this long-term vision with a commitment to charging infrastructure on commercial or residential developments.</p> <p>It may be appropriate for policy 27A in</p>	<p>the use of green infrastructure, and use of guttering which can cope with higher-intensity rainfall. Reducing the demand for energy and improving energy efficiency is also an important starting point for achieving sustainable design. Further advice and guidance can be sought from the UK Climate Change Risk Assessment, which covers risks to infrastructure and the built environment.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				conjunction with policy 11A to set out that developments should require the appropriate storage of waste and recycling bins for each property, along with safe access for waste disposal vehicles.	
Place Partnership Ltd	LPPO1096	Policy 27A Part xiii	Support	WP, WMP and HWFRS support the inclusion part (xiii) within Policy 27A. In addition, the proposed policy provision is consistent with those in existing development plan documents in Wyre Forest and is also fully supported the decisions taken by Planning Inspectors looking at this elsewhere in Worcestershire and Herefordshire.	Support for Policy 27 A and consistency with other recently adopted Local Plans in Worcestershire is noted.
Historic England	LPPO1285	Policy 27A	Support	We support Policy 27A and we welcome the reference to views and vistas within this policy. It may also be useful to include a sentence on this within Policy 26A and the role of views to setting and significance.	Support for Policy 27 A noted. Agree amendment to Policy 26 A in line with recommendations (see comments on Policy 26 A for wording of amendment)
	LPPO2639	Policy 27A	Support	We support the following: Policy 27A Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness	Support for Policy 27 A noted.
	LPPO4859	Policy 27A	Support	Support Policy 27A.	Support for Policy 27 A noted.
	LPPO645	Policy 27A	Support	Support for Policy 27A.	Support for Policy 27 A noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Bewdley Town Council	LPPO836	Policy 27A	Support	The Council supports the provisions made in Support Policy 27A which seek to preserve the distinct identity of Bewdley. This includes its "prominent views, vistas and skylines" and "heritage assets". The Neighbourhood Plan consultation results ranked the preservation of the town's distinctiveness as vitally important to the local community. <i>Part iv of Policy 27A</i> is of particular relevance here.	Support for Policy 27 A noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO884	Policy 27A	Support	Support for Policy 27A.	Support for Policy 27 A noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO885	Policy 27B	Support	Qualified support. This policy doesn't allow for a complete refurbishment or facelift of a property. It promotes the retention of a property that could be visually poor. There needs to be an assessment of the quality of the original property and of benefits of the wholesale change.	Qualified support for Policy 27 B noted. "Complete refurbishment or facelift of a property" is not specifically prohibited within Policy 27 B. Section B stipulates that extensions and alterations should accord with the Council's Adopted Design Quality SPD 2015.
	LPPO2640	Policy 27B	Support	We support the following: Policy 27B Design of extensions etc	Support for Policy 27 B noted.
	LPPO4860	Policy 27B	Support	Support Policy 27B.	Support for Policy 27 B noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPPO1357	Policy 27C	Comment	We consider that Policy 27C could be strengthened by reflecting the Waste Core Strategy's policy WCS 5 and its Explanatory Text paragraphs 4.46 and 4.47, which seek to	Comments on Policy 27 C noted. Insert new paragraph ix. within section C:

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>prevent the inappropriate disposal of excavated materials in artificial mounds unless the use of such material is fully justified as being necessary for purposes such as flood management schemes, levelling of sites, or features for noise attenuation. We suggest that this could be addressed through the inclusion of an additional point under part C of policy 27C such as "Landscape schemes must demonstrate that they: ... Utilise any excavated materials on-site in an appropriate manner and any proposed artificial mounds or bunds are fully justified". The Reasoned Justification could then refer to the Waste Core Strategy.</p> <p>Part C (iii) should also take into account Historic Landscape Characterisation.</p>	<p>"Utilise any excavated materials on-site in an appropriate manner and any proposed artificial mounds or bunds are fully justified".</p> <p>Amend paragraph iii. within section C:</p> <p>"Take into consideration the Landscape Character Assessment and/or Historic Landscape Characterisation, protecting existing trees and landscape features where possible".</p>
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	LPPO1381	Policy 27C	Comment	In part C (vii), the word "too" should be "to".	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Correct typo in Section C paragraph vii. to read:</p> <p>"Utilise lighting and architectural features to give artistic effect where appropriate to the locality"</p>
Canal & River Trust	LPPO1020	Policy 27C	Support	Welcome this policy and requirement to include native landscaping in developments. Canalside landscaping should be appropriate	Support for Policy 27 C noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>for location and set back to allow for future growth and allow for safe navigation. Also need to have robust barriers in place to ensure vehicles do not enter waterway. Details of maintenance of landscape should be required as part of policy.</p>	<p>Policy 27 C Section B to be amended to read:</p> <p>"Landscape Schemes and Boundary Treatments should be specific to the place, recognise the context, reflect existing materials where these contribute to the character of the area and be demonstrably maintainable."</p> <p>Policy 27 E Section C should have a new paragraph:</p> <p>"Canalside landscaping should be appropriate for location, set back to allow for future growth, allow for safe navigation and feature robust barriers to ensure vehicles do not enter the waterway".</p>
Place Partnership Ltd	LPPO1093	Policy 27C	Support	<p>WP, WMP and HWFRS welcome and support the recognition that planting can help to prevent crime and vandalism. This compliments part (xiii) of Policy 27A. Together they will ensure the achievement of the objective of creating safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; as set out in paragraphs 58 and 69 of the NPPF.</p>	Support for Policy 27 C noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO2641	Policy 27C	Support	We support the following: Policy 27C Landscaping and Boundary Treatment	Support for Policy 27 C noted.
	LPPO4861	Policy 27C	Support	Support Policy 27C.	Support for Policy 27 C noted.
Historic England	LPPO1286	Policy 27D	Comment	We welcome the reference to heritage assets within Policy 27D and what measures are required.	Support for Policy 27 D noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO946	Policy 27D.A.iv	Comment	The policy says that adverts should not “confuse” drivers. It should also require them not to distract <i>them</i> . <i>Having an advertisement at a road junction can have that effect, taking a driver’s concentration away from other traffic.</i> A brief slogan or brand name will probably not distract a driver, but if there is more that needs to be read, it will.	<p>Comments on Policy 27 D A iv. noted.</p> <p>Policy 27 D A ii. requires that "Proposals for advertisements must not be prejudicial to public safety by reasons of their size, location or content", and "distraction" is covered by that paragraph.</p> <p>In respect of Policy 27 D A iv. "confusion" refers to advertisements which might be mis-interpreted as (for example) traffic signals or railway signals, or mis-interpreted as instructions, directional signage or information intended for road, rail or canal traffic. This might or might not have a public safety element, hence the distinction and the two paragraphs in the Policy.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO886	Policy 27D	Support	Support for Policy 27D.	Support for Policy 27 D noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Canal & River Trust	LPPO1018	Policy 27E	Comment	The waterways are also supporting climate change, carbon reduction and environmental sustainability initiatives by assisting in the mitigation of flood risk, playing a role in urban cooling, providing sustainable means of transport, supporting biodiversity and forming ecological corridors and contributing to local renewable energy targets through the use of canal water for the heating and cooling of buildings. These opportunities could be reflected in the policy and / or supporting text.	<p>Comments on Policy 27 E noted.</p> <p>Add paragraph to reasoned justification:</p> <p>Environmental Benefits</p> <p>27.47 The District's waterways support climate change, carbon reduction and environmental sustainability initiatives by assisting in the mitigation of flood risk, playing a role in urban cooling, providing sustainable means of transport, supporting biodiversity, forming ecological corridors and contributing to local renewable energy targets through the use of canal water for the heating and cooling of buildings.</p>
Historic England	LPPO1287	Policy 27E	Comment	Policy 27E as referenced elsewhere, we recommend noting that the Canal is a Conservation Area (part of) and that it needs to be considered in line with heritage policies as well as other environmental policies.	<p>Comments noted. The final paragraph of Policy 27 E Section C refers to the Conservation Area, however agree revision will clarify this:</p> <p>Revise Policy 27 E Section C final paragraph to read:</p> <p>"All development proposals affecting the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area (a designated heritage asset) must comply with the requirements of Policy 26 Safeguarding the Historic Environment".</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO4035	Policy 27E	Object	I agree that local canals offer great opportunities for development and should be preserved as a heritage and conservation asset. However, a current lack of bins or alternative waste management solutions along key routes means that litter is once again a major problem. If plans are to improve access to and use of canal-side areas, this problem will only get worse unless targeted measure are put in place.	Objection to Policy 27 E noted, however the provision of waste bins along the canal is the responsibility of the landowner, the Canal and River Trust.
Canal & River Trust	LPPO1017	Policy 27E	Support	The supporting text identifies the Staffordshire & Worcestershire canal as a tourist attraction and the Trust welcomes such recognition. The Policy however is clear that any development proposals whilst supported do need to be appropriate and give sufficient consideration to heritage assets, their setting and character, which we welcome.	Support for Policy 27 E noted.
Canal & River Trust	LPPO1021	Policy 27E	Support	Support policy and need for development to respond to its canalside setting. Support principle that development MUST provide strong active frontage but there may be cases where this is inappropriate - landscaping needs to be retained or dominant buildings screened. Need to take into account setting of specific site and surroundings and respond accordingly. Policy should reflect this. Canal also passes through rural areas and any	Support for Policy 27 E noted. Comments relating to maintenance and development noted. Amendments to Policy 27 E should address these issues.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>towpath improvements should be appropriate to setting and character. Policy should reflect this and Trust should be consulted to determine how this should be funded. Specific improvements have been identified in Kidderminster town centre between Castle Road and Stourvale Drive to include lighting, painting and measures to improve safety.</p> <p>A number of proposed allocations could help finance improvements as they lie in close proximity to the canal corridor. Enhancement works could form part of the infrastructure needs of these development.</p>	
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	LPPO1324	Policy 27E - Section C	Support	We strongly approve the policy for developing the canal towpath as a sustainable pedestrian and cycling route. To encourage the maximum use of the towpath there must be decent surface to walk or ride on. Parts of the towpath were resurfaced using rolled aggregate a few years ago but this surface has not been maintained so that large pools of water form when wet. It would be best if the entire towpath through Wyre Forest was paved but on cost grounds it is likely that on the more rural stretches aggregate would be used which must be maintained to keep a decent surface.	Support for Policy 27 E Section C noted.
Wyre Forest Green Party	LPPO1416	Policy 27E -	Support	We strongly approve the policy for developing the canal towpath as a sustainable pedestrian	Support for Policy 27 E Section C noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		bullet point C		and cycling route. To encourage the maximum use of the towpath there must be decent surface to walk or ride on. Parts of the towpath were resurfaced using rolled aggregate a few years ago but this surface has not been maintained so that large pools of water form when wet. It would be best if the entire towpath through Wyre Forest was paved but on cost grounds it is likely that on the more rural stretches aggregate would be used which must be maintained to keep a decent surface.	
Bewdley Town Council	LPPO834	Policy 27E	Support	The Council particularly supports <i>Section A in policy 27E</i> which states that "...initiatives that make a positive contribution to the creation of a high quality riverside environment will be supported...". The Neighbourhood Plan specifically allocates Riverside North as a zone for potential regeneration for leisure and recreation uses in line with the riverside meadows landscape character. This zone could also include car parking to reduce traffic congestion in the town centre.	Support for Policy 27 E noted.
	LPPO2826	27.7	Comment	This states that new facilities such as shops will be needed, use empty shops in Kidderminster instead.	This comment appears not to relate to Paragraph 27.7 which makes no reference to "new facilities such as shops".
	LPPO647	27.28	Support	Support for paragraph 27.28.	Support for paragraph 27.28 noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 27: QUALITY DESIGN AND LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Kidderminster Civic Society	LPPO1172	Section 27	Support	Fully supports Section 27.	Support for Section 27 noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO308	Policy 28A	Comment	At draft Policy 28A, at F there needs to be a cross-reference to draft Policy 8D, with that extensions for family or dependant relatives will be allowed.	Policy 28 A Section F does not permit extensions to previously converted rural buildings. Thus Policy 8 D cannot be applied to annexe accommodation proposed for converted rural buildings as it is not consistent with Policy 28 A Section F. Where there are special circumstances that warrant consideration of a departure from adopted policy each case can be considered on its individual merits.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO887	Policy 28A	Comment	Support but object to point F. This point is restrictive and is contrary to NPPF advice on sustainable developments, unreasonable given the changing nature of accommodation requirements and at variance with local distinctiveness policies. Point F singles out barn conversions for very special restrictive policies which does not reflect their importance, their reason or potential impact.	Support for Policy 28 A noted. With respect to the objection: Section F is not considered restrictive - it applies the criteria contained in Policy 28 A Section A paragraph i) to previous development, which was itself subject to similar policies. The proposed Policy 28 A Section A paragraph i) is virtually identical to WFDC Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan 2006-2026 Policy SAL.UP11 paragraph i) which post-dated the NPPF and was considered acceptable under public examination.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	LPPO1071	Policy 28A	Comment	We note the wording of this policy and we are pleased to support the commentary set out in Part A. Subsection 5.	Support for Policy 28A noted.
Historic England	LPPO1288	Policy 28A	Comment	Policy 28A it may also be worthwhile to include a	Agree that this reference should be inserted

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				reference to historic farmsteads and the importance of safeguarding these important historic farmsteads and the patterns and form of the buildings. Historic England has further advice on historic farmsteads and development if this would be beneficial.	into Policy 28A A Policy 28 A A iii) has been revised to read: iii) The proposed development enhances and safeguards heritage assets and the pattern and form of the buildings within historic farmsteads.
	LPPO4911	Policy 28A	Comment	We cannot understand why converted barns can not be subsequently extended when other accommodation can.	The purpose of Section F is to ensure development enhances and safeguards heritage assets and the pattern and form of the buildings within historic farmsteads. Section F applies the criteria contained in Policy 28 A Section A paragraph i) to previous development, which was itself subject to similar policies. The proposed Policy 28 A Section A paragraph i) is virtually identical to WFDC Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan 2006-2026 Policy SAL.UP11 paragraph i) which post-dated the NPPF and was considered acceptable under public examination.
	LPPO4913	Policy 28A	Comment	We cannot understand why converted barns cannot be subsequently extended when any other accommodation can.	The purpose of Section F is to ensure development enhances and safeguards heritage assets and the pattern and form of the buildings within historic farmsteads.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					Section F applies the criteria contained in Policy 28 A Section A paragraph i) to previous development, which was itself subject to similar policies. The proposed Policy 28 A Section A paragraph i) is virtually identical to WFDC Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan 2006-2026 Policy SAL.UP11 paragraph i) which post-dated the NPPF and was considered acceptable under public examination.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPPO1219	Policy 28B	Comment	See comments re: Policy 23C above. Need to make sure that we have a single clear and consistent approach to replacement and/or conversion to permanent dwelling. Policy 23C Re: Chalets – What’s the difference between bullet points 2 and 4. It seems to amount to the same thing.	Comments are noted. Policies 23C and 28B have been revised and rationalised to avoid duplication and clarify intent.
	LPPO3543	Policy 28B	Object	I feel furious that as a resident of Austcliffe Park which is classed as Residential, where we pay Council tax, <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. where we have adequate road access 2. where we have access to facilities by road foot and public transport. iii. where we live in permanent constructions NOT	Objection to Policy 28 B noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>LIABLE TO FLOOD, HEAVE OR SUBSIDENCE.</p> <p>WE ARE NOT remote from shops, schools or public amenities.</p> <p>I feel we are treated not just as second class citizens, but with contempt by the council of Wyre Forest, where we are continually overlooked by the council in our proposal for 12 months residency. In 2001 the then site owner then was refused a 2 week shutdown proposal, due to the effect it would have on the public amenities and the Green Belt of the area, everything that you now propose to overlook for the proposals of your own!</p>	
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO888	Policy 28B	Support	Support for Policy 28B.	Support for Policy 28 B noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO947	Policy 28B	Support	We support this policy, but it is closely related to 18E and 23C. At the very least a cross reference is needed, but it might be better to bring them all together.	Support for Policy 28 B noted. Policies 23C and 28B have been re-drafted to avoid duplication and clarify intent.
Environment Agency	LPPO1184	Policy 28B	Support	We support the wording of this policy on the basis of flood risk management issues and safety concerns in line with NPPG and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	Support for Policy 28 B noted.
	LPPO4421	Policy 28B	Support	The Parish Council of Kidderminster Foreign wish to support policy 28B in respect of chalets,	Support for Policy 28 B noted.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				caravans and mobile homes.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	LPPO1072	Policy 28C	Comment	We note the content of this policy and we are pleased to support the wording set out in Part B. The risk of harm to biodiversity, and in particular acid grassland and the species that rely on it, from equestrian development is especially significant in Wyre Forest District and so we endorse the proposed policy approach.	Support for Policy 28 C part B noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	LPPO889	Policy 28C	Support	Support for Policy 28C.	Support for Policy 28 C noted.
	LPPO588	Policy 28D	Comment	Agricultural land should be safeguarded as post Brexit it will become a greener and more economic option for food production to return to UK farmland.	Comment on Policy 28 D noted.
Moor Park Trustees	LPPO1100	Policy 28D	Comment	In relation to OC/5 and WFR/CB/7 - The land is Grade II according to the agricultural land classification maps so in that regard it is good agricultural land, however, in order to avoid this and develop anything which is average to low quality (grade 3 to 4) would cause further encroachment into the Green Belt and not contribute to sustainable development by expansion of the development boundary of Kidderminster. The authority, in allocating this site, must be confident that it will not conflict with emerging policy 28D Agricultural land Quality which states that development of such land (as	Comments noted. In light of this and other consultation responses paragraphs 28 D A and 28 D B are no longer required and decision-making will be based on the NPPF and NPPG.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				defined in the NPPF as including Grade 1,2 and 3a) will not be permitted unless it can be proven it cannot be located elsewhere. We would assume, given the stage we are at, that the LPA has sufficient evidence to support the requirement for such an urban extension on this type of land so as not to conflict with their own policies at a later date. We note that allocation of a site, under point C, may assist this proposal/prevent resistance from a policy perspective.	
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	LPPO1220	Policy 28D	Comment	The SWDP places a threshold in terms of how much BVL can be lost. Do we want to take a similar approach, or just stick with a simple "no" to development?	Comment on Policy 28 D noted.
	LPPO455	Policy 28D	Object	<p>Agricultural Land Classification detailed Post 1988 ALC Survey, Kidderminster East (ALCBO7898) published by Natural England on 17th March 2016 states that the agricultural land is Grade 2 deemed very good. At present the fields at the rear of Baldwin Road OC/4 are productive with a grain crop being grown.</p> <p>I am concerned about the detrimental effect any development would have on the wildlife of the area, as well as the impact this would have with the destruction of hedges and mature trees. The Hornet Robberfly has been observed in the fields behind Baldwin Road OC/4 and wildlife includes rabbits, foxes, pheasants and a wide variety of</p>	Comments noted. In light of this and other consultation responses paragraphs 28 D A and 28 D B are no longer required and decision-making will be based on the NPPF and NPPG.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				birds	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO948	Policy 28D	Object	Support this policy. HOWEVER it is inconsistent with criteria used for site selection as many of the proposed allocations east of Kidderminster are grade 1 or 2 land. Such land should never be allocated for housing. The reference to allocated sites in part C should be removed.	Support for Policy 28 D noted. Comment requesting removal of reference to allocated sites in Part C is noted, however in making the decision to allocate sites consideration has already been given to the sites' current agricultural land quality.
Gladman Developments Limited	LPPO1398	Policy 28D	Object	Gladman object to the proposal in Policy 28D which introduces a blanket restriction on development of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BMVAL). They refer to a 2016 judgment on one of their developments which concludes that para.112 of the NPPF cannot be characterised as a policy which indicates that development on BMVAL should be restricted. Any such sites on BMVAL should be judged in the SA alongside all reasonable alternatives.	Comments noted. In light of this and other consultation responses paragraphs 28 D A and 28 D B are no longer required and decision-making will be based on the NPPF and NPPG.
	LPPO649	28.6	Support	Support for paragraph 28.6.	Support for paragraph 28.6 noted.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	LPPO560	28.14	Comment	Agricultural Land Classification (1985 being the last updated document) is out of date in terms of the ability to grow crops and the way land is farmed. In Malvern Hills District Council area a site with Grade 2 and 3 classifications but when a full geological and agronomist's survey was produced the land was poor and hardly worth farming	Comments noted. In light of this and other consultation responses paragraphs 28 D A and 28 D B are no longer required and decision-making will be based on the NPPF and NPPG.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 28: RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				economically. So the word "Best" would not apply. Accordingly this matter should be carefully reassessed and revisited.	
	LPPO648	Section 28	Support	Support for Section 28.	Support for Section 28 noted.

APPENDIX 3A – RESPONSES AND OFFICER COMMENTS TO SECTIONS 29, 34 AND 36

CONTENTS TABLE

	Page no.
Section 29: Site Allocations Introduction	1
Section 34: Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt	20
Section 36: Monitoring and Implementation Framework	24

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS**INTRODUCTION**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	LPPO3927	29.1	Object	The stated requirement is unjustified and not supported by objective evidence dismissing 3 independent analysis in favour of one that supports the Council's original agenda. I object strongly.	The objection is noted. A revised OAHN has been commissioned which reflects latest Government guidance.
	LPPO3928	29.2	Object	The stated requirement is unjustified and not supported by objective evidence dismissing 3 independent analysis in favour of one that supports the Council's original agenda. I object strongly.	Your objection is noted. Further work on the OAHN has been commissioned and this will reflect the latest Government guidance. The sites selected for the pre-submission draft Local Plan and their potential capacity will reflect this new requirement.
	LPPO597	29.2	Object	Let's keep Green Belt Green Belt.	Objection noted
Gladman Developments Limited	LPPO1400	29.3	Object	It is essential that local plans are accompanied by a clear audit trail to set out how the assessment of potential sites for allocation has been undertaken. Any such process must be explicit, transparent and robustly justified within the Council's proportionate evidence base. This evidence must clearly set out what common factors have been considered and the resultant outcome for each site in reaching a robust planning judgment on site selection. It is essential that each interested party is able to fully understand why certain sites are proposed for allocation and why others are not. Reference is made to Telford & Wrekin's Inspector's note concerning the flawed site selection methodology.	A detailed site selection paper will accompany the draft pre-submission consultation draft. This will set out the key findings for each site from the various evidence base studies.
Historic England	LPPO1290	29.4	Comment	There is no reference of historic environment	Noted. Evidence base list will be updated to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				evidence base under paragraph 29.4.	include reference to historic environment.
	LPPO4408	Core Sites	Object	I object to plan B and “Core sites”.	Your objection to development at Lea Castle is noted.
Historic England	LPPO1291	29.8	Comment	Under paragraph 29.8 we would expect reference to the historic environment to be included where there were mitigation measures identified within the evidence base/ assessment process.	Individual site policies will reflect mitigation measures required for the historic environment as highlighted in the evidence base.
Education & Skills Funding Agency	LPPO1060	29.9 infrastructure requirements site allocations	Comment	Note that several former school sites are proposed/allocated for housing. We would welcome opportunity to discuss their future redevelopment as new school provision may be needed as a result. Emerging ESFA proposals for a Forward Loan Fund to support delivery of schools at an early stage as part of mixed use developments may be of interest to WFDC.	Comments are noted. School sites listed came out of mainstream educational use as a result of the Wyre Forest Schools Review in 2007 when the education system changed from 3 tier to 2 tier. As a result of development proposals it is likely that 2 new primary schools will be required. Discussions between developers and County Education officers are in progress.
National Farmers Union West Midlands Region	LPPO1123	Site Allocations	Comment	Where sites are allocated for development, the proximity of the land to existing livestock units must be examined. Sites should not be allocated for residential development if they are found to be in near proximity to an existing livestock unit. Farms can be sources of noise and odour and therefore neighbouring land could be unsuited to residential development.	Comments regarding proximity of livestock units to residential sites are noted. Any potential issues will be highlighted under site specific policy.
Natural England	LPPO1136	Site	Comment	For the purposes of Natural England’s remit when	The detailed comments are noted. All large

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS**INTRODUCTION**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Allocations - Policies 30 - 34		<p>considering site allocations we regard sites of around 100 or more houses or 3ha or more of employment land (as a rule of thumb) as 'strategic sites' and apply a range of considerations to inform plan making. The themes and issues described below are therefore relevant to the following site allocation policies:</p> <p>Policy 30 - Kidderminster Town – all tables. Policy 31 – Kidderminster urban extensions - all tables Policy 32 – Stourport-on-Severn – all tables Policy 33 – Bewdley – Table 33.0.1 Policy 34 – Previously developed sites in the Green Belt – Table 34.0.1</p> <p>Least environmental value – In particular allocations should avoid designated sites, priority habitats and best and most versatile land. NPPF para 110 refers – as do our previous consultation responses of 9.9.16 and 2.12.16.</p> <p>Landscape - The allocation should be consistent with local plan landscape policies. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be undertaken for each site under consideration, and its conclusions should inform the development specification/masterplan/brief. Sites proceeding to formal allocation should conserve and enhance the landscape character of the area. NPPF paras 17, 109</p>	<p>allocations (100+ dwellings) being taken forward will provide a visual impact assessment as part of the background evidence. Impact on designated sites has been carefully assessed and any sites found to have a detrimental impact on SSSIs will be removed from the plan going forward.</p> <p>Impact on local designations will be carefully assessed and mitigation put in place where required. It is acknowledged that some allocations will impact on best and most versatile land. However, these sites are in more sustainable locations. Any development in the vicinity of ancient woodland will have at least the minimum 15m buffer applied as suggested. Presence of priority habitats and species has been assessed for all these larger sites. Green Infrastructure Concept Plans have been prepared for the key areas of the district where development is proposed. The strategic allocations will be based around the existing GI network providing enhanced GI and additional footpath networks.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>and 170 refer.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – please see above re ‘least environmental value’. NPPF para 118 also refers as do our previous consultation responses of 9.9.16 and 2.12.16. We look forward to meeting with the Council to discuss our previous responses regarding the potential impacts of those allocations likely to have adverse effects on SSSIs including: Hurcott Pasture, Hurcott & Podmore Pools, Wilden Marsh & Meadows, Hartlebury Common & Hillditch Coppice, Areley Wood.</p> <p>Local Sites (biodiversity and geodiversity) – While Natural England is unable to provide advice on the specific impacts of proposed development allocations on local sites we strongly encourage the Council to use locally available evidence and expertise to assess impacts on them. A number of local wildlife site datasets are available via gov.uk Such sites should be mapped and impacts properly assessed. NPPF paras 113,117,118 refer.</p> <p>Ancient woodland and veteran trees – our Standing Advice refers as does NPPF para 118.</p> <p>Priority species and habitats – Proposed site allocations should take account of records of these assets. NPPF para 117 refers.</p> <p>Protected species – As above. Our standing advice refers.</p> <p>Ecological networks – Allocations should set out</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>how connectivity of the network will be maintained or enhanced. NPPF para 117 refers.</p> <p>Green infrastructure – Allocations should maintain and enhance the green infrastructure resource by connecting with existing GI and providing new GI on site. NPPF para 114 refers.</p> <p>Rights of way – Allocations should protect and enhance public rights of way, incorporating them into new development in sympathy with their character and quality. NPPF paras 74 and 75 refer.</p>	
South Worcestershire Authorities	LPPO1249	Site Allocations	Comment	<p>It is noted that there are a number of housing and employment sites that border Wychavon and Malvern Hills District administrative boundaries.</p> <p>The following housing and employment sites are adjacent to Wychavon and Malvern’s boundary which could have cross boundary infrastructure delivery implications which will need to be considered as the Plan progresses, the implications will differ depending on which of the two options is taken forward:</p> <p>Wychavon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPH/29 VOSA site, North of Summerfield (employment) 1.72 ha • FPH/27 East Of Kidderminster: Easter Park, Worcester Road (employment) 9.66 ha 	<p>Your comments on potential allocations along the borders with Malvern Hills and Wychavon are noted. Further discussions are taking place with developers on many of the sites listed. If any sites are proposed in the next stage of the Local Plan which are near the administrative boundary we will discuss them as part of the Duty to Cooperate meetings.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFR/ST/2 East Of Kidderminster: Land off Stanklyn Lane, and AS/10 Rear of Spennells and Easter Park – (Option A) up to 930 dwellings • M1/10 4 Acres Caravan Site (ADR) – The SWCs welcome that the ADR site continues to be safeguarded during the plan period. • M1/3 Parson Chain, Stourport on Severn, (Core Site) 114 dwellings and a link road to relieve congestion at Hartlebury / Worcester Road Island. <p>Malvern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AKR/14 Pearl Lane, Stourport on Severn (Option B) 420 dwellings – In addition to the comments set out earlier within this letter, we acknowledge that a number of issues have been raised about this site including: drainage, encroachment in the countryside, extra traffic which would lead to a new Air Quality Management Area to be implemented. • AKR/15 Rectory Lane, Stourport on Severn (Option B) 130 dwellings • BR/RO/1 Former garage, land at Clows Top (Core Housing / Travelling Showpeople site) 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				30 dwellings.	
Historic England	LPPO1289	Site Allocations	Comment	<p>Can the Council give us the historic environment assessment work accompanying the sites which assesses the potential impact proposed development will have on the significance of heritage assets? There is no historic environment information on the maps or in the comments relating to the sites so we are unsure as to what evidence base the Council has and how they are conforming with the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>We would be happy to attend a meeting and go through each of the proposed site allocations with the Council and to assist them in developing an assessment process, if this has not already been undertaken.</p> <p>I include a link to Historic Environment Advice Note on Site Allocations and Local Plans which I hope you will find useful. https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/</p> <p>At this stage it is difficult to tell if Historic England will have objections to the sites though we would welcome the opportunity to work with the Council prior to the next consultation stage.</p>	A detailed historic environment evidence base has been developed for each of the potential allocations.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Health and Safety Executive CEMHD5	LPPO18	Site Allocations	Comment	<p>HSE where possible will make representations to ensure that compatible development within the consultation zones of major hazard establishments and major accident hazard pipelines (MAHPs) is achieved. HSE acknowledges that early consultation can be an effective way of alleviating problems due to incompatible development at the later stages of the planning process. We also recognise that there is a requirement for you to meet the following duties in your plan, and that consultation with HSE may contribute to achieving compliance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The National Planning Policy Framework (Para. 172) requires that planning policies should be based on up-to-date information on the location of major accident hazards and on the mitigation of the consequences of major accidents 2. Regulation 10(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended requires that in local plans and supplementary planning documents, regard be had for the objectives of preventing major accidents and limiting the consequences of such accidents for human health and the environment by pursuing those objectives through the controls described in Article 13 of Council Directive 2012/18/EU (Seveso III). Regulation 10(c)(i) requires that regard also be 	<p>The advice is noted. In terms of potential allocations affecting HSE consultation zones, site OC/13S is not being taken forward. Site WFR/WC/32 is being progressed but the gas main runs through the neighbouring land which is not being brought forward. The area within the consultation zone for this pipeline is likely to be used for landscaping rather than built development. This issue has been highlighted to the landowner.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>had to the need, in the long term, to maintain appropriate safety distances between establishments and residential areas, buildings and areas of public use, recreational areas, and, as far as possible, major transport routes.</p> <p>At this early stage HSE can give a general opinion regarding development compatibility based only on the outline information contained in your plan. This opinion takes no account of any intention to vary, relinquish or revoke hazardous substances consents. Planning authorities are advised to use HSE’s Planning Advice Web App to verify any advice given. The Web App is a software version of the methodology used in providing land use planning advice. It replaces PADHI+. Further information on the Web App is available on HSE’s website: http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.htm</p> <p>Encroachment of Local Plan Allocations on Consultations Zones</p> <p>We have concluded that there is the potential for land allocated in your plan to encroach on consultations zones. The land allocations that could be effected are as follows:</p> <p>STONE HILL SOUTH – OC/13 – HSE Ref: 7169 National Grid Gas Pipeline – Hossil</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Lane/Kidderminster</p> <p>LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION (EAST) – WFR/WC/32 – HSE Ref: 6867 National Grid Gas Pipeline – Blakedown/Swindon</p> <p>Compatibility of Development with Consultation Zones</p> <p>The compatibility issues raised by developing housing and workplaces within the inner, middle and outer zones are summarised below.</p> <p>Housing Allocations</p> <p><u>Inner Zone</u> – Housing is not compatible with development in the inner zone. HSE would normally Advise Against such development. The only exception is developments of 1 or 2 dwelling units where there is a minimal increase in people at risk.</p> <p><u>Middle Zone</u> – The middle zone is compatible with housing developments up to and including 30 dwelling units <i>and</i> at a density of no more than 40 per hectare.</p> <p><u>Outer Zone</u> – Housing is compatible with development in the outer zone including larger</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>developments of more than 30 dwelling units and high-density developments of more than 40 dwelling units per hectare.</p> <p>Workplace Allocations</p> <p><u>Inner Zone</u> – Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) providing for less than 100 occupants in each building and less than 3 occupied storeys are compatible with the inner zone. Retail developments with less than 250m² total floor space are compatible with the inner zone.</p> <p>Note : Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) providing for 100 or more occupants in any building or 3 or more occupied storeys in height are compatible with the inner zone where the development is at the major hazard site itself and will be under the control of the site operator.</p> <p><u>Middle Zone</u> – The middle zone is compatible with workplaces (predominantly non-retail). Retail developments with total floor space up to 5000m² are compatible with the middle zone.</p> <p><u>Outer Zone</u> – Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) are compatible with the outer zone. Workplaces (predominantly non-retail) specifically</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>for people with disabilities (e.g. sheltered workshops) are only compatible with the outer zone. Retail developments with more than 5000m² total floor space are compatible with the outer zone.</p> <p>This is a general description of the compatibility for housing and workplaces. Detail of other development types, for example institutional accommodation and education, and their compatibility with consultations zones can be found in the section on <i>Development Type Tables</i> of <i>HSE's Land Use Planning Methodology</i> , which is available at: http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.pdf</p> <p>Mixed-Use Allocations</p> <p>Because of the potential complexity when combination use classes are proposed, advice regarding mixed-use allocations is outside the scope of the general advice that can be given in this representation. Please refer to the Web App to determine HSE's advice regarding mixed-use developments.</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Verification of Advice using the Web App</p> <p>The potential for encroachment is being brought to your attention at an early stage so that you can assess the actual extent of any incompatibility on future developments. Information on the location and extent of the consultation zones associated with major hazard establishments and MAHPs can be found on HSE’s extranet system along with advice on HSE’s land use planning policy. Lists of all major hazard establishments and MAHPs, consultation zone maps for establishments, and consultation distances for MAHPs are included to aid planners. All planning authorities should have an authorised administrator who can access HSE’s Planning Advice Web App; further information is available on HSE’s website: http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/padhi.htm . When sufficient information on the location and use class of sites becomes available at the pre-planning stages of your local plan, the use of the Web App could assist you in making informed planning decisions about development compatibility.</p> <p>Identifying Consultation Zones in Local Plans</p> <p>HSE recommends that where there are major</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>hazard establishments and MAHPs within the area of your local plan, that you mark the associated consultation zones on a map. This is an effective way to identify the development proposals that could encroach on consultation zones, and the extent of any encroachment that could occur. The proposal maps in site allocation development planning documents may be suitable for presenting this information.</p> <p>We particularly recommend marking the zones associated with any MAHPs, and HSE advises that you contact the pipeline operator for up-to-date information on pipeline location, as pipelines can be diverted by operators from notified routes. Most incidents involving damage to buried pipelines occur because third parties are not aware of their presence.</p> <p>Identifying Compatible Development in Local Plans</p> <p>The guidance in HSE’s Land Use Planning Methodology, available at http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.pdf will allow you to identify compatible development within any consultation zone in the area of your local plan. HSE recommends that you include in your plan an analysis of compatible</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>development type within the consultation zones of major hazard establishments and MAHPs based on the methodology. The sections on <i>Development Type Tables</i> and the <i>Decision Matrix</i> are particularly relevant, and contain sufficient information to provide a general assessment of compatible development by use class within the zones.</p> <p>There are a number of factors that can alter a Web App decision, for example where a development straddles 2 zones. These factors are outside the scope of the general advice in this letter. <u>HSE’s final advice on development compatibility can only be determined through use of the Web App.</u></p> <p>Provision of Information to Interested Parties – Pipeline Operators</p> <p>The pipeline operator/s referred to will be sent a copy of this representation to make them aware of HSE’s preliminary advice on this matter</p>	
	LPP04661	Section C	Comment	<p>Are all Core housing sites definitely going to be built on or will this be part of the Pre-Submission stage decisions? It's worrying to see the number of Core housing sites on the Green Belt of our towns, surely it would be more beneficial to build on the brownfield sites first which is what I assume would be the preferred approach by the Council too given</p>	<p>The final list of sites going forward to the pre-submission consultation is likely to be a mix of those in the Preferred Option (both Core, option A and option B) plus additional sites which have either been submitted during the Preferred Options consultation or were assessed through the HELAA. Further</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS**INTRODUCTION**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>the existing utilities and infrastructure available to these sites?</p> <p>Referring to Section C, Site Allocations, there are c1500 dwellings that can be built before even thinking about the Green Belt sites. Should this not be the obvious choice first of all? Furthermore, having looked in detail at Section C I can see that if all of the site locations and potential number of dwellings are added together, for Core, Option A and Option B, there are only 3,891 dwellings. Have I calculated this correctly? Does this mean that essentially the Options will be taken away at some stage between now and 2034 as ultimately all of the sites (and more) will need to be developed to meet the 5,400 target?</p>	<p>work to update the housing requirement is underway taking into account the Government's latest guidance and recently released population figures. Until the final housing requirement is known, the list of sites cannot be finalised. It should be noted that more sites will be put forward for allocation than are required to allow for sites not being developed. A number of additional areas of safeguarded land will also be put forward for removal from the Green Belt. These sites could then be brought forward for release for development at a future Local Plan review once the existing allocations have been exhausted.</p>
Stanmore Properties Ltd	LPPO1517	Site Allocations	Comment	<p>It is acknowledged that an evidence base has been prepared to assess sites for allocation. In the absence of a Topic Paper it is difficult to justify the selections made and why certain elements of an allocation have arisen. For example, in respect of Core Site BW/4, the allocation states the site can accommodate a total of 200 dwellings across the entire site with extensive areas left undeveloped to protect Hurcott Pastures SSSI and Hurcott Wood Nature Reserve. There is no evidence as to why it is capable of accommodating only 200 dwellings which is low for a site of 13.80 ha even allowing for</p>	<p>Comments are noted. A Site Selection Paper will be published alongside the pre-submission consultation document. Further pieces of evidence base work have been commissioned and all of this work will be summarised in this paper on a site by site basis.</p> <p>In terms of BW/4 - the figure of 200 dwellings was based on the capacity of a single access out onto Stourbridge Road with no secondary access off Hurcott Lane.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				35% green infrastructure.	Further details will be given in the site selection paper.
Ramblers Association	LPPO4138	Section 29	Comment	<p>Section 29 to 35 deal with site allocations for various land use proposals. Basic information is given in tables and the reasoned justification but no information is given about constraints. We think that such information should be available as it has an impact upon the capacity of sites and consequently their value.</p> <p>As examples, the site at Clows Top earmarked as a possible Travelling Show Persons’ site has a footpath at one side of it. Ramblers would have some doubt that the two uses are compatible. Also, as already discussed above, the Preferred Option site to the south east of Kidderminster has a number of footpaths across it. I assume that you must have been aware of these constraints in considering the suitability of these sites for the proposed uses. Not drawing attention to their existence could imply that prospective developers do not have to take them into account.</p> <p>There will be other sites in your list that will have footpaths and other constraints on them and they ought to be considered and flagged up in bringing the sites forward for development.</p>	Officers are aware that a number of sites have footpaths affecting them. This is flagged up in the assessment sheets compiled for each site in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). Detailed site policies will be drawn up for the next stage of the Local Plan process for those sites being taken forward. Any public rights of way will be mentioned in the site policy.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS**INTRODUCTION**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				I trust that these comments will be helpful to you in progressing the local plan and apologise that it has not been possible to make an earlier response.	
	LPPO447	29 - Site Allocations	Object	<p>I object to Option A and Option B, also to some of the Core Sites. By requesting 'A' or 'B' you imply acceptance of the Core Sites.</p> <p>I object (at Lea Castle) to Option A, Option B, and the removal of the trees along the Core Site from the Green Belt.</p>	Your objections relating to the development at Lea Castle are noted. However, there are no plans for widespread removal of the trees at Lea Castle. The mapping on the document simply showed the extent of the landholding.
The Woodland Trust	LPPO532	site allocations	Object	<p>We wish to object to the following site allocations as they are either within or adjacent to an area of ancient woodland. We have set out in our comments as to the importance of ancient woodland in our response under the Green Infrastructure section and also in more detail in our submission at the Issues and Options stage. In summary, it is an irreplaceable habitat, it is strongly protected in national planning policy and so it is imperative that any development which could damage ancient woodland is avoided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPH/8 SDF and adjacent land • WFR/WC/18 Sion Hill School site • FPH/1 Settling Ponds • WFR/WC/15 Lea Castle Hospital • OC/4 East of Kidderminster (N) 	<p>Officers agree that Ancient Woodland should be protected and any proposed allocations being taken forward will require development to be set back a minimum of 15m from the edge of ancient woodland.</p> <p>FPH/8 site boundary revised to keep development 15m back from edge of woodland (redevelopment of existing buildings)</p> <p>WFR/WC/18 Mostly redevelopment on existing footprint of school buildings</p> <p>FPH/1 not being taken forward</p> <p>WFR/WC/15/32 all woodland being retained</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 29 – SITE ALLOCATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OC/13S Stone Hill South • WFR/ST/1 Captains & The Lodge • WFR/WC/32 Lea Castle Hospital extension (E) • AKR/14 Pearl Lane • BR/BE/6 Land off Highclere 	<p>on site. Axborough Wood will be protected from development through policy.</p> <p>OC/4 not being taken forward</p> <p>OC/13S not being taken forward</p> <p>WFR/ST/1 not being taken forward</p> <p>AKR/14 reduced scheme being taken forward. Will not impact on Areley Wood</p> <p>BR/BE/6 not being taken forward</p>
Environment Agency	LPPO1185	29.4	Support	Paragraph 29.4 confirms all sites have been assessed against national and local policy and technical evidence, including the Level 1 and 2 SFRA and WCS. This will help to inform the sequential test to site allocation and ensure development is deliverable.	Your support is noted. The SFRA and WCS have been used to further inform the site selection going forward.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 34 – PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES IN THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	LPP0996	Policy 34	Comment	Amend policy to include proposed <u>site south of Kidderminster for the proposed centre of sporting excellence and relocated Kidderminster Harriers stadium and associated facilities. Remove from Green Belt.</u>	Officers do not consider that this policy is relevant to the proposal in question. The site is part of a larger policy allocation for Minster Road Outdoor Sports Area.
West Midland Safari Park	LPP01331	Policy 34	Comment	We support the designation of the Park as a previously developed site in the Green Belt in the Green Belt, and the support given by the Policy to development proposals that support and enhance the park's operations as a leisure and tourism destination. We objects however to the section of the Policy which requires the design and landscaping of development to minimise the impact on the Green Belt through using sensitive materials and colours and providing extensive landscaping. RPS considers that these considerations do not impact on whether or not development is appropriate in the Green Belt, and proposing to control development in the Green Belt does not enjoy the support of Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Other policies in the Local Plan, notably Policy 11C and Policy 27C, along with the Councils' Design DPD can adequately deal with these matters.	Support for designation of WMSP under this policy is noted. The section on design and landscaping of development refers to previously developed site in the Green Belt which are not specifically allocated under this policy. The final sentence will be amended to read as ' For other previously developed sites in the Green Belt, applications for development will be considered against this policy framework and the rest of the policies in the plan.'
West Midland Safari Park	LPP01332	34.4	Comment	We object to the extent of the previously developed land (PDL), as shown on the plan on page 187 of the Preferred Options document.	Your objections are noted. However, officers do not agree that the extent of the previously developed area should be extended to take in the drive-thru- safari area. The red line boundary

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 34 – PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES IN THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>RPS considers that the boundary should be the same as the 'Development Envelope' area shown in red on the plan (Figure 1). The general principle for the identification of major tourist attractions as major previously developed sites under PPG2 was to include all the main operational areas within the attraction, including buildings, amusement park rides and associated infrastructure, animal enclosures and lakes (where they fall within operational area).</p> <p>It is considered, however, that other operational land (including the Safari Drive), the car parks and the other lakes should also be defined as previously developed land. We consider that the hotel/waterpark site should be included as that has an extant planning permission and will be implemented within the Plan period. The animal areas should also be included as they contain buildings and various other significant structures, such as fencing.</p> <p>Given the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the designation of these areas would ensure that, by definition, only development that has no strategic impact on the Green Belt will be permitted without the need to demonstrate very special circumstances. All other forms of inappropriate development would need to follow</p>	<p>will be extended northwards to include the land with permission for the water park/hotel and conference centre.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 34 – PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES IN THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>the normal approach where very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated. This wider designation would not be a blanket designation where all forms of development would be acceptable at all locations within the park. This means that, for example, within the Safari Drive area, the replacement of buildings and structures for animals would not need to demonstrate very special circumstances. However, the intensification of these areas outside the parameters of the previously-developed site, or which would be harmful to openness, would need to demonstrate very special circumstances. This is particularly important at WMSP where animal houses and maintenance buildings need to be upgraded, relocated or replaced, and the PDL designation would provide a framework for this. Essentially, the parameters within which development can take place would differ depending on which zone of the park the development proposed is within; so the Safari Drive would differ from the Amusement Park. Given the scale of the site, it is entirely appropriate to apply a PDL designation to all of the operational parts of the site as shown in Figure 1. The undeveloped/non-operational areas should fall outside the MDS.</p>	
Horton Estates	LPP0866	Policy 34	Comment	Firstly, it is requested that this policy be re-titled	Agree with first comment - policy title will be

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 34 – PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES IN THE GREEN BELT

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Ltd				<p>because it isn't limited to "allocated" PDL sites but also covers "windfall" PDL sites. Secondly, we request that Cursley Distribution Park be specifically identified/allocated as a PDL site in the Green Belt under this policy (the site boundary is identified on the enclosed Existing Site Plan). This comprises a 10ha site providing a significant quantum of employment floorspace (22,577sqm), including several large warehouses. It is similar in scale to the nearby Rushock Trading Estate and its identification under this policy is therefore fully justified. Finally, the view is taken that the policy should explicitly confirm that replacement buildings, limited infilling and partial/complete redevelopment will be supported at PDL sites in the Green Belt in principle. This would be in accordance with NPPF para. 89 and would also link to draft Policy 25.</p>	<p>amended to read as 'Previously Developed Sites in the Green Belt'.</p> <p>Second comment - Cursley Distribution Park will be specifically identified under this policy. The policy will confirm that replacement buildings, limited infilling and partial/complete redevelopment will be supported for B1, B2 and B8 uses.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 36: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Stanmore Properties Ltd	LPPO1526	IDP	Comment	<p>BW/4a and BW/4b should be considered as one site and the whole site should be liable for the infrastructure costs of the development. Splitting the site unfairly allows the northern part of the site to benefit from existing school capacity to the cost of the rest of the site. Furthermore, it should be noted the planning application on the northern part of the site is for up to 100 dwellings, not 82 which is the number shown on an indicative layout and therefore to calculate contributions based on 82 dwellings is erroneous.</p> <p>Overall, the whole site BW/4 should be master planned as one complete site and this would allow for the most efficient layout to be achieved with shared infrastructure, particularly open space. This will lead to the most efficient use of the land and is likely to deliver the greatest number of houses on the site and the greatest infrastructure benefits.</p>	Your comments are noted. Planning permission is now in place for 91 dwellings on the northern part of the site. This includes a S106 agreement covering contributions towards education provision, open space provision and highways infrastructure. This site will be brought forward as a stand alone development.
	LPPO385	Section 106 obligations	Comment	What financial contributions are the developers expected to make under s106? Residents should have sight of the deal the council is striking to weigh up value for money.	Details are provided in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Planning Contributions SPD.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	LPPO1551	Paragraph 36.3	Comment	No evidence to demonstrate delivery rates of both options in the Preferred Options document. It is extremely important that a Housing Trajectory is prepared so that development rates of each site	Your comments are noted. The plan period is now to be extended until 2036. This should allow time for larger urban extension sites to be delivered within the plan period. Detailed

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 36: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>are fully transparent and can be publicly scrutinised. As highlighted in the context of Rugby Borough (whereby their sites were not in the Green Belt), there is concern that the larger sites may not be delivered, or delivered in full, within the plan period. For example, the plan is not likely to be adopted and, accordingly sites removed from the Green Belt, until 2019, after which the preparation, submission and determination of all planning applications, reserved matters and conditions is likely to take three to five years and earliest completions can be anticipated from year 7 of the 22 year plan. It should be noted that this does not allow for any significant infrastructure that may be required. If five developers deliver 50 per annum, which is 250 per annum, the urban extensions will provide 3,000 dwellings over the remaining plan period. This would result in the urban extensions being completed beyond the plan period.</p> <p>To overcome this, one potential option would be to alter the plan period to commence in 2016 and extend to 2041. This would provide a longer plan period and, although it is acknowledged further OAN work would need to take place, on the basis of the 300 dwellings per annum based on the emerging Plan, a new dwelling requirement of 7,500 would result in a need to identify a supply</p>	<p>site policies will give details of expected delivery timescales. Larger sites are expected to be delivered in phases with multiple sales outlets allowing for an increased rate of housing delivery.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 36: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>of land equivalent to the delivery of 9,000 dwellings (7,500 + 20%). As demonstrated by the site schedules in the SHELAA, there are sufficient sites to meet the revised land supply requirement, which would allow for both Option 'A' and a dispersal strategy to be delivered.</p> <p>Furthermore, the SHELAA also identified that there is further capacity over and above the 9,000 dwellings to provide relief to the neighbouring HMA whereby housing delivery is proving to be difficult.</p> <p>An alternative approach would be to identify the Option 'A' urban extension as safeguarded land to be delivered beyond the plan period. This mechanism would remove land from the Green Belt and secure the delivery of the Eastern Relief Road in the longer term and would be consistent with paragraph 85 of the NPPF which sets out that: 'where necessary, local planning authorities should identify in their plans areas of 'safeguarded land' between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.'</p> <p>This approach would secure the benefits of Option 'A' yet be realistic in respect of the contributions to housing delivery from the urban extensions.</p>	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 36: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Education & Skills Funding Agency	LPPO1061	Chapter 36	Comment	<p>One of the tests of soundness is that a Local Plan is 'effective' i.e. the plan should be deliverable over its period. There is a need to ensure that education contributions made by developers are sufficient to deliver additional school places required. The ESFA support the Council's approach to ensure developer contributions address the impacts arising from growth.</p> <p>The ESFA would like to respond to any update to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Please add us to database for future Developer Contributions/CIL</p>	ESFA has been added to database as requested.
Place Partnership Ltd	LPPO1098	Monitoring and Implementation Framework 36.1, 36.2	Comment	<p>WP, WMP and HWFRS are supportive of the proposal for the IDP to detail the infrastructure required to support the proposals and development sites in the Local Plan. We also welcome the recognition that both the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 mechanisms will be required to deliver this.</p> <p>Pleased that the contents of the IDP on pages 60 – 61 reflect the representations that we submitted to the Council on the 05 September 2016 and 05 January 2017.</p> <p>We would like to update the aforementioned representations by enclosing in Appendix 2 details of the most recent Secretary of State and Planning</p>	NOT FINISHED

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 36: MONITORING AND IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Inspectorate appeal decisions supporting Section 106 contributions for the police service. They confirm that the principle of and methodology used to request such contributions are wholly compliant with the CIL Regulations. They also confirm that 'infrastructure' is a broad term and includes not just includes buildings, but equipment and vehicles too, with all types acceptable within the terms of the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>Disappointed to see that the table enclosed in Appendix A of the IDP has not taken into account the aforementioned representations. No reason is given for this. However, please find enclosed in Appendix 3 an update for inclusion in the IDP.</p> <p>Overall, we trust that this response is of assistance to the preparation of the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review, but should there be any queries or further information is needed, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	

APPENDIX 3B – KEY ISSUES ARISING FROM RESPONSES
CONTENTS TABLE

	Page no.
Section 30: Kidderminster Town	1
Section 31: Kidderminster Urban Extensions	8
Section 32: Stourport-on-Severn	62
Section 33: Bewdley	82
Section 35: Wyre Forest Rural	90

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
AS/1 – Comberton Place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This includes what should be an opportunity site for a Park and Ride car park related to the station. 	Part of this site is now being developed for 23 dwellings. Some public car parking is retained
AS/5 – Victoria Carpets Sports Ground	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of the proposed allocation. The site is deliverable and a planning application will be submitted shortly. <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flooding. The site floods significantly and often and is within Flood Zone 2. The significance and impact of this has not been appreciated in the site’s HELAA Assessment. A housing development on this site could have serious implications on the viability and playing of golf at KGC. Loss of Sport facility/Playing field. The proposal is in conflict with the plan which seeks to protect and safeguard community facilities. The site is a prominent and important open space on a major thoroughway of the town. Its loss to bricks and mortar will deplete its green, open value. The adjoining Golf Course has a habitat for wide ranging flora and fauna, some of which could include protected. Traffic. There is an issue with traffic both vehicular and pedestrian. Access to the site is difficult given the high volume of traffic in the area both on the A449 Trunk Road and the Spennells Valley Road and the proximity to the traffic island. How is the loss of the playing field to be mitigated and how does it accord with the PPS? Currently allocated as open space. Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. 	This site now has planning approval (outline) for up to 45 dwellings. It has not been used as a playing field since 2003. Access will be taken from the Spennells Valley Road.
AS/6 – Lea Street School	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a period of uncertainty about when site could be delivered and as such this test is not met. SHLAA states part of site still in use and thus allocation is not NPPF compliant. 	The building has been confirmed as not fit for purpose for the current users (a small pupil referral unit plus ancillary education staff). New premises are being sought.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
BHS/2 – Bromsgrove Street	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many other attractive old and empty buildings are ideal for conversion to attractive town centre living. Additional shops and restaurants in this area are not desirable or economically sustainable. <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An unsuitable area for a commercial retail island, but should be considered as an area for housing development only. 	The former magistrates' court building is now listed Grade II and is expected to be brought forward for mainly residential uses. Plans for a leisure use on the former Glades site are well advanced. This will include ancillary restaurants. Part of the existing car park will be retained as part of this proposal with the remainder potentially being available for residential use. The former health centre buildings are being retained by the NHS.
BHS/16 – Timber Yard, Park Lane	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appears to include a DW sport and fitness centre. How does this fit with the Built Sports Facility Strategy? Is it surplus? How does the proposal meet NPPF Par 74? Policy and supporting text is very limited and narrow on what form development should take on this gateway site. KCAAP provides detailed guidance and this should be replicated in the Local Plan Review. Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. 	The site only includes the former timber yard and its buildings plus additional land on Park Lane. It does not include land on the other side of the canal. The KCAAP policy will be used as a basis for the policy going forward into the Local Plan
BHS/18 – Blakebrook School	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This paragraph speaks of the potential for a cycle path/pedestrian path in relation to St John's Close (and Church View). It is difficult to understand how this may be achieved. <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> County Buildings and Blakebrook School - includes listed chapel and TPOs. Question whether capacity is too high at 35dph. Capacity should be reduced. 	Permission is now in place for a development of 40 dwellings plus the conversion of the former library building adjacent to Bewdley Road. There are no links to the residential development to the rear proposed. The listed chapel and curtilage buildings do not form part of this application. They will be retained and there are proposals to convert them non-residential uses.
BW/1 – Churchfields	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current application for 95 dwellings/offices on part of site. Question 	A revised application for up to 270 dwellings and including conversion of 1902 building is

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>deliverability of rest of site as subject to tenancies. Suggest capacity is reduced significantly.</p>	<p>expected to be determined by the planning committee in late 2018. Existing site tenants are on short-term leases.</p>
<p>BW/2 - Limekiln Bridge</p>	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports zoning of BW/2 for residential. <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site includes a MUGA. Is this to be protected, relocated or is it surplus? How does it meet with NPPF Par 74? • Deliverability of site is questionable. No evidence to show site is viable. • In accordance with the adopted and emerging Plans the employment element of this site must be clearly shown to be surplus to requirements through robust evidence. • Protect Limekiln Park (existing basket ball court). • Question deliverability of site as new link road required to bring site forward. • Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. 	<p>The existing basketball court has not been used/maintained for a number of years. The link road will need to be brought forward prior to this site being developed. Funding is now in place and it is expected to be delivered in 2019/20. Talks between the Council and the landowner of the employment site are ongoing. Any proposal will be expected to include some form of open space.</p>
<p>BW/3 – Sladen School</p>	<p>Comments / Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolished in 2009 but progress has not been made. • It is about time the old school of Sladen was used for building houses but please improve the road access at the Horsefair first. <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sladen school land was provided by the Church for the specific purpose as an educational facility. What is the status of the covenant that forbade other uses? • Sport England may require large area of sports field to be retained. Capacity of 72 should be reduced. • This will give rise to the loss of playing field. Is this in compliance with NPPF Par 74 and SE Policy? Is the loss supported by the PPS - is the playing field surplus? • Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. 	<p>It is still intended to bring the site forward for a mix of general needs housing and supported housing. The link road at Churchfields will need to be provided prior to this site coming forward. Some form of open space suitable for sports use should be provided as part of any development proposal as this playing field was assessed as part of the Open Space Study.</p>
<p>FPH/6 – Oasis – Goldthorn Road</p>	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although currently allocated, site has not come forward. Delivery is questionable and it should be removed from plan. 	<p>Site has had its lease renewed for employment and has therefore been removed from the plan in order to safeguard</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
		jobs.
FPH/18 – Naylor’s Field	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Today it is still used by children playing football etc. The proposed development of 35 dwellings would be totally out of character with the area. • Residents’ access to fields will be restricted. • Community event held on fields. • Spoil the view from the houses. • WFDC stated in writing that "they do not support any housing scheme" and that historically the land had "educational use" as playing fields. • The loss of habitat for wildlife. • Sutton Park Road itself is already busy and congested. • Use brown field sites not green field. • Should be maintained as open space - subject to para.74 of NPPF. • Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. 	This site is surplus to education requirements. It is acknowledged that it has informal use but it is not marked out as a playing pitch. Any development will need to retain 40% of the site as open space/green infrastructure.
FPH/24 – Romwire	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and support the recognition within paragraph 30.8 that it is proposed to construct the Wyre Forest Emergency Services Hub on part of the former Romwire site. 	Support is noted. Planning approval is now in place for the Emergency Hub
FPH/25 - Rear of Vale Industrial Estate	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some adjacent vacant land at the north end of the sewage works whose inclusion in the development should be encouraged. • It needs to be bear in mind that this site did not form part of the outline approval of the British Sugar site and as such the wider surface water drainage strategy agreed for this site has not taken this site into account. 	It is no longer proposed to allocate this site for employment use as there are biodiversity issues which cannot easily be mitigated for.
OC/11 – Stourminster School site	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. • Playing fields on site will be subject to para.74 of NPPF • No amenities to support development on such a large scale. 	This site does not include any of the playing fields which are being retained for use by the schools on Borrington Road. Pedestrian links from the site through to the neighbouring site will be encouraged.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
WFR/WC/18 – Sion Hill School site	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A point of major disquiet, it has become a focus for anti-social behaviour and thus there is a danger of serious injury. It should be demolished immediately. • Planning permission has been granted on this site but progress has not been made. <p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocated for 60 dwellings but has permission for 46. Capacity should be reduced to reflect this as already counted as commitment. • Will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. • No amenities to support development on such a large scale. 	<p>Site is now cleared of buildings and a planning application for residential development is expected to be determined shortly.</p> <p>The previous application for 46 dwellings was never fully approved as the S106 agreement was not signed. This proposal only affects the previously developed part of the site and does lead to loss of the playing fields. Part of the playing field is now owned by the primary school.</p>
FPH/1 – Settling Ponds	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The release of the developable part of this site for housing will not threaten permanence of Green Belt boundary as adjoining land is SSSI or FZ2/3. • Site is in suitable and sustainable location especially for housing. In largely residential area with associated facilities, is close to employment areas, is easily accessible to town centre and has strong links to main road network and rail network. <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is totally inappropriate to this area, lying adjacent to the nationally important SSSI and nature reserve. This area should again be retained as a buffer between development and the relatively rare and protected marshland habitat. • Adjacent to some of our District’s most valuable wildlife areas. There is a real risk of increasing disturbance pressure on these sensitive areas. • Site will be subject to current planning regulation and biodiversity concerns will make development more complicated and may even restrict the nature available developable area Need to maintain buffer between development and SSSI but should be possible to make some land available. 	<p>This site is not proposed for release from the Green Belt due to impact on adjacent SSSI. See site selection paper and sustainability appraisal</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, home to many toads, frogs, polecats and protected species such as otter and great crested newt use the lagoons. • Domestic/industrial activity would destroy the Marsh, which is also a flood plain. • Already traffic congestion in area; further housing could bring the whole of North/South traffic to a standstill. • Needs to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Green Belt assessment advises there is an absence of defensible boundaries at this location. Need evidence before it can be allocated. • Development here will lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the adjacent SSSI and the Wilden Marsh Nature Reserve. • It is essential to recognise that the council has a statutory duty to take steps to protect and where possible enhance the SSSI under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and we cannot see how this duty can be discharged in light of the significant effects anticipated. • It would be devastating to the local area to allow all natural land to be consumed by housing or industry. • The road itself cannot possibly support any more traffic at either end as well as the fact that cars race down Wilden lane in parts and more traffic would likely cause more accidents and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and residents. • This is a valuable asset to the local area which will be seriously disrupted in the event of erection of housing or light industrial areas. • This pocket of land should be gifted to the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust • The land is an important valuable local wildlife asset. • This site "feeds" the SSSI site and use for industrial housing will have a long term effect on flora and fauna. Additionally the infrastructure and access to the site is insufficient to support any increase in traffic flow along Wilden Lane towards Kidderminster. • No constructive evidence why the "settling ponds" need to be developed for housing. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sure but this area thought to be possibly contaminated. Surely drainage issues exist as well. • There has already been a major development on the western side of the SSSI, with the large Silverwoods residential and industrial estate. A development to the east of the SSSI would squeeze the green corridor to an impossible degree, inevitably causing the existing wildlife occupying the site to be disturbed and frightened away. • The Settling Lagoons should be added to the existing SSSI in order to provide a more realistic nature reserve • Surely the pre-eminent principle is supposed to be that any development should not adversely affect a SSSI and this would inevitably be the case if any development was to take place upon this site. • There are countless brownfield sites in Kidderminster which should be developed first. • Site currently acts as a buffer between a busy road and a SSSI. 	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King Charles 1 School is satisfied there is sufficient capacity to deal with the effects of both options. • There is a need to determine any ecological constraints using up to date survey information. • Concerned that the schools and doctors will not be able to cope. • How will water/sewage disposal for 5400 households be provided? • Bring empty houses back into use. • The hospital is already inadequate and new school places would be needed. • Kidderminster has 'zoned' parts of the town centre for commercial development which is just not happening. • Supports the idea that people should live in town centres. It makes sense to use the unused space over shops and business premises for housing • Horsefair shopping street is a disgrace to look at especially as an entry/exit portal to and from Kidderminster 	<p>Proposals include land for 2 additional 2-form primary schools. Community buildings are also proposed which could potentially house GP surgeries subject to NHS requirements.</p> <p>The Water Cycle Study has been undertaken by specialist consultants and looks at future water supply and sewage disposal capacity. The district council is working hard to bring empty homes back into use and has officers tackling this issue.</p> <p>Horsefair – proposals for new link road will enable this area to become one-way. Local community groups are helping to spruce up buildings throughout the area.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
WFR/WC/15- Lea Castle Hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital site as a proposed allocation for 600 dwellings. • 1.96ha or employment land on the site. This should be re-worded to be around 1.2ha • Is inappropriate for it to remain derelict but its boundaries re too widely drawn. Talbots Hill Coppice should be retained. Shelter belts which screen site should be retained and adjacent land should be planted up. • Undeveloped land in centre should be retained as a park. • Sports field should be retained and field to south should be excluded to retain gap between Kidderminster and Lea Castle. • Village centre facilities should be at centre of site not southern gateway. • Road junctions need amending on A451. • Impacts on biodiversity at Lea Castle site as it has a large amount of rare and protected biodiversity on site. • Infrastructure doesn't exist to support 600 dwellings at Lea Castle. • Cookley is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be developed as such. • 300 care home places could be accommodated and would make sense. The care home would provide employment for local residents. • Development of the Lea Castle site is needed but must be done sensitively to support local infrastructure/need unlike current plans. • The access onto two very busy main roads will need careful consideration. • Infrastructure is already stretched to full capacity, with the A449 already an accident hot spot. • No reason for development to remove trees, woodlands or wild life habitats in the name of progress. • Support re-use of Lea Castle but only if a sustainable settlement is created. Otherwise this will impact adversely on neighbouring areas. • Cookley School has already been extended and is at capacity. Medical facilities are stretched. 	Site has outline planning approval for up to 600 dwellings subject to S106 agreement.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning approval has already been given approval. • The current plans allow for no additional facilities such as doctors surgeries or schools and would place a huge burden on Cookley's resources. • Where is evidence that site has been marketed as mixed use led scheme? It is inappropriate for site status to be changed. This allocation is inappropriate. • Unsustainable since it lacks viable access for all people. • Impact on Cookley village facilities. • The proposal will blight the village's attractiveness. • Would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. • As a separate village Cookley should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. • Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs. • In order to meet lower Co2 targets the plan should be promoting centralised housing development that reduces the dependency on car traffic. • How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when southern Green Belt is removed? • There are brown field sites not on plan. • The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy. • Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. • Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster. • The loss of farmland and threats to the natural habitat. In addition to the devastating environmental impact of this loss, the potential detriment to the health and wellbeing of the residents of Cookley should not be underestimated. • Loss of village identity/infrastructure concerns. • The scale of the suggested development of both options A and B reach far beyond the footprint of the former Lea Castle hospital site. • The Infrastructure in, and surrounding, Cookley is inadequate for such a large 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>scale development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not object to some development on Lea Castle but it needs to be done sympathetically with good infrastructure. • Increase in traffic in and around our quiet village. • Support for development of a new community on the Lea Castle Hospital and School brownfield site, provided that consideration is given to the local environment and ecosystems; is built with good housing principles; the local community is fully engaged with planning the development and infrastructure, such as transport, schools and GPs are provided. • It will not have a negative impact upon the landscape character. 	
BW/4 - Hurcott ADR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept that we need more family-sized semis but also need to provide for ageing population. • Site will be subject to current planning regulation and biodiversity concerns will make development more complicated and may even restrict the nature available developable area. • 314 dwellings could be provided at 35 dwellings per hectare. • 200 dwellings is too low, the site should be allocated for at least 300 dwellings. • The whole site BW/4 should be master planned as one complete site and this would allow for the most efficient layout to be achieved. • Would have a devastating effect on the traffic using Hurcott Lane which is currently a rat-run between the Birmingham and Stourbridge roads. • Clearly visible from Stourbridge Road, and forms a vital part of the visual landscape. Development would be detrimental to visual landscape. • Good quality (Grade 3a) agricultural land. • Too close to Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool SSSI. • A new survey should be carried out to determine the present diversity of bird life. • An up-to-date survey of flora, fauna and insect life should be carried out to determine the biodiversity in the SSSI, the Nature Reserve and surroundings. • It will cause urban drift in the merging of Kidderminster with Hurcott Village. 	<p>The parcel to the north of the dry valley has planning approval for 91 dwellings and Miller Homes are expected to start on site shortly.</p> <p>The southern parcel is proposed to remain as an undeveloped 'green gap' as development here would have an adverse impact on the adjoining SSSIs, the setting of the historic settlement of Hurcott and access would be unworkable. It is proposed to close off Hurcott Lane to through traffic and any additional traffic from development on the southern parcel would have an adverse impact on this historic lane and its sandstone cuttings. Site access would not be acceptable from Hurcott Lane. Access from the northern parcel would require a raised bridge across the 'dry' valley. This would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape.</p> <p>The proposal to reopen the footpath link</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic at Hurcott Lane should be limited by a one way system. • Any development behind Kendlewood Road should be conducted sympathetically. • Any access should be limited to Stourbridge Road. • The bridle path between Hurcott Road and Hurcott Lane must be preserved. • All trees within the proposed site should be preserved. • The character of this little village will be destroyed. • The greater the access the more unwanted criminal activity will arise. • The junction will not cope with the extra traffic. • The intrusion of more people and a pathway/cycle path from the housing estate to Broadwaters Park will destroy the SSSI. • The cycle path and walkway will also provide a big security risk for houses backing onto the land at the rear of the Kendlewood Road. • Infrastructure needs to be upsized to cope with the extra population. • Whatever development is proposed for Kidderminster the dangerous junction between Hurcott Lane and the A456 and the weak road bridge at Hurcott Pool Reservoir need addressing. • The Council might also want to consider cutting off Hurcott Road at the point where it narrows to a single track road, improving the amenity access to Hurcott Nature Reserve for pedestrians, cyclists and horses. • The proposed core development would engulf is Hurcott Village • The village is of historic and scientific interest, being developed on a site that is regarded as one of the oldest sites in British papermaking dating back to the middle ages. • There are regular incidents and accidents as a consequence of increased traffic from drivers using it as a cut-through from Stourbridge Road to Birmingham Road. • The village is wholly residential; there are no shops and no pub and the road should only serve residents and those visiting the woods. • The village is currently crime-free and - with no street lighting - free of light 	<p>from Hurcott Village would have an adverse impact on the SSSI. Worcestershire County Council is still considering this footpath proposal.</p> <p>The SSSI must be kept free of public access as it is very sensitive. (see Ecological assessment report in Evidence Base)</p> <p>The northern site has been design so that a wide natural buffer of wildflower meadow planting is provided along the southern edge adjacent to the 'dry' valley.</p> <p>Pedestrian access into Broadwaters will be provided along Stourbridge Road itself.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p data-bbox="562 268 680 292">pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="517 308 1509 368">• The Hurcott Road is small, busy and dangerous as it is and would not be able to cope with that amount of travellers coming up and down. <li data-bbox="517 379 1429 403">• The current plan for the strip next to the Stourbridge Road is far enough. <li data-bbox="517 414 1509 515">• I do not believe the infrastructure of roads, amenities, schools and is enough to support such a development and would suffer causing major disruption and disadvantage to the existing residents. <li data-bbox="517 526 1070 550">• Development would also reduce openness <li data-bbox="517 561 1460 585">• Hurcott Village is an ancient settlement, mentioned in the Doomsday Book. <li data-bbox="517 596 1494 657">• There is no mention in the plan of infrastructure to support the developments either side of the village. <li data-bbox="517 668 1480 729">• Policy 26 A and B - The proposals would not protect the historic environment with regard to Hurcott Village. <li data-bbox="517 740 1473 841">• There are a large number of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest, particularly Kidderminster, which either do not appear in the plan or show absolutely no signs of development. <li data-bbox="517 852 1520 952">• The vehicle pollution emissions and noise levels are already unbearable, with excessive speeds and the increase of HGV's which have caused unsightly passing places and in turn are dumping grounds for fly tippers. <li data-bbox="517 963 1534 1024">• It is unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists to venture into the village. This lane needs protecting and preserving now. <li data-bbox="517 1035 1126 1059">• Stop traffic flows in Hurcott before it's too late. <li data-bbox="517 1070 1469 1131">• Better utilise unoccupied commercial buildings and existing brownfield sites firstly, rather than destroying areas of outstanding beauty. <li data-bbox="517 1142 1391 1166">• Both the A449 and A451 head to the bottle neck that is the Horsefair. <li data-bbox="517 1177 1498 1238">• Any development of this traditional land with hedgerows and fields is found to impact negatively in the wildlife habitats. <li data-bbox="517 1249 1534 1350">• The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some cosmetic changes, additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. <li data-bbox="517 1361 1520 1385">• Would cause impossible traffic situations for Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road. No 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>traffic count or accident details can illustrate the reality of the dangers for motorists or pedestrians on these routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reality of no pavement and safe pedestrian access along Hurcott Lane to the Nature Reserve needs to be a priority and the volume of traffic restricted. • We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. • Do we need another 20,000 residents? • Character of the village will be lost. • Hurcott needs to be made into a cul-de-sac anyway to stop the erosion, dangerous speeds, accidents, volume of traffic and air pollution. • The fumes from all these vehicles is bad due to the village being in almost the lowest dip of the valley, therefore not dispersing. Many front doors are just a few feet from the road itself and the speed of the traffic is frightening, never mind the noise. • Traffic problems in Hurcott with additional cars - horse riding has stopped, accidents have happened. • This area should be left alone for natural wildlife. • The proposed extensions, in one area are unfair to local residents causing a new bottle neck to the entry of Kidderminster. • Current road layouts are not suited for the extra traffic and would need significant alteration to safely incorporate another estate • (BW/4) incorporating the dry valley has the potential to significantly modify the drainage characteristics of the area and development here has the potential to have a significant harm upon the Hurcott Pasture SSSI and the adjacent Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI, adversely affecting their unique setting. • Development of site BW/4 would make the appropriate management of the SSSI to maintain its ecological interest difficult. • There is no evidence of an applied buffer zone to the SSSIs as the site assessment report indicated would be required. • Hurcott Lane is a single carriageway with vehicle forced passing places over steep grass verge with in part restricted visibility. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not believe development of either Hurcott site would offer any benefit to the people of Kidderminster. It would most likely comprise of expensive housing which the majority within the area could not afford with a token of affordable housing. • The Local Plan predominantly concentrates proposed development along a wide eastern corridor. Is this not disproportionate? • It is entirely appropriate for this ADR site to be allocated as a Core Site • SHLAA panel considered that this ADR may be suitable for housing (up to 250 dwellings) if greenfield land releases are required at the end of the plan period. • There is no need to remove the site from the Green Belt. • Deliverable within the next 5 years. • Frontage to the A451 Stourbridge Road, which is an existing bus route. • The ecological features of most interest are located around the boundaries of the site, which can be retained and enhanced. • The wider area of Site BW/4 also offers potential for green infrastructure connectivity through to Broadwaters Park / Podmore Pool and the facilities and amenities in Broadwaters. • It amounts to about 14 hectares of poor quality agricultural land. • Overall, its development would not significantly harm the purposes of the Green Belt. • The Inspectors Report 2003 considered whether there were any exceptional circumstances to return the land to Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances were justified and the site was not needed for development at that time such that it remained as ADR. 	
OC/4 - Rear of Baldwin Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern to the integrity of Hurcott Village. • Any access should be limited to Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road. • The bridle path between Hurcott Road and Hurcott Lane must be preserved. • Area between Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool is an important wildlife corridor. • All trees within the proposed site should be preserved. • The road structure is ridiculously inadequate for this type of development. • Too close to the SSSI. 	This land is not proposed for allocation in the Local Plan owing to adverse impact on SSSIs, setting of Hurcott Village and landscape impact of building beyond the ridgeline opposite Husum Way.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of this land will make the western approach (A456) to the WF very unattractive. • There is also the issue of whether the road bridge on Hurcott Lane could support any material increase in traffic. • Put bollards across the road adjacent to the access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve, thereby allowing vehicle access to the Nature Reserve from both the Stourbridge Road and the Birmingham Road, but preventing through traffic. • Development would spoil our main approach along the A456 completely. Endangered species in this area, the skylarks, owl, hedgehogs, bats and the plethora of beautiful small birds. • Retain and preserve as much nature, flora and fauna as we possibly can. • Building on it would be contrary to County Green Belt policy. • 450 dwellings on this site would also have a devastating effect on the traffic using Hurcott Lane. • Increasing vehicular access will further reduce pedestrian safety. • Visual impact on the landscape resulting in an urban rather than rural approach to Kidderminster. • Good quality (Grade 3a) agricultural land. • An up-to-date survey of flora, fauna and insect life should be carried out to determine the biodiversity in the SSSI, the Nature Reserve and surroundings. • Merging of Kidderminster with Hurcott Village. • Developments either side of Hurcott village would completely change this hamlet. • The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster is vital in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. • The development would not be a sustainable community. • The fields are regularly used - and have been for 30 years or more. • Offmore primary school is ready full. • Birmingham Road already accident blackspot. • Brownfield sites should be used as they are more appropriate and are available. • Used by walkers, dog walkers and people wanting to run/exercise in an unspoilt 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>green area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is Green Belt and should remain so. • Linear development along the A456 towards Blakedown and Hagley will negate one of the purposes of Green Belt policy. • Development will lead to increased traffic congestion and the inevitable increase in resulting accidents. • This site is the main entry to the town approaching from the north and east. The proposed building work would be an urbanised eyesore for anyone driving into the town this way. • Current infrastructure cannot support suggested numbers. • It will tower over houses on Baldwin Road. • Future generations will judge us by the decisions we have taken. • We consider a plan to develop this area for housing as inconsiderate, inappropriate, short sighted and piecemeal. • Noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters. • Pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc). • Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access by walking. • Increase of pedestrians (in particular children accessing Offmore primary) - there would need to be provision of a suitable crossing. • Detrimental impact on our wellbeing and our house prices. • Road Safety/Road access – Problem for over 20 years - Baldwin Road used as a rat run, excessive traffic as the Birmingham Road and the Land Oak junction cannot cope. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients • Loss of views and amenity / recreation space for local residents. • What benefits this proposed development would bring to the area? • Baldwin Road is already used as a rat run to avoid congestion at the Land Oak traffic lights. • Unsustainable. The only facilities on this side of town include a public house a 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>garage and a small convenience store.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats to public rights of way. • Would not support a new bus route. • Reduction in property value. • Interruption of rural outlook. • Removal of privacy. • Light reduction. • Additional noise. • Disruption throughout development. • Removal of leisure facilities. • Employment opportunities. • New services costs. • Access • Contrary to the wording used within the plan – extending the town will make Kidderminster a LESS desirable place to live. • Wyre Forest should not allow construction of housing if existing routes and a valued Nature Reserve are compromised and made increasingly unsafe. • Were told no new houses were to be built in the area. • Kidderminster’s boundary would be moving nearer to Blakedown. • Loss of amenity and loss of privacy. • The Greenhill district of Kidderminster was developed with no common land or park areas. The local populace have used the land at the rear of Baldwin Road for general recreational purposes including walking/dog walking, picnics and educational walks for children. • This Green Belt area also allows for some fantastic views of the Clent Hills. • Additional building will add to flood risk. • Would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. • Agrees with the Offmore Comberton Action Group. • Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. • Green Belt Site clearly makes positive contribution to openness of Green Belt. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>However, boundary to rear of gardens in Baldwin Road is not robust as some gardens have been 'extended'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is well located on edge of Kidderminster. • Considered to be sustainable location and most logical area to release from Green Belt. • Important that Hurcott Village retains its separate identity. Safe and suitable access can be designed and local support for stopping up of lane. 	
<p>WFR/CB/7 - Land off Birmingham Road</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A456 would require substantial capacity development to deal with the increase in traffic, if this was achieved Husum Way will not cope. • There is currently a high level of wildlife within this area including badgers, foxes, deer and a large variety of birds, including endangered species. • This proposal does not support a sustainable community, does not accommodate a neighbourhood centre and will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. The Offmore primary school is currently at full capacity and cannot be developed as it is on a restricted site. • Development of this site would be a case of gross sprawl. • Transport links to the motorways involve trucks using the already overloaded A456 through Hagley. • The proposals at Hodge Hill are in conflict with Policy CB16 of the Neighbourhood Plan which provides for the use of existing rather than new buildings. • Hodge Hill Farm is locally listed and access to the site is dangerous. • Impact on highways. • Impact on wildlife. • Loss of good agricultural land. • Loss of and impact on Green Belt. • Loss of amenity. • Noise and air pollution • All industrial/trade units should be kept within the South Kidderminster 	<p>This land is not proposed for allocation. It would extend development out into open countryside along the A456 towards Blakedown.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Enterprise Zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agree with all 10 "Disadvantages listed on the circular known as "OCAG-LP (Offmore Comberton Action Group-Local Plans). • It represents inappropriate ribbon development of the worse kind in one of the more attractive approaches to Kidderminster • support the sites OC/5 and WFR/CB/7 • The site is self-contained/self-governing • Employment uses proposed and its location on the outskirts would assist in keeping traffic off the more limited road network within Kidderminster itself. • Site already has sustainable transport links. 	
OC/ 5 – Husum Way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Kidderminster is to extend out to Hurcott Lane, it may be appropriate for it to extend out as far on the other side of A456. • Impact on highways. • Impact on wildlife. • Loss of good agricultural land. • Loss of and impact on Green Belt. • Loss of amenity. • Noise and air pollution. • This land is considerably higher than the surrounding so development would be very visible. • The views as you drive into Kidderminster currently help lift the appearance of the area. • The junction on the Birmingham Road onto Husum Way is already very dangerous and proposing to add to the traffic and congestion in that area would be catastrophic. • The houses could also prove difficult for a private developer to sell due to the traffic noise. • Before any building work commences the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to be constructed. • The proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to extend from the A449 	<p>Part of this site will be required for junction improvements – a 3 arm roundabout is proposed. With planting of a significant landscape buffer along the A456 frontage, limited residential development of up to 30 dwellings is proposed on this site as part of a wider eastern urban extension. This site must be designed to limit the impact on the gateway to Kidderminster and soften the urban edge where it meets the historic Hodge Hill Farm complex.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Wolverhampton Road all the way to the A449 Worcester Road to be effectual,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. • Support the site OC/5. • The site is self-contained with little constraint. • Agricultural field which will have limited ecological value. 	
OC/6 - East of Offmore Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been demonstrated that the release of the site from the Green Belt would not compromise the five purposes of Green Belt. • The value of our property will be significantly decreased. • The lower field encompasses the Blakeway stream which regularly floods. • Will cause flooding in Offmore and Borrington • Badgers and bats which are active are in this area. • With this development we will have gridlock on the existing roads. • Hospital is not capable of covering the new population. • Insufficient GP's. • Insufficient Dental infrastructure. • Insufficient Schools. • There is no satisfactory access to the fields behind Offmore farm (Old People's Home). • At least two different species of woodpecker, frogs and toads, bats, foxes, pheasants and many other bird varieties in these fields as well as other wildlife. • Would be "ribbon development" with no "soul" or shops and school attached to it. • An eastwards extension of the town would be patchy, haphazard development at best and blight on the Green Belt. • Any further intrusion in to the Green Belt risks connecting Kidderminster to Blakedown to Hagley to Halesowen and eventually to the outer suburbs of Birmingham. • Traffic in these areas is already at unacceptable levels and any development would add to the already heavily used rat runs in these areas. • Loss of views and amenity / recreation space for local residents 	<p>This site together with OC/13N is proposed as an urban extension with at least 50% of the overall site given over to open space with significant woodland planting. Planned development will be in the form of a number of character areas with wide swathes of green infrastructure linking through the site. Areas prone to flooding will be kept free of development. Land for a new school will be provided on the site to the south together with a 'community building' which could potentially house a GP surgery and small convenience store. Pedestrian links to the existing Offmore Farm Estate will be provided at Offmore Farm Close. Development will follow the contour lines with extensive planted corridors to form a firm eastern boundary. The development will provide the opportunity for a series of circular walks where there is currently no public access. A community orchard is proposed near to Offmore Farm. This development will be served by a single carriageway estate road (20 mph) which will join Husum Way below the railway bridge and eventually come out onto the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you build hundreds of houses on Green Belt land it will only attract those who will not work in the area but simply commute out of the area. • Some of this is grade 2 agricultural land. • No benefit of putting a road through these fields and building houses. • No room at Offmore Primary and it has been extended to maximum. • Tennyson way and Husum way are already used rat runs • Does not believe that any meaningful communities will be created by developing to the east of Offmore. • Additional pressure on Offmore Primary School which is on a restricted site. • Noise and air pollution would increase substantially. • Traffic congestion. • Other sites more suitable. • We are expected to accept that one of these options is inevitable • The fact that councils are being given the green light to remove the protected status of such areas is wrong in principle. • This farmed land is a key aspect of the local environment. Changing the use of this land would be wrong on historical, political and environmental levels. • We do NOT want an Eastern relief road with the resulting disruption, noise, pollution, corrosion of local character and damage to the environment. • Developing the Eastern side of the town will adversely affect the lives of thousands. • Dispersal is preferable to extending an already busy town. • The Green Belt area to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. • There are anti social behaviour issues that need sorting on Offmore. Adding more houses is likely to worsen the issue. • The local bus service doesn't properly serve the existing community. • There are many speeding cars on Tennyson Way during the evenings; this will only become busier with more housing and cars. • You are proposing to build more houses that we don't seem to need. 	<p>Comberton Road/Spennells Valley Road roundabout.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To centralise all the current development plans to one area of the town seems very unfair. • Far more suitable and sustainable options for future development in the area. • It is important for wildlife. • It would have no neighbourhood centre. • This land also has a habit of flooding and water run-off would be increased with building on these fields. • Will ruin the countryside. • Consideration should be given to the effect of flooding of the stream which flows from the eastern direction and along the edge of the Offmore estate towards Spennells. • If development here goes ahead we ask that the unique nature of the Offmore Court development is respected and an area of undeveloped land should be allowed to remain around the development. • This will affect many things i.e. doctors, more pressure on hospitals, dentists, schools too. • Object to OC/6. • There are many species of birds in this area and a number on the BTO/RSPB red list. There’s also plenty of other wildlife around including great crested newts. • There is no immediate road access to the rear of Prior Close. • We do not wish to become the Wyre Forest District of Birmingham or the West Midlands. • A bypass would need to be developed before the land to the east of Offmore could be developed. • Question whether the linear development would create any degree of community and social cohesion. • Would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. • Proposed eastern relief road would add further pressure to A456 in village. If A448/A450 junction was improved it would divert traffic from centre of Kidderminster and relieve pressure on A456. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is promoted as an infrastructure led residential development with significant green infrastructure, plus land for a primary school and other community facilities. It also provides opportunity for strategic relief road around eastern Kidderminster. Analysis of evidence base and technical information shows that urban extension is soundly based. 	
OC/12 - Comberton Lodge Nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Its got a high flood risk. Building here blocks off the wild life access into / out of the Spennells Valley nature reserves. 	It is proposed to allocate this site for up to 10 dwellings. Development will be kept to the centre of the site with the Hoo Brook and its flood plain buffered from built development by a substantial green buffer. The extensive tree belt will be kept along the A448 to maintain the rural feel of the entrance to Kidderminster.
OC/13(N) - Stone Hill North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridge between Stanklyn and Bell Brooks should be kept open as green wedge. Grade 2 areas should not be developed. Some of northern part is marsh. Irrigation system dating from 17th century. Area to south of Spennells is part of former Stone Common and Hoo Farm. This is grade 2 and should not be used for housing. Building on parts of the flood plain. Building here will disrupt the east west flow of wild life along Hoo Brook. The northern area is promoted as an infrastructure led residential development with significant green infrastructure, plus land for a primary school and other community facilities. Analysis of evidence base and technical information shows that urban extension is soundly based. 	This site is proposed for allocation as a sustainable urban extension for housing, new school, community facilities and extensive areas of open space including a new linear wetland nature reserve together with an extensive network of footpaths/cycle ways.
WFR/CB/7, OC/5/6/12/13N - East of Offmore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agrees with the Offmore Comberton Action Group. Green Belt development should be the last resort. Look at potential for residential development in the town. We have no industry to attract extra people to need the housing. How will surrounding roads of Hurcott cope with double-triple the amount of 	Land at WFR/CB/7 is not being taken forward for employment development as development here would severely encroach into open countryside between Kidderminster and Blakedown. The other

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>cars to houses?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will doctors and schools cope? • Lack of infrastructure - hard to exit estate due to volume of traffic on Birmingham Road; crossing is a death trap. • Local school is already full which cannot be extended. • Kidderminster has no A&E and Worcester is in special measures - these services will be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The eastern by-pass and railway bridges are unlikely to be built due to expense. • The Green Belt land is vital for separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands Conurbation. • Wildlife habitats are on this land. • Lea Castle site is a much better proposal. • Propose development on the north/west of Kidderminster and in Stourport/Bewdley as there are areas which could be developed here. • If development is to take place in Green Belt land in the east of Kidderminster a new park is needed. • There should be multiple off road parking spaces to the rear of the new properties to avoid the roads being crammed with cars. • Development on the east side of Kidderminster running from Cookley down to Offmore would not appear to address the core policies of the Local Plan Review (Sections 6 to 11) in encouraging the growth of Wyre Forest with Kidderminster at its centre. • Would not attract a younger population into the centre of the town but encourage the corridor of growth along the A456 and A451 for commuters to Birmingham and Stourbridge. • Bus services along Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road are infrequent and unreliable. • Developing semi-rural sites would be detrimental for the district, destroying open spaces and ruining the approaches to the town from the east which are currently green and inviting. 	<p>site are proposed for allocation for a development of around 1440 dwellings in total set within an extensive green space with less than 50% of the site developed. A linear wetland nature reserve will run along the boundary between the existing and proposed developments.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear how some areas have been declared 'Core' and some as options (A and B). • Logical to include extra communal areas in development adjacent to existing areas with poor provision or areas that will increase in the number of residents. • Before any building work commences the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to be constructed along with the required and very expensive railway crossing / bridge. • The proposed housing together with the By-Pass itself would be in an elevated position making them very visible and obtrusive. • This ribbon development is not sustainable or a community and an alternative proposal needs to be considered. • Masterplans will be required for each of these allocations. • High quality farmland. • Loss of about 2½ % of Green Belt. • Husum Way railway bridge is neither big nor strong enough to support the extra traffic from the proposed Offmore development. • There would be more air pollution and more flood water as a consequence of more housing. • Husum Way already floods regularly when there is a prolonged period of heavy rain. • The junction at the A456 Birmingham Road and Husum Way is a dangerous road crossing owing to the volume of traffic to and from Birmingham. • No comprehensive assessments have been undertaken of the entire allocation and the impact its release as a whole would have on the development of the Green Belt. The Green Belt assessment is flawed in this regard. • It is questionable whether such a large allocation could be built out in the Plan period. • The market could not sustain this number of sales in such a small area. The capacity during the plan period should be greatly reduced by at least 50%. • There should be a presumption that major future development should have the 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>aim of creating sustainable communities of a size capable of supporting, at least, its own Primary School, village centre with shops and community facilities, if possible some live work units and adequate recreational facilities, and not simply be an ‘add on’ to existing communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land in question is Grade 2 Agricultural Land. • There are endangered bird species: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers, Skylarks and Lapwings are present in this land and along the route the “by pass “would have to take from the A456 to the A449. • Eastern bypass: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would have to be built from the Wolverhampton Rd to the Worcester Rd to be of any use as anything shorter would cause roads around Hurcott Rd/ Birmingham Rd. to be used as rat runs. ○ Would be needed <u>before</u> land to the east of Offmore could be developed. ○ Would need at least one and probably two new Railway Bridges. These are incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for them. ○ The elevated position would need at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. • Drainage of the land to the rear of the existing Offmore estate is extremely poor. • Adverse Road traffic on already congested road junctions. We need to keep the Green Belt buffer zone at this side of Kidderminster. • Loss of wildlife. • Side roads would be used for rat runs. • Objects until extra infrastructure is sorted i.e. schools, road, and medical facilities. • Do not need industrial development. • The development would need shops/community facilities. • Will create environmental damage. • The development should include home for older couples and single people. • Where have the housing figures for the Kidderminster area been obtained? They 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>do not agree with the projections from the census etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be a visual incursion and cause noise and pollution. • Heavy rain floods roads at Husum Way/Shakespeare Drive. • Distribute development to allow for natural expansion to reduce the environmental impact. • Industrial development at WFR/CB/7 Hodge Hill - site unattractive to business investment with limited access options, transport links are restricted. • Damage wildlife habitats and affect the air quality/noise levels • Once Green Belt is gone there is no going back. • When we need more land to grow food in the future it won't be there. • Wildlife habitats are under enough pressure -please leave them alone. • Something should be done about Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction before considering more houses being built in and around this immediate area. • If development happens, consideration should be given to existing properties – to be granted a little space rather than housing butting up to existing properties robbing any views that they have of the Clee and Malvern Hills and Worcestershire. • We need more facilities as well as houses. • Too many homes proposed for the eastern boundary; burden should be spread. • Housing on either option A or B will devalue our property. • Building in this area will result in loss of privacy for residents, high visibility, light and noise pollution. • The idea of industrial units between Hodge Hill Farm on the A456 and the farm house near corner of Husum Way simply goes right into the face of current road restrictions made a few years ago to keep traffic in single file and generally slow it down as it approaches Husum Way. • Any green space in or around towns adds great value. It keeps everyone in touch with nature and enhances lives. It should always be preserved. • Proposed development will totally destroy the natural and free outlook we and many others enjoy. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The route of the relief road has not even been established. • The proposed buildings would impact greatly on sewage disposal and other services required. • The wellbeing and lifestyle of existing residents would be severely affected. • Would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health, pollution and social problems. • Development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. • Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. • Its unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. • Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP. • Policy 6B states locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt. • May be drainage issues with this site, a proper investigation into this should have taken place before the area was allocated. • Can the NHS cope? Kidderminster & Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand. • Money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services. • It really would destroy this already established area and cause much upset to local residents. • A full survey should be done to identify all of the species which will be destroyed. • The land is used by local residents for health walks and other leisure activities. • There are no jobs for the local population how will the plan provide jobs for additional people? • When purchasing our property the local search did not reveal anything. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses would tower over the current barns and would cause a reduction in property values. • Lives will be blighted by such a carbuncle in such a beautiful part of the Wyre Forest. • When/if the development of the fields adjoining Offmore Court takes place we ask that consideration is given to the effect of flooding of the stream which flows from the eastern direction and along the edge of the Offmore estate towards Spennells. When this land is developed there will be significant run-off as the land available for natural drainage will be greatly reduced. • Ask that the nature of the Offmore Court development is respected and an area of undeveloped land should be allowed to remain around the development to enable its unique character to be retained and not submerged. • The Core housing plan to the east of Kidderminster is on Green Belt, which includes grade 1 & 2 agricultural land, is also used for shooting sports. • There is important wooded wetland area, allowed to go to wild bog, adjacent to the stream between OC/13 & OC/6. • Why ruin something that is already a very attractive gateway to the town? • Husum Way already carries a large amount of school traffic to and from Offmore and Comberton schools and is used as a cut through. Speeding traffic already causes concerns for the children who walk to school. • I do not see how expansion to Offmore and surrounding areas is viable. • Objections to placing industrial land close to Hodge Hill nursery, right in the middle of countryside when so many alternatives. • Do we in Kidderminster really need such a large volume of new housing? • The gateway to Kidderminster from the Birmingham side would be totally spoiled. • There are endangered bird species along the bypass route. • Would not support a new bus route. • Must challenge the bulldozing of Green Belt in ill-conceived plans, when brown 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>sites continue to be allowed to lie dormant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to find a solution to all the disused properties before embarking on new build. • Health will be compromised by the noise and traffic pollution. • The A456 is a single lane carriageway and would not be able to cope with the proposed industrial development near Hodge Hill Farm. • Will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. • Have a lovely view of fields - don't want to look at new builds. • Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/Traffic emissions. • Many people and families live here and need the open spaces of the Green Belt. • Before embarking on any new development WFDC need to safe guard, improve the environment and social care of the people already living here. • A huge housing estate on the Green Belt which surrounds Offmore would be very detrimental for all. • How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular? • Concerned about the industrial development at Hodge Hill and the impact it will have on noise and pollution. • Would start a potential chain of development into Blakedown and other areas. • Development of industrial units by Hodge Hill also bring additional traffic to what is an already extremely busy road. • Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape. • Impact on air quality/ noise. • It will be separate from the existing community because it will require totally separate access/egress, leaving its residents isolated from a community that is on their own doorstep. • Walkways might be incorporated into the design but the simple fact is that human nature will result in traffic movements rather than walking. 	
WFR/ST/1 - Captains	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why was it selected over other proposed sites? 	This site is not proposed for allocation in this

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
& the Lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will happen to the current right of way which runs from the A448 east to west? • Could you give an assurance that any planned development of the Captain’s section of WFR/ST/1 would not give vehicular access onto Kittiwake Drive? • Kittiwake Drive is narrow with adverse cambers and I believe is unsuitable to higher vehicular use. • Adjacent to a children’s park and increased traffic movements would increase risk to children crossing the road to get to the park. • The foul drainage system would not have been designed to accommodate outflow from an additional housing estate. • What would be the final disposition of Captain’s Pool and its fishing rights? • It would also reduce the price and privacy of my house. • The area is quiet and full of nature and wildlife. • Lots of constant noise and traffic especially entering onto the Bromsgrove Road. • Will place more pressure on infrastructure • The sewers in Spennells can barely cope already. • There will be insufficient school places and doctors. • Traffic on Spennells is already a nightmare at peak times- this will make it even worse! • Noise, traffic fumes (increasing risk to health) and access. • Question the need for so many houses. • It would put huge pressure on existing roads, schools, shops, doctors and dentists, the police and hospitals. I do not think that the infrastructure is there to support such a huge growth in population. • Loss of wildlife. • Please amend status of WFR/ST/1 to greenfield not brownfield. • Effect on visual amenity that is Captain's Pool. • Area used by walkers. • Pollution to the pool by way of litter which is harmful to the wildlife. • Current public transport is very poor and needs substantial investment to serve 	<p>local plan. Limited development may still be possible based on existing footprint of development. Key issue is impact on ancient woodland and pools and streams complex which would severely limit the developable area.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>the current population levels let alone increased population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence whatsoever that there is a need for this number of units. • Report incorrectly states site has no natural interest. • The fields are teeming with wildlife. • Open Space and PRow's do not as such feature in our community facilities plans in the detail we would expect. • Major and significant loss of amenity to the residents of Spennells. • Damage the biodiversity of an area it seeks to enhance. • No evidence that the suggested enhanced employment opportunities will be delivered. • The rural nature of Stone Parish will be destroyed. • The Planning Inspectorate refused an appeal to develop the site of Captains on the grounds of Inappropriate Development, Openness, Visual Amenity, Highway Safety and a number of lesser considerations. • The ancient woodland to the south of Captains was badly damaged when there was an attempt to develop the area before any permission had been approved. The woodland should have been returned to its previous form. • Area of Captains site has been infilled and hard packed to provide for caravan storage. • The site has been compromised and should be returned to its previous state in order to preserve the linear landscape. • The massive environmental impact in the face of climate change needs to be considered. I urge you not to allow Wyre Forest Green Belt to be depleted for short term gain. • Poor quality, narrow and speed restricted A448 is already over loaded and congested. • It will destroy the approach into Kidderminster if you develop near Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive and also the area close to Captains Pool. • How will the waters be maintained and who will be responsible for it? • Backs on to a peaceful cul-de-sac and residents are very concerned about access 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>to the houses and the noise problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that plans do not specify the type of housing proposed on any of the sites. The council should take the lead in this, rather than be reactive to the developers' plans. • Loss of use of fields & footpaths. • How does the WFDC plan to offset the carbon footprint created by building these houses and the extra cars? • Tree Protection Orders are in force over the Spennells and its surrounding areas. • Development of this area would also be detrimental to the Spennells Nature Reserve. • There is no footpath on the Captains and The Lodge side of the A448 for children to walk safely to Comberton or King Charles schools • There is swamp land at the easterly corner of Captains Pool. • Both Captains and The Lodge contain restrictive agriculture related covenants. • Concern is that if developed without the adjacent area of OC/13 Stone Hill South the only feasible access to this area for construction traffic and residents would be through either Kittiwake Drive or on to the A448 Bromsgrove Road significantly increasing the hazards on either road. • Access on to the A448 from the adjacent area of the existing Spennells estate is explicitly prohibited in the deeds of the Spennells properties precisely because of the hazardous nature of this stretch of road. • Captains Pool is classified as brownfield despite in reality being a field full of plant life, trees, wildlife, etc. • Might possibly be an appropriate extension to the existing developed area, but we would not like to see development further along Bromsgrove Road, so as to maintain a strategic gap between Kidderminster and Stone. • I believe the site to be amongst the least worst, if not the least worst, of all the current Green Belt sites and would wholeheartedly support its reallocation for residential development. • Support for Captains and The Lodge development 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It offers only a limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt. 	
FPH/27 - Adjacent Easter Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those already there have never been fully occupied and are an eye sore • Coupled with the empty VOSA building further creating the impression of a run down and economically poor town • Fully support the proposal and the land is available at short notice. Land is currently underutilised and is of low agricultural worth and has little attractive merit. 	This site will be allocated for employment use. Access will be taken from the neighbouring development at Easter Park.
OC/13(S), WFR/ST/2, AS/10 - Spennells fields	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road infrastructure is struggling to support the current residents; more dwellings will have a huge impact on road congestion in these areas. • A through road will not change the roads that are already congested on a daily basis especially at rush hour. • Concerns for road safety, congestion, access to emergency services, air pollution. • Object to any proposed bypass that would increase traffic on the A456. • When will new road be built before or after the houses? • Kidderminster has higher obesity levels than the national average so need fields for exercise. • Extra buses and traffic will cause a safety issue for children in the area. • Will considerably increase the amount of commuters on the rail network to Birmingham and as such cause overcrowding and delays impacting along the train line. • Effect on infrastructure: Schools, doctors, roads, hospitals and bus service are already hugely under pressure. • How do you know that school provision will be delivered? • There is no spare space to extend the existing school. • Crossing the road for school is already hazardous at Captains Pool Road / Heronswood Road / Turnstone Close. More homes would result in more traffic and a worse situation. • Poor access at Turnstone Road - already has to accommodate road traffic from around 150 dwellings 	These sites are not proposed for release from the Green Belt. OC/13S and WFR/ST/2 have biodiversity issues which preclude the sites being released for development.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More pressure on Stanklyn lane and its two major junctions. • Stanklyn Lane and the Spennells Est. roads are not fit to cope with the heavy building site traffic. These are already hazardous to turn left from and pose more danger with busier roads. • The new road has badly affected the main road from Worcester and also Wilden Lane. • Spennells Road, Mustow Green and the viaduct roundabout are already blocked solid at rush hour, 2000 plus extra people making their way onto Kidderminster and Birmingham would do nothing for the problem and create a lot of pollution. • Bridge at the top end of Stanklyn lane is very narrow and there has been accidents there, not be suitable for HGV vehicles and extra traffic adding more danger to the situation. Stanklyn lane is only 30 mph at the end, yet cars use it as a cut through to avoid gridlocked roads of the A449 Stone Hill. • Have never been convinced that a relief road would help the congestion in Kidderminster. • The vast majority of the trees on this estate have Tree Preservation Orders on them, they need to be protected. • Many red listed and other species of birds. • Diverse population of mammals. This stretch of land contains 2 pools, woods, a bridle path and public rights of way which in their own rights are protected. Sightings of European otters, 3 species of Bats and badgers setts with breeding pairs. • Fields are used for recreation by horse riders, cyclists, joggers, walkers etc who enjoy the benefits that this beautiful space provides. This interaction is vital for both building community spirit and offering a lifeline to those who do not normally see anyone to talk to. • The area is not wasted space but valuable open space enjoyed and used by not only residents on Spennells but residents from Offmore, Comberton and surrounding areas. • Footpaths that allow walking in the open countryside cannot be equated with 'Green Corridors' between housing developments. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields are a well used community asset with walkers, dog walkers and cyclists, an amenity which can only be a benefit for physical and mental health of all who use it. That includes families, people of all generations and people of varying physical ability. • It would eventually more than double the size of Spennells. Spennells is already a big estate but it was built with many grassy areas and walkways and is surrounded by the nature reserve, Captains Pool and the fields. Consequently, Spennells has become a pleasant place to live. • Replacing the rural aspect of the town with undesirable buildings and the increased pressure on services and infrastructure will not encourage people to want to live here. • There would be development right up to the district boundary. • Provides a rare opportunity for those that live in the area to enjoy the benefits that the outdoors has to offer. The footpaths are easily accessible to all involved. Are new businesses and enterprises <u>definitely</u> going to be set up in Kidderminster to provide jobs for the new residents? • Spennells fields should not be built on. It should become a SSSI. • Spennells Valley is a nature reserve. • Development will have adverse impact on local global warming and pollution in general. More carbon dioxide will be produced with a loss of trees and green areas that produce oxygen. • Development would join Spennells to Stanklyn Lane. These are two separate communities. • Links between the parish of Stone and the edge of Kidderminster do not need to be made stronger. • Infilling will ruin the character of Spennells and estate development will overwhelm an already large estate. • The proposed site will NOT increase industry and jobs in the area. The Easter Park industrial site still has empty units and there are empty units on Hoo Farm industrial estate. • There is evidence that large estates have increased crime/drug levels. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no big industries left in Kidderminster therefore jobs are hard to find. Has the M.O.D site at Summerfield been approached - surely there is an exclusion zone there? • Concerned about increase in the amount of light pollution. • Loss of buffer to Easter Park. • Spennells is a really nice place to live and that is because it is surrounded by fields and green spaces. • Massive impact on the environment and local habitats and nature destroyed. • Increase in noise and pollution. • With the future of fossil fuel uncertain I believe that there will come a time when importing food and travel abroad will become extremely expensive. • Residential and industrial development would have a severe detrimental impact on the habitat of the fauna and flora and deface the natural environment. • This area was originally supposed to have a church and a pub. Where are they? • The 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report' published in 2013 emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan removes. • Historical drainage ditches in this area of archaeological importance that should be protected and enhanced. • Only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter Green Belt boundaries after consulting local people and submitting the revised Local Plan for examination. • Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Worcestershire's Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. • AS/10 is this within a 600 metre blast zone of the Roxel Summerfield site? The POD does not mention any constraints caused by the proximity to the Roxel site or National Grid electricity power lines. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is common practice for planners to avoid urban development across ridges into valleys, in order to take account of visual intrusion into surrounding countryside. The existing Kidderminster boundary is so screened from Summerfield. Selection of Option A would extend the boundary into the valley occupied by Stanklyn Lane, with the next ridge being a further half mile, or so, away at Shenstone. That visual intrusion could be seen as unacceptable to Summerfield residents, who will quite reasonably wish to perpetuate separation of their village from the town, both physically and visually. • Spennells estate was built adjacent to a golf course and therefore did not impinge on existing housing. • Proposed housing development lies within an area of agricultural land graded as 'very good' by Natural England. Land within this classification represents just 16.6% of agricultural land in Worcestershire. The continuous loss of quality agricultural land will further reduce the ability of the country to become more self-sufficient and to decrease our import bill. • Flood Risk Management: The POD ignores Water Cycle and flooding issues raised by Consultants reports and identified by further research. Development in these areas would have significant impact on infrastructure and are flagged red in the RAG assessment. There are major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. • These fields land are always been planted with either cereal or in the past sugar beet crops. England will need these fields to grow food for our population. • The field currently acts as a valuable soak away, concerns re new drainage for storm and sewerage. Fields are a good flood plain for soaking away surface water. In heavy rain drives and roads can flood and this would be made worse by the removal of the field. • Threat to existing public Rights of Way. • Green Belt land is in place to stop urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with. • No Green Belt land should be lost unless it can be shown beyond doubt that there's an imperative need which cannot be resolved in any other way. Sajid 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, has rather controversially stated that up to 1% of Green Belt land may have to be taken to meet housing needs. It is not acceptable to plan to take up to 2.4%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan A contradicts all of the points Green Belt serves five purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas ○ to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another ○ to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment ○ to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns ○ to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land” (Government, 2012) • Should there be extra houses built we would need to see plans for green spaces being interspersed. • Stone is surrounded by beautiful green land. • Should take radical action to increase brownfield development and to bring life back to abandoned sites. That means high quality housing for families in town centres, breathing new life back into our high streets, turning abandoned shopping centres into new communities and increasing density of housing around transport hubs to build homes that people want to live in. • Residents are entitled to their share of green land. • Just 16% of houses built on Green Belt land since 2009 outside local plans were classed as ‘affordable’. • Build on brownfield sites, use brownfield sites in the town to provide homes. • We need to spend the money on regenerating the town first. • Smaller developments around the town of Kidderminster would share the load. • Logical to build houses on Brownfield Sites between Kidderminster, Bewdley and Stourport on an infill basis. This could contribute to the regeneration of these towns. • Blakedown, and Wolverley and a development of Lea Castle are better served by the existing infrastructure in terms of transport and schools. Why has no development been proposed in Wolverley? • With a modified Option B development (making greater use of Blakedown and 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Wolverley) across the Wyre Forest will maximise the use of current resources and as a consequence reduce demands on the infrastructure of one area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses are being built to accommodate West Midlands overspill NOT extra housing needed for Wyre Forest residents. • Extra housing should be located nearer to industrial areas where jobs are available, better for the environment with a reduction in the pollution from commuting cars. • Land being 'banked' by developers should be used along with empty buildings. • A sprawling new housing development is going to do absolutely nothing for the quality of people's lives in this area. • A very low percentage are affordable homes for first time buyers. • We cannot just keep allowing development to keep eating into our precious British countryside. Our shared environment is worth a lot more than mere money when it has such a dramatic affect on the quality of people's lives. • The surrounding countryside is beautiful and should not be allowed to be built on. I don't believe there are enough jobs in the local area to require extra homes. • National trends show house demand to be flat lining therefore there is no justification to build more houses. • The planners have been misinformed by the Amion independent report. • There is a static population - the housing planned far outweighs the need. • The POD does not acknowledge the full input and importance of this AMEC report as it is clearly a major piece of work identifying the sites. • This huge development goes way beyond any health foot print we should be trying to make! More cars more fumes. • Do not see how Kidderminster can sustain any more housing • Could the development options be less concentrated and spread around the whole of Kidderminster, not just the south-east? • House values on Spennells will decline. • As a country, we need more houses. • The plan must include social housing, and a greater number of houses will help in a small way to keep a lid on local housing costs which is forever rising so 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>making it almost impossible for young couples to get their foot on the first rung of the housing ladder.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on housing estates like Comberton or Spennells as they have been designed for and could just be extended. • Many of the existing residents on Spennells bought a house that took up Green Belt land and farming land. They did not think about it too much as they wanted to have a bigger, better house. 	
<p>OC/13(S) - Stone Hill South</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ridge between Stanklyn and Bell Brooks should be kept open as green wedge. Grade 2 areas should not be developed. Some of northern part is marsh. Irrigation system dating from 17th century. Area to south of Spennells is part of former Stone Common and Hoo Farm. This is grade 2 and should not be used for housing. • Effect on the wild life habitat which is continually being eroded. • Loss of rights of way. • The benefits to mental health and physical well being are at serious risk. • Effect on the ability of local schools and medical centres. • Building here will disrupt the flow North / South of wild life into the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve. • Building on parts of the flood plain. • Encroaches on HSE consultation zones. 	<p>Biodiversity issues mean that this site will not be released for development</p>
<p>WFR/ST/2 - Land off Stanklyn Lane</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land is part of the former Stone Common. • High agricultural grading and should be retained for food production. • Development would cause Kidderminster to join up with ribbon development at Summerfield. • Stanklyn Lane is a relatively narrow road with no footpath along the whole length of it. It is used as a "rat run" by commuters which makes being a pedestrian dangerous. • Local schools are oversubscribed already. • Loss of wildlife. 	<p>This site is no longer being proposed for development.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on views towards Stone. • Destruction of nesting areas for birds – corn buntings, skylarks etc. and destruction of habitat of butterflies and bees. • Loss of Green Belt. • We are already a vast expanse of houses with an <u>exceptionally poor road</u> transport system. • To consider adding further traffic volumes to this already inadequate system is madness. • This is a lane not a dual carriage-way and already has massive problems at the T-junction with the busy A449. • To consider building a second school so close to the existing one, will not only increase traffic and traffic noise, but ultimately lead to higher exhaust emissions and pose a risk to health. • Putting all of the proposed housing development in one area of the town would create an imbalance with too much pressure on the infrastructure. • If houses are built here then all this wildlife will be lost forever some of which is protected. • We will also have to put up with all the dirt, disruption and noise. • It cannot be guaranteed that any new houses built will help any local housing supply issues. • If access to the proposed new development is made from the existing Spennells estate, not only will there be a significant increase in traffic along the existing roads throughout the day but also at peak rush hour time traffic at the two Heronswood Road exits from Spennells Valley Road will become even more congested than they currently are. • If access onto Stanklyn Lane is provided then the two ends of Stanklyn Lane, at Stone and Summerfield, will see a huge increase in traffic congestion at currently awkward and hazardous junctions. • The Spennells estate should be a model for developers to follow, leave it alone; it works for the local residents! 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will overwhelm local roads, permanently remove Green Belt land and withdraw a popular recreational leisure area. • These fields host a wide variety of plant and wildlife and all will be lost. • The fields are used by dog walkers, runners, and ramblers. • The removal of leisure and recreational space. • Question the source of the predicted rise in population. • The plan to build a road to connect the Bromsgrove and Worcester roads will deliberately increase through traffic. • Such a large increase in the number of households concentrated in a single area will put pressure on local essential services, especially health and education. • The negative impact on the biodiversity & wildlife in the area. • The impact on the existing residents from increased traffic. • The absorption of Summerfield & Stone into Kidderminster. • That there appears to be little consideration regarding infrastructure particularly access to medical treatment and schooling. • Lost forever. Stanklyn Lane is a haven for many local people to enjoy comparative safety walking, riding, cycling and enjoying the ancient public Rights of Way paths crossing fields and leading on our country lanes. • Noise and air pollution and the negative effect that this will have on the residents in the local area. • We are in full support of the proposal and the land owner's intentions towards this overall development and the inclusion of this land are positive. 	
AS/10 - Rear of Spennells & Easter Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood area-Take away the fields – would this cause flooding on the estate due to the natural water table. • The railway embankment acts like a dam. • Traffic congestion. • Destruction of nesting areas for birds – corn buntings, skylarks etc. and destruction of habitat of butterflies and bees. • Loss of Green Belt. • We are being encouraged to protect our wildlife and you want to take away their 	This land is not proposed for allocation in this Local Plan

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>natural homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should be released in its entirety to provide a comprehensive development with necessary infrastructure helping to contribute to the provision of housing needed to meet the needs of the Black Country and Birmingham 	
WFR/WC/16 - Lea Castle Hospital extension (S)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important site for separating Kidderminster and Lea Castle Hospital. • Prefer to see site left open. • Site WFR/WC/16 should not be developed. The village of Cookley is entirely separate and clearly distinct from the outer suburban areas of Kidderminster. • Development effectively joins the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. • WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt. • Support a plan to develop the Lea Castle site (WFR/WC/15) and adjacent sites (WFR/WC/32) and (WFR/WC/16). • This proposal links Lea Castle development to Kidderminster, and therefore links Cookley to Kidderminster. Your proposals do not support your vision. • There is lack of local infrastructure to support. • No provision made for additional demands on existing services such as schooling, GP surgery and shops. I also have concerns re increased traffic in the area and the exhaust emission and noise pollution associated with it. • Contrary to retaining the local identity of Cookley. The Parish Council want to safeguard the setting and special character of the villages. • Site identified as making a 'contribution' and 'significant contribution' to the Green Belt by the Green Belt assessment. • No consideration given to infrastructure. • Concerned about housing development areas without any employment or entertainment for young people. • Access and highways infrastructure is insufficient to cope with proposed development. Additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. 	This site is not proposed for allocation as it would remove the strategic gap between Lea Castle and Kidderminster.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will houses be taken by commuters and what would impact be on roads, services and carbon footprint? • The proposed extensions, in one area are unfair to local residents causing a new bottle neck to the entry of Kidderminster. • Cookley is a village and should remain so. • Who is the development aimed at clearly not the local population with only 18% affordable housing. • This kind of development will attract people from outside the area not people who already live and work here. • Lea Castle site is an area of natural beauty this should be preserved and enhanced. It is an asset that could be used for the benefit of local people in perpetuity. • Other local action groups are recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. • To cater for increased housing that is not actually required is against the Development Needs Assessment 2015. • Creates a link to the Lea Castle site which cumulatively would result in an unacceptable linear extension of Kidderminster towards the north-east and encourage urban sprawl towards Cookley creating a corridor of continuous development between the two settlements. • It is a sloping site that is highly visible, particularly from the A449 Wolverhampton Road and from the Wolverley direction and as such any large-scale development would be highly visually intrusive. • Would create a significant and unacceptable narrowing of the designated Green Belt between Kidderminster and Stourbridge and the wider West Midlands conurbation. • When left fallow, this arable field becomes one of the distinctive poppy fields in this area of Worcestershire and one of the few on the east side of Kidderminster. • No submitted plans to describe where proposed facilities like doctors, shops, schools for us to consider. • Redevelopment of Kidderminster is needed prior to this development to support 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>jobs and infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? • Village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. • These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others. • Does not agree with Green Belt land being swallowed up into urban development unless, as a very last resort! • It is Green Belt land currently being farmed. • It also will be the only countryside buffer. • I am shocked that our Council would build on land that has been preserved as Green Belt • This local plan does not promote sustainable development. • Public transport needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest, run frequently and economic to use. • Housing should be spread as equally as possible across Wyre Forest so that it does not negatively impact one side/area. • Development here is both unnecessary and morally wrong. Green Belt is not to be used in this fashion it is fit agricultural and recreational use only. • Will devalue our house if the plans go ahead. • Kidderminster will suddenly no longer feel rural, but completely over-crowded. • Cookley is referred to as <i>“Inset Green Belt”</i>. How will this be Inset when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? • The more Green Belt that is taken away and replaced with concrete will impact on the amount of water that goes into the drains. • An ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land. 	
WFR/WC/32 - Lea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer the larger Option B to be developed to achieve the required number of 	This site is proposed for allocation as part of

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
<p>Castle Hospital extension (E)</p>	<p>dwelling for an additional primary school. Cookley village primary school should remain a village primary school serving the needs of the immediate local village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for land allocated in your plan to encroach on HSE consultations zones. • Supports the inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital Extension site, • Considered an appropriate location to deliver additional housing at Kidderminster. • This area would provide a good number of dwellings (2000+) with local amenities to compliment this size of development such as a primary school a good bus service etc. • Lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. • Highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. • As a separate village Cookley should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. • Object to options A & B or any developments that effectively joins the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. • Current infrastructure will not support this development. • For this proposal to be successful extra schooling and medical facilities and great improvements in road safety would be needed • This site is very open. Development would mean urbanisation of open countryside. • Should be meeting local needs in a sustainable way and not destroying Green Belt. • There are brown field sites not on plan. • The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic. • 600 homes can never be supported by the facilities in the village which are near capacity already. The additional proposal of Option B would only compound the 	<p>the wider Lea Castle Village proposal. The allocation will include residential and open space, with up to 7ha for workshop units. Warehousing and general industry will not be permitted on this site. The site will be landscaped with development set back from the road frontage and kept below the ridgeline.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>problem. The village needs to expand according to its own needs and the development of this site should reflect this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt • Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. • Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs. • Loss of Green Belt land not just at Lea Castle. • What plans are there for more facilities e.g. Doctors', shops, schools? • Redevelop Kidderminster first to support local jobs/infrastructure/transport. • Where link roads and what are is their impact? • No access should be permitted onto the A449 from Lea Castle. • No access should be permitted from Lea Castle via The Crescent. • Axborough Lane- although it is only proposed that a small amount of houses access this road, it will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the Stourbridge Road. • Concerned that Cookley will become a 'rat run' to and from Kidderminster via Lea Lane. • Consider that the main road in and out of Lea Castle should run directly onto the Stourbridge Road A451 (between Axborough Lane and the Park Gate pub). A roundabout at this point or slip roads • Public transport needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest, run frequently and economic to use. • Any building on the Lea Castle site needs to be sympathetic to the area, I would be totally against removing/destroying the forest area as this creates a natural 'wall' and in effect hides he fact that a housing estate may exist there. Existing wildlife should be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife. • This local plan does not promote sustainable development. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I see no reason for development to remove trees, woodlands or wild life habitats in the name of progress. • Site identified as making a ‘contribution’ and ‘significant contribution’ to the Green Belt by the Green Belt assessment. The site should not be allocated for development. • Impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill. • Noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters. • Pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc). • Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access by walking. • Kidderminster will suddenly no longer feel rural, but completely over-crowded • Does not agree with Green Belt land being swallowed up into urban development unless, as a very last resort! • Cookley is a Green Belt village. The Council has a responsibility to ensure this continues. • Removal of Green Belt including established woodland will affect wild life in the area, Buzzards and Bats along with other species. • Cookley is referred to as “village Inset Green Belt” how can this be if our Green Belt is removed? • Access should be via the B4189 and the A451 in order not to over burden the already busy A449. • Before established Green Belt is destroyed for new housing all existing brown field sites within the councils jurisdiction should be fully developed. • I do not agree that the neighbouring fields bordering the A451 should be added on. This would be an eyesore for those approaching Kidderminster, as well as wanton destruction of productive farmland. • How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? • These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others. • Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs. • Concerns re increased traffic in the area and the exhaust emission and noise pollution associated with it. • Will join Cookley Village a rural community to Kidderminster Town and therefore lose the village status. • Concerned about housing development areas without any employment or entertainment for young people. • Access and highways infrastructure is insufficient to cope with proposed development. • Consider other brown field sites in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish. • The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland. • This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land. • Children and parents walking to school in Cookley would need to cross the A449 safely. We think that Lea Castle site should be developed, but sympathetically in its own right and as a separate entity to Cookley and Kidderminster with its own infrastructure and surrounded by the woodland already established not surrounded by houses. • We should be doing all we can to protect and preserve these areas. They should be used only when all brownfield options have been exhausted. • What is the main force driving this development, population growth? 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of Green Belt land. • 1000 homes completely out of context with local environment. • This kind of development will attract people from outside the area not people who already live and work here, increasing pollution and traffic density. • Lea Castle site is an area of natural beauty this should be preserved and enhanced. • The area affected is home to wildlife including birds of prey and sometimes deer. I am shocked that our Council would build on land that has been preserved as Green Belt. • Plans will result in Cookley losing this sense of identity, history and community. • The more Green Belt that is taken away and replaced with concrete will impact on the amount of water that goes into the drains. • Do not consider it possible for east of Kidderminster to sustain completion rates needed to deliver these allocations during Plan period. • The roads, around this site already have many problems. • A451 Stourbridge Road, both this junction & the whole of the Stourbridge Road again is a fast road experiencing many accidents & fatalities. • A large number of dwellings could support a 2 form entry primary school, thus reducing the impact on the local facilities. • It would be within the catchment of Wolverly CE High School and would positively impact the schools long term viability. • It would be capable of sustaining a bus service. • It would support a village centre which would fall under Cookley Parish, but would not put any burden on that community as it would be large enough to support its own park, village hall, school and shop. • It would potentially be able to provide live-work units. • Impact on The Crescent would be small. • It makes sense to develop just a few areas of the district with large housing sites rather than lots of areas with smaller developments. 	
Eastern Relief Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of the so-called “Eastern Relief Road” are vague and not in a form that 	The proposal for an ‘eastern relief road’ has

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
Comments	<p>can be fairly assessed in this consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A road tunnel and rail bridge would be needed near the A449 and another expensive and intrusive bridge over the railway line would be needed at Offmore. This expenditure is totally unjustified, since the A450 already serves the purpose. • No definitive route or traffic model has been provided for this proposal. • Local residents are not being provided with sufficient details to make an informed judgement • Route must have been put forward to enable preliminary costings and this information should have been transparent in the local plan review. • If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450. • The proposed new road (the Eastern Relief road) would impact environmentally sensitive areas with increased air pollution, more noise pollution, light pollution and the destruction of large amounts of natural habitats. • A new road would create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife • An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster • The construction of the Eastern Bypass is likely to encourage more car journeys • The claim that the Eastern Relief Road will facilitate an improvement in AQMA at Churchfields is bogus, • No rationale reasoning has been given for the need of an Eastern relief road • The additional cost of funding the provision of railway bridges for a dual carriageway could well be prohibitive. • There should be no development to the east of Offmore until after an Eastern By Pass has been constructed. • If this by-pass was, in fact, built can WFDC confirm that there would be no need to connect to Turnstone Road. • If extended as far as the A449, the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would cause congestion further up the A449 so affecting the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. 	<p>been removed from the Plan. Funding will be sought by Worcestershire County Council to upgrade existing roads in order to remove heavy lorries from the local network.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence in the report to show that a new access road, which would be essential to gain access to the sites. • WFDC have signed up to the Carbon Emissions Programme – yet the end goal based on the Local Plan Review is to get the Eastern Bypass/Relief Road funded from Central Government. • The LTP4 states that it is a misnomer to say just building a road alleviates a problem - the very building of that road leads to ‘that road’ becoming the next problem. • A <u>new road</u> would simply move traffic a little further away to existing congestion areas on the Worcester Road, Husum Way, Blakedown, Hagley and Mustow Green/Bromsgrove. • Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected. • I would question why this road is needed and what benefit it would provide. • The plan mentions creating cycling and walking paths for people, we will lose the public footpaths and routes currently available on the eastern side of town if you go ahead with option A. • Spennells already absorbs noise from the railway line, Worcester Road and factory units at Easter Park (which recently had a request for extended hours rejected on the grounds of noise) and further noise pollution would be unacceptable and would have an adverse effect on health and quality of life. • We fail to understand how this ribbon development can be contemplated without first considering an eastern bypass. • A relatively high speed road would lead to a reduction in air quality in what would be a residential area and make any existing rights of way unattractive for recreational activities, especially important in Kidderminster, with its relatively obese and elderly population. • Footbridges should be provided for both pedestrians and cyclists. • It has been suggested that this road will also serve as a “bypass”. However, it cannot serve as a route which will carry HGVs as well as run through a housing estate. • The rough map indicates that it would terminate at the A456, which makes no 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>sense in terms of where bypass traffic is expected to go from there – clearly the A456 and the Land Oak junction would experience higher traffic flows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand that a proposal to either raise the railway ‘Black Bridge’ over the A450 or to lower the road under the ‘Black Bridge’ has already been investigated, so that HGVs could use this route. • There is virtually no room for such a road to pass through the proposed development at OC/13 south which passes the water course incorporating Captains Pool and the green corridor to Stanklyn Pool in order to then link up to the A448 Bromsgrove Road. • A road link at Easter Park would have to cross the railway presumably with a bridge. This would have a significant visual and noise impact on the area. • A Kidderminster eastern relief road would attract more traffic, particularly HGVs, along any new development between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells. The aim should be to divert traffic away from Kidderminster entering from the south and east. • The majority of the A450 could be upgraded without major disruption to traffic flows whilst being built. This would greatly reduce traffic on the Chester Road North and South and remove pollution from Kidderminster. • It will serve no other purpose than to give access/egress to the new developments. • It will require significant investment from the public purse because it will have to cross an existing rail network at one or two points by going under or over. • Developers will only contribute toward the easier/cheaper engineering which crosses through virgin land, they will not expect to fund major engineering works. • It is factually incorrect to promote it as a relief road or by-pass, in fact it will be a local distributor road. • The so called relief road will not provide an alternative to the current congestion on A449 or A448. • No evidence of any traffic survey data to prove such a road is required. • Local authorities should not be spending public money on schemes that have no 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>direct benefit to the community at large.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed route would open up Green Belt to unnecessary development. • Any option that includes a relief road should not be followed without a guarantee that the relief road would be constructed. • No research has been done to show that carving up our Green Belt land for such a road would serve the purpose. • The A450 already accommodates the need for the majority of traffic going towards Birmingham, • Money would be better spent on amending the bridge to allow larger vehicles to pass under, rather than increase light, noise and exhaust pollution elsewhere. • The close proximity of the Roxel site should also be considered as there have been incidents that affected residents and safety should be considered. • Network Rail will also no doubt place strict guidelines on any building of roads, bridges and houses near their lines which will also increase costs considerably. • This appears to have been resurrected apparently again due to another 'useful contribution' from the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP. • Wyre Forest seems to have survived quite well for the last 21 years without the need for this bypass. • The sole reason for resurrecting this proposal must be to enable easier access to the motorway network for the proposed and any future Birmingham overspill. • I would be very open to further investigation into the Eastern relief road regardless of which option is taken as I feel this could be necessary in the future to reduce traffic flow through the town, Chester Road and Land Oak areas • Relief roads are not popular but neither is congestion and poor traffic flow and in the modern world this is an ever increasing problem • I trust any relief road would be built sympathetically to the surroundings taking nature and wildlife into consideration. • Would like to see the detailed work on traffic flows around Kidderminster that demonstrates that an Eastern Bypass is viable financially, practically and ethically. • How many homes would have already been built before construction of the road 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>begins?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a further issue to the location of this Relief Road and that is the electricity pylons and cables that cross the land from Stanklyn Lane to Bromsgrove Road. • Within your local plan there is mention of trying to raise funds for this "Relief Road", what will you do if there funds are not available? • The present Local Plan should be significantly rewritten to include the full impact of road proposals to enable residents to give their verdict on the proposed urban extensions. • Land N of Comberton Road can deliver significant section of relief road with secondary links onto Husum Way and Spennells Valley Road/Comberton Road. A Transport Assessment will be undertaken to support a future planning application. • The budget (£17.5 million) seems grossly under-estimated, especially considering that the Worcester Road to Silverwoods Link Road cost in the region of £6.5 Million. • The Plan appears to have a strong bias towards the promotion of Option A, seemingly to facilitate the building of an Eastern Relief Road. • Traffic wishing to avoid Kidderminster can already do this without the expense and environmental damage which would be caused by constructing yet another road through the Green Belt. • Any new road should run the whole eastern side of Kidderminster from A449 North to A449 South, possibly to A451. • The elevated position of the new road linking the Wolverhampton Road and Worcester Road would mean it would require at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. • Mention was made of a Southern (?) Relief Road but no effective information has been available. If this is indeed a substantive suggestion it must be much clearer in the final document. • There is no meaningful information about the proposed new road in the Local 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	Plan.	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTP4 identifies the need for WFDC to address public transport issues and support the use of cycle lanes. • Serious thought needs to be given to finding another entrance/exit to Crossley Park as congestion here will only get worse with an expanding town. • WWT does not consider that these biodiversity constraints have been considered properly in the evidence base for the plan and we do not accept the findings of the SA. • Would it not be safer and more environmentally friendly to develop one large new housing estate that would include the necessary facilities for the families who move there - e.g. shops and a primary school? • The Core sites will take out a considerable chunk of Green Belt land and there appears to be no alternative within the plan. To consult without alternatives is not consultation. • Land banking needs to be stopped. • The plan seems to pursue urban sprawl and needs to be more imaginative, without building on farmland. • New sports provision will be required with the east of Kidderminster sites and this should be addressed in a strategic manner (e.g. perhaps a multi pitch sports hub). • Allocation of sites east of Kidderminster will encourage commuting to Birmingham. • Against removing Lea Castle and the east of Kidderminster from the Green Belt, this needs to be preserved at all costs. The woodlands should be protected and no dwellings should be seen from the roads. • Cannot understand the concept of an eastern by-pass without description/visual aid to show how such a road would be built/its impact on the area, people and the environment. The financial aspect also sounds prohibitive. Surrounding Green Belt fields used for walking and new development will erode this • Support for growth in Kidderminster. Agree that this is likely to require carefully 	<p>New strategic development proposals include provision for cycle paths which will link through to the existing network and provide easy access to key facilities</p> <p>Crossley – 2nd exit was explored as part of Churchfields Masterplan. It would be difficult to implement and the business case is unlikely to stack up.</p> <p>Meetings have been held between officers and the WWT to discuss their concerns. Ecological site appraisals have been undertaken for a number of key sites and detailed Green Infrastructure Concept Plans have been drawn up by the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Group.</p> <p>There are 2 strategic allocations proposed which would also provide land for a primary school plus community facilities. Further sports provision is planned at Lea Castle.</p> <p>The proposed allocations will require substantial buffering with additional woodland planting to minimise the visual impact.</p> <p>Urban extension will provide access to the countryside where there is currently no</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>considered GB release.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposed intention to review Green Belt. • The population of Kidderminster over the last few years as remained fairly static and this proposal will unnecessarily attract more people into the area. • We would like to strongly object to this ridiculous plan. • The Council has commitment and planning policy to protect the open countryside. They should therefore follow its own policies in this regard. • Some proposed development areas are on good agricultural land. • There would be a loss of trees and hedgerows, community leisure spaces and public rights of way. • Some proposed development sites have steep gradients which could cause flooding issues from run-off. • Some proposed sites are very near SSSIs. Development could result in loss of wildlife habitat and permanent urbanisation of important landscapes • Development and the associated increase in vehicular movement would have a further detrimental impact upon air quality and would be contrary to the NPPF. • There is a shortage of primary school places – many primary schools in WFDC area are already full to capacity. • Commence work on the 3000 homes on brownfield sites. Use the income you receive from Crown House to pay the salary of an officer to effect the regeneration of the town centre, alongside any grants you may receive. • Kidderminster currently has a very poor town centre which is in desperate need of improvement. Building residential properties instead of more shops would give the place more vitality and attractiveness. • The Green Belt to the east will be attractive to the house builders for the provision of luxury detached houses where the housing need does not appear to lie. • There is no clear indication of how the development to the south and east of the town would be accessed. • Large numbers of additional housing on one side of Kidderminster will put strain 	<p>public access. An extensive network of signposted walking routes is proposed as part of the development.</p> <p>The population of Wyre Forest is projected to increase by 4.9% over the plan period.</p> <p>Kidderminster is surrounded by high quality agricultural land with poorer quality land mostly found either west of the River Severn or where the topography would make development difficult. As there is insufficient brownfield land which is viable to bring forward, the release of high quality agricultural land for development is unavoidable in order to allocate enough land to cater for the housing requirement.</p> <p>It is hoped that the brownfield sites which are currently allocated for redevelopment can be brought forward in advance of any release of Green Belt land through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The Local Plan proposals include a number of additional brownfield sites within Kidderminster with housing the most likely use for the former Magistrate’s building.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>on the inadequate infrastructure, increase congestion, pollution and change the character of independent communities, particularly Cookley, Hurcott and Stone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will encroach onto pasture land, green field and Green Belt areas. This will affect wildlife and remove amenity areas enjoyed by the communities. • There should be more development in Stourport, there would be scope for another High School which would give people more choice. • Green Belt land is essential to maintain wildlife. • Please ensure that the Husum Way Junction on the A459 Birmingham Rd junction is made safe. • Develop Lea Castle so as to be "self-contained". • Include sustainable transport provision such as cycle lanes/bus services, esp. between the new settlement/Broadwaters and Kidderminster. • The council owns a great deal of properties in and around the town centre which are currently unused and create an eyesore and derelict look to the town. • It is imperative that diversion of traffic away from main population areas is considered using a link road to avoid the villages of Blakedown and Hagley. • The proposed expansion can only result in Kidderminster becoming a satellite town for Birmingham • Historically the town has always been unable to compete, in terms of introducing new businesses, with the facilities of Birmingham to the north or the attractiveness of Worcester to the south. • The continuous loss of quality agricultural land will further reduce the ability of the country to become more self-sufficient and to decrease our import bill. • Would like to see more imaginative solutions provided for housing than just big blocks of new development. • Minimal impact on the Green Belt would be better achieved by removing a larger volume of smaller sites across the district rather than a smaller number of large sites which will have greater impact. • Please do not assume that green land doesn't matter to us, as it really does • Both proposals A and B propose to build houses on green land behind 	<p>There is currently only one public footpath on the east of Comberton/Offmore near Heathy Mill Farm. There is no other access to the countryside serving these residential estates. The proposed extension will provide an extensive network of circular paths through wetland and woodland areas. The Husum Way junction will be upgraded to a roundabout as part of these proposals. Sustainable transport links from the new development back into Kidderminster and on to Blakedown will be considered as part of these proposals.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>established housing estates. This will destroy beautiful nature and land and make the houses less desirable for incoming residents. These developments would have no heart.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned with proposed Kidderminster Urban Extensions. • Kidderminster town itself needs a lot of work, the green spaces around Kidderminster and its many pleasant areas and attractions are what keep us here. • Will WFDC also consider transforming and investing in the town centre itself, within the ring road? When we were renting we struggled to find good quality flats, and there appears to be a lack of these near to town centre facilities. • The town centre is a depressing place to visit and too many people are happy to destroy and ruin anything nice. Make the area residential and bring life back into this area. Don't destroy our Green Belt. • We question whether the provision of the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would be at the mercy of central government funding? If so, what happens if option A is adopted and the relief road doesn't materialize? • Whilst we understand the need for more housing and the difficult decisions that have to be made, we ask that it could be more proportionate around the area. • Our town is lucky to be surrounded by Green Belt because it lets you know you have arrived and are travelling into a town that is proud to stand on its own • Loss of this Green Belt land, in combination with development of the Lea Castle hospital site, would create a significant and unacceptable narrowing of the designated Green Belt between Kidderminster and Stourbridge and the wider West Midlands conurbation. • The proposed development on the East side of Kidderminster would not appear to address the core policies of the Local Plan Review (Sections 6 to 11) in encouraging the growth of Wyre Forest with Kidderminster at its centre. It would encourage the corridor of growth along the A456 and A451 for commuters to Birmingham and Stourbridge and areas served by Bromsgrove District and Dudley Metropolitan Borough Councils. • Wyre Forest's ageing and static population (Table 2.0.1) would not be served by 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>housing that would require greater mobility to access the amenities provided by Kidderminster town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing semi-rural sites would be detrimental for the district, destroying open spaces and ruining the approaches to the town from the East which are currently green and inviting. • Concerned about the new road and the amount of traffic that will be generated in and around Kidderminster and the air quality with the additional fumes and noise. • Realises extra housing is necessary but doesn't think it is a good idea to focus developing just one side of Kidderminster - especially on Green Belt land. • There is no guarantee that building more housing on the eastern side of Kidderminster will make the development of an Eastern Relief Road more likely • The 'necessary housing' has been falsely derived by a flawed OAHN report. • It is unnecessary to pave over Green Belt when other forms of buildings can be considered within the curtilage of the existing town boundary • Justification 31.1 states "there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc " However there are brownfield sites not on the plan, • 540 unit development for elderly persons would be more suitable and safer on the Lea Castle site. • The proposed relief road will simply attract more vehicles along the A449/A456 route decreasing safety and isolating the town centre from custom. • Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site • you really need to have a robust plan for traffic management • Document is too long, too technical and too prescriptive. 	

Further details on site selection can be found in the Site Selection Paper and the Sustainability Appraisal.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
LI/2 – Wyre Forest Golf Club	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic. • This in an important and widely used public open space currently acts as a “buffer” between a large residential area and the local nature reserve and SSSI. • Local schools, doctors and dentists are already struggling to cope with existing numbers of occupants in these areas, and a significant increase in the number of houses would lead to an influx in students and patients. • The lie of this land has previously been the cause of severe flooding to properties in Elan Avenue, my own property included. • New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers. • Access to the site is very limited via the Kingsway this is not a main road and was not designed to take a substantial increase to traffic flow. • The area is poorly serviced by the current road infrastructure. At peak traffic times there are often traffic queues from the sharp bend in Kingsway to the traffic lights at Burlish crossroads. • No evidence base to support the release of the entire site shown from the Green Belt • Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic. • There is a spring feeding an Aquifer for Blackwell Abstraction point on the site. • We are being asked to lodge our concerns before we actually know exactly what is being planned i.e. the type of houses, the spacing/road layout and the entrance from the Kingsway. • Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way/ good agricultural land. • With the Burlish Top Nature reserve having homes, right up to its border. Will these defeat the object of a nature reserve? • Increase in traffic noise and pollution • Surface water flooding. • The land has been contaminated by recent waste tipping. • The Kingsway road will require widening to a standard carriageway so that 	This site is no longer proposed for allocation in this Local Plan

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>residents can access the A451 safely rather than use Burlish Crossing or Windermere Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Burlish Crossing lights will need to be reconfigured to avoid even worse traffic delays if all the developments closest to this junction are approved. • The proposal to develop the golf course does not take into consideration that for building of properties the site will be cut into two by the Strategic Main and its service access zone. This will not only limit the number of dwellings but effectively create two separate sites. • The site borders an SSSI. • Public transport is not seen as viable as bus service is 'extremely poor.' • Severn Trent has put a major pipeline through the site surely this cannot be compromised. • Loss of wildlife. It is home to badgers, sky larks and many other animals. Any development would be destructive and have a massive impact on the environment. There would be light and noise intrusion to the nature reserve and would remove a valuable public amenity. • Concerns related to potential impacts on biodiversity at Wyre forest golf club. Due to the presence of acidic habitat. • The increased traffic Burlish Top to the main Kidderminster - Stourport road represents a real safety hazard particularly to children at Stourport High School and users of the sports facilities. The road is very narrow and would not support increased traffic. • Wouldn't this land be better used for recreational purposes giving its proximity to the nature reserve, taking into account National obesity levels rising, the lack of local leisure facilities in both Bewdley and Stourport (and an under-equipped Leisure Centre for the Wyre Forest as a whole) and also the fact that the land is currently utilised by dog walkers and children for leisure? • Given that the plan now only suggests housing on this site, am I right to assume that the 'recreational' plans for this land have been quashed? • There is already a problem with illegal use of motorcycles and at night with youths drinking/drugs. Any major development will probably exacerbate these problems. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of pollution on health. • I am concerned that any development will increase the risk of flooding properties. • The development is another step towards joining the towns of Kidderminster and Stourport via Birchen Coppice. Development towards the joining of the two towns must not be allowed to take place. • Would be better used as allotments. • This currently acts as a “buffer” between a large residential area and the local nature reserve and SSSI. • It is used by many walkers (ref. obesity figures for Wyre Forest District). • An area with no direct public transport into the nearest town, increasing car traffic and air pollution. • Green Belt land must be protected at all costs. • Doctors and Dentists will find it difficult to cope with extra people. • More schools will be needed and that will mean more transport on our roads. • Traffic is very noisy already on our roads so the increase will make it worse. • The impact of building houses on Kingsway field would have significant impact on plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve. • There is no need to use Green Belt land when there are enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District. • This site should not be developed as it is essential to maintain green space between the three towns. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the golf course cannot be reopened then the site could be used for building more homes having good accessibility to both Kidderminster and Stourport. • Site suitable for mixed housing and green space. • I support the release of land at site LI/2, subject to significant landscape considerations. • The whole of the western edge of Stourport lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. • A policy of the plan should set out at this stage that only the lower-Lying areas of 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>the site, say to the south of where the pipeline has been laid, should be considered for housing purposes. The visually prominent northern half of the site should be set aside for landscaping and habitat restoration, so as to enhance Burlish Top.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of the northern most land could be used to provide a car park for the Wildlife reserve at Burlish Top. • LI/2 could also be designated for use by self-build applicants 	
LI/6/7 – Lickhill Road, North	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads around Burlish Crossing are already heavily congested and additional traffic would cause further congestion at the Swan Hotel/High street junction. • Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing. • Negative impact on wildlife. • Loss of agricultural land. • Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools. • Building houses here would increase commuter traffic through the known congestion points in Kidderminster or Stourport in order to access the main arterial route. The sites are too far away from town centres. • Increase in traffic will lead to more road noise, pollution & congestion. • Schools already full with lack of places for children. Where will the new house residents' children go? • Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations. • Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land. • Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated. • Pipeline running across the middle of the field that was put in 30 years. • Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth. • Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available. • Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding. • Need land for food production post Brexit. • Build affordable housing near shops/services for people without own transport. 	These sites are no longer proposed for allocation in this Local Plan mainly due to highway issues at Burlish Crossing.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic. • The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity. • Site not big enough for 90 houses, there are only 16 or so on the opposite side of the road, so it must be a very dense development with small houses and close together. • Sites L1/6/7 Lickhill Road North represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments. • The increased traffic Burlish Top to the main Kidderminster - Stourport road represents a real safety hazard particularly to children at Stourport High School and users of the sports facilities. The road is very narrow and would not support increased traffic. • Concerns about retaining Stourport's character and identity, • Threatening existing public rights of way. • There is no evidence that this amount of new housing is required in the Wyre Forest area, where the population growth is below the national average. • Surely there should be a review of need for housing in the area and also the provision of schools, health centres and local hospitals before detailed plans for housing. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use garden centre site for mixed housing with green space. • I support the release of land at site L1/6/7, subject to significant landscape considerations. The whole of the western edge of Stourport lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. • This site is one which represents a sustainable location for development. • The site has a choice of routes out to Kidderminster, Bewdley and two routes to Stourport Town assisting and there are bus links within a few hundred meters walking distance from the site. 	
AKR/1 – Bridge Street Basins	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AKR/1 – site set aside to access to the canal basins - claw back cost if not? • Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops. 	A proposal for the site is being drawn up which will be mostly residential.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food & entertainment. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be developed for mixed use - residential with retail. The retail units would complement and enhance the existing retail units within the town. 	
AKR/2 – Cheapside	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of site at risk of flooding. Development should be directed to sites of lower flood risk first. Site should be removed. Part of site also occupied and thus not currently available. There needs to be clear evidence that the site should not be protected for employment purposes before a mixed use allocation is pursued. 	Site falls within Conservation Area and is important for its industrial history as a vinegar works. Detailed heritage study has been undertaken. Much of site should be retained for conversion as large part of site falls within floodzone 3 and redevelopment would not be an option. Allocation to be retained.
AKR/7 – Swan Hotel / Working Men’s Club	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England: this site appears to include a bowling green. • The Workmen’s Club and adjacent Bowling Club are important social centres for the town and host a range of activities which require provision of adequate car parking. Some local business people have contract parking on this site. • The whole of the Swan/Workman's Club site is indicated, I was told that this represents land ownership and the whole site is not affected. This needs significant clarification to indicate the areas involved. • The Swan Hotel has been developed as a thriving and much needed social resource. It would be detrimental to the community if this leisure resource were to be closed down. • Housing would worsen already congested traffic in town centre • No walking access to rail links or reliable bus service at present. • Why consider this site when the site at the “Bond Worths” former factory has been lying idle for so many years? • To pursue a compulsory purchase on this site would not only deprive the people of Stourport with an important place of relaxation, but would also put several 	This site is currently allocated and includes social clubs / bowling greens and extensive car parking. The area to the rear of the Swan Hotel on Lickhill Road requires redevelopment to improve the streetscene. No other parts of the site would be affected.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>people out of work and should therefore be removed by WFDC from any compulsory purchase or future residential development plans</p>	
<p>AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth</p>	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site had planning permission for 159 units which lapsed. Is site suitable and deliverable? The allocation should be removed from the plan. • The access road, off Severn Road/Discovery Road is only very narrow and struggles to cope with traffic at the present time. Will this be widened for the redevelopment? • There will be a large increase in footfall of people wanting to get from Cheapside into the High Street area of town. Waters Edge is a private development – not a Public Right of Way. The adjacent Public Right of Way should be highlighted by signs and the Water’s Edge development should have a gate erected on its entrance off Mart Lane, to stop the “traffic”. • The roadway that comes from Tesco on to Severn Road gets very congested. • What provisions are there going to be made for the occupants of the new housing all over Stourport for schools and Doctors Surgeries? • There is reference to building an Eastern By-pass for Kidderminster, but what about a by-pass for Stourport? The whole town grinds to a standstill on good weekends, holiday times and peak times. • There are unrealistic assumptions of development value by the landowners. The Council might wish to consider Planning or Regeneration CPO powers. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be developed with houses to attract people who choose to live in the Wyre Forest but their employment is within the surrounding towns and cities as they offer easy access to the main arterial roads without going through the known congestion points. • This brownfield site should be used before other proposed sites are utilised. Can pressure be put upon the developers to either proceed with building or relinquish the land to another developer? • Use site for mixed housing. 	<p>This site is currently being marketed for housing development with a number of national house builders showing interest. Once sold to a developer, a fresh planning application will be submitted for determination.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do feel these offer sufficient provision for new homes within the Stourport area. These utilise suitable land around the Carpets of Worth and Parsons Chain area without encroaching on green belt or 'open land'. 	
MI/1 – County Buildings	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rebuild health centre with better facilities on site. Ongoing review to relocate to emergency hub, no certainty site will be available for development. The allocation should be removed. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be developed for mixed use - residential with retail. The retail units would complement and enhance the existing retail units within the town. Place Partnership: WP, WMP and HWFRS support the allocation of the County Buildings site for 40 dwellings. The delivery of the new Wyre Forest Emergency Service Hub means there is certainty that the HWFRS element of the site will come forward for development. Similarly, the Place Review being undertaken jointly by the Council and PPL means that there is confidence that the site as a whole will be available for redevelopment. 	<p>Most of the occupants of this site have already relocated or will be relocating in the next few years. Only the health centre remains with no firm plans for relocation. The site is able to come forward on a phased basis whilst funding and a site is secured for the health centre relocation. The site will be allocated in the Local Plan for up to 40 dwellings.</p>
MI/3 – Parsons Chain	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parsons Chain - deliverability is questionable. Depends on need to remove former railway embankment as part of Stourport Relief Road. Site should be removed. Traffic – Worcester and Hartlebury roads are already heavily congested. Woodland – concerned about any suggested removal of the woodland on the old Railway Line behind The Birches. Schools – What provision is there for school places? Whilst applauding the use of brownfield rather than greenfield sites this particular proposal removes an edge of town employment opportunity in Parsons Chain site. The town has little employment with the exception of retail outlets. Should be developed with houses to attract people who choose to live in the Wyre Forest but their employment is within the surrounding towns and cities as they offer easy access to the main arterial roads without going through the 	<p>The railway embankment is no longer proposed for removal. Plans are being drawn up to redesign the Hartlebury/Worcester Roads junction which suffers from severe congestion. It is proposed to allocate the site for a mix of uses including employment/ care home / housing</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>known congestion points.</p> <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be developed with houses. • Use Parsons Chain for mixed housing and green space. • I do feel these offer sufficient provision for new homes within the Stourport area. These utilise suitable land around the Carpets of Worth and Parsons Chain area without encroaching on Green Belt or 'open land'. 	
MI/6 – Steatite Way	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fears that it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park. More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health. Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles. • Insufficient schools to cope with more children. • Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people. • Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land. • Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations. • Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree that MIP site should be developed for housing but not high density. • Use MIP site for mixed housing plus green space. • Support the allocation of Site Ref MI/6 (Steatite Way) for housing use. Insufficient sites within Stourport on Severn's settlement boundary to accommodate the housing needs of the town. Site is located within a sustainable location, within walking distance of a number of bus stops and approximately 10 minutes' walk from the town centre of Stourport. There are no physical constraints that prevent the site from being released for development. • Supports Steatite Way proposals with the provision that the exit onto Bewdley Road is improved due to several traffic accidents. 	There is an outline application for 106 dwellings on this site which has not been determined. The site is understood to have recently been sold to a national house builder. It is a brownfield site and will be allocated in the local plan.
MI/18 and MI/33 – Wilden Industrial	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of wildlife and negative impact on Wilden Marsh. 	MI/18 is already in use for storage. The site will be zoned for employment and removed

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to any more industrial units on Wilden Lane. Surrounded by industrial units in this area, many of which are empty. The Worcester Road has had units empty for years, why build more? There is also the Hoo Farm industrial estate and the Worcester Road premises. • A majority of the residents of Wilden Lane live very close to road and already suffer fast traffic speeding HGV's (over the weight limit) that are hurtling down the road at all times of the day and night and more industrial units would add to this. • Any industrial units will add to noise, air and road pollution and be detrimental to the road and residents. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the zoning of the two sites for employment purposes. 	<p>from the Green Belt to regularise the situation. MI/33 is a vacant plot within the industrial estate which may be required for expansion for the neighbouring unit.</p>
LI/5 – Burlish Crossing	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is an attractive band of farmland forming a natural barrier between Stourport and Bewdley. • The roads around Burlish Crossroads area is currently already subject to traffic congestion at many times of day, and the development would only exasperate this. • An area with no direct public transport into the nearest town, increasing car traffic and air pollution, leaving residents with no alternative means of transport. • The road can scarcely handle the volume of traffic currently using it, and speeding is a big problem on the run from Burlish Top to the Burlish traffic lights. • Stourport has no bypass, or ring road to deal with increased traffic. Congestion in the area at school times is already a significant problem. • Loss of Green Belt land. • The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements. • Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land. • This field and the adjacent fields are an important habitat for birds, particularly in winter when lapwings gather in the area. 	<p>It is not proposed to allocate this site for development in this Local Plan. The adjacent Burlish Crossing has no capacity for further expansion without widening which would require loss of existing dwellings.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of an area of natural beauty and wildlife habitats. • Longer waiting times at doctors/dentists etc • Extra noise and pollution to what is a quiet neighbourhood. • Negative visual impact over adjacent properties. Loss of views from homes overlooking the field. • The need for additional housing in this area can be met from the use of existing brownfield sites. • Bewdley Road North is heavily congested, especially at peak times. • Development at Burlish field threatens nesting birds and rights of way. • Major traffic congestion at crossroads. • Lack of capacity in schools, doctors, dentists. • No exceptional circumstances that would justify removal of site from Green Belt. Non-Green Belt sites are available in Stourport. • A loss of Green Belt and precious open land which will affect wildlife populations. • The introduction of more traffic on already congested roads (peak periods) i.e. Kingsway, Bewdley Road, Windermere Way. More junctions causing even more traffic chaos. • Stourport has already catered for more people i.e. Tan Lane, Manor Road, Vale Road, which will impact on local facilities such as GPs, dentists, schools etc. • More traffic noise and emissions will risk the health of local residents. • This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations. • Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents. • Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds nesting in these fields. • Significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve. • This area is an attractive band of farmland forming a natural barrier between Stourport and Bewdley. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected. • The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity. • No exceptional circumstances that would justify removal of site from Green Belt. • Stourport has no bypass, or ring road to deal with increased traffic. • Radical impact on property values • Some of this land would be better used as allotments. • There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, • Concerned about retaining Stourport's character and identity • Crime and anti-social behaviour quite low in this area at present, extra influx of people put this at risk. • New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers. • The Council refused to allow a car boot sale on these fields a couple of years ago on the grounds that it would create too much traffic. How is it now acceptable to build so many houses without any plans to improve the road system? <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of this site is less unacceptable than sites to the north, in that the town would extend out to the boundary of the former Burlish Common, of which the field is part. The next parcel to the northeast has already been developed (including Elan Avenue). • Instead of LI/2, the Option B site LI/5 Burlish Crossing should be used, where it would be in closer proximity to the main road and to keep development more compact. • Seems to be a sensible option. Access to the town, Kidderminster and Bewdley is simple because it is on the right side of the town. • The whole of the western edge of Stourport, lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. • Various facilities are within easy walking distance • Site is sustainably located. Site is suitable, developable and available. It scores well in GB Review and SA. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
MI/17 – Stourport Manor	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England: this site appears to have 2 x tennis courts and perhaps some playing field. Any losses would need to be justified under NPPF Par 74 and SE policy. • Exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated to remove site from Green Belt. Non-Green Belt sites should be favoured first. • This is a Greenfield site with mature trees and a valuable open space which is not farmland but a rare area of grass and hedges. • The proposed number of houses would be too dense to be sustainable and would be inappropriate so close to Hartlebury Common. • There are few amenities; no shop, only a small school with limited room for expansion, no bus stop, narrow road with no pavement (Wilden Top Road is basically single track). • Dangerous road junction at Wilden Top Road and Hartlebury Road. Heavy lorries (Talbot Landfill) frequently use Wilden Top Road. • Area characterised by steep scarp above Stour valley. This site is above top of scarp. Hotel should remain as isolated building in Green Belt. • The current local transport infrastructure cannot support this development. • At peak times traffic often queues on the Hartlebury Road as far as Wilden Top Lane, also backs up along Wilden Lane from the Stourport end. • The junction of Wilden Top Lane and Hartlebury Road is close to a summit in the road. That would make that junction unsuitable for access to any new development On Wilden Top. • Bigbury Lane, (which is the main pedestrian access from existing housing at Wilden Top to Wilden Lane) has a narrow section with no footpath. This would be the primary road access to Wilden All Saints CofE Primary School, resulting in increased traffic volumes. 	This site is not being taken forward into the Local Plan.
AKR/14 – Pearl Lane	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about significant levels of growth at Areley Kings. This area is adjacent to the Malvern Hills District boundary and has already seen growth come forward within Malvern Hills District. The infrastructure implications of any site 	It is proposed to allocate this Greenfield (non Green Belt) site for approximately 200 dwellings. This is the maximum amount of housing that the local schools could

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>allocations within this area need to be carefully considered in the context of recent and planned development on the Malvern Hills side of the administrative boundary to ensure that sufficient capacity exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of growth on the current river Severn crossing within Stourport should be considered, particularly as there is no longer an intention to deliver the Stourport Relief Road in Local Transport Plan 4. • A number of issues have been raised about this site including: drainage, encroachment in the countryside, extra traffic which would lead to a new Air Quality Management Area to be implemented. • There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of this site and there are limited local facilities in Areley Kings. • Housing development here will increase the traffic crossing Stourport Bridge and using the one-way system through Stourport. • Development of this land would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat. • Proposed development on Pearl Lane will have an adverse impact on the neighbourhood, the bridge in Stourport already struggles to cope with the amount of traffic crossing into the town centre, can take 30 minutes to get from Arley Kings into Stourport. • Another 420 houses will increase gridlock to an unsustainable level. • No pavements on Pearl Lane or Ribbesford Road so unsuitable for pedestrians. • Option B has no plans for added infrastructure, where are extra school places, doctors, etc needed to sustain all these extra families coming from? • Stourport infrastructure is not sustainable in its current state, the addition of any housing to the West of the river bridge would produce more stress to those who need to cross the river, there are no doctors surgeries on the West bank and there is only one primary school, very limited employment opportunities and only convenience shopping facilities. • The public transport provision is constrained along with domestic traffic by the limitations of the congested bridge and high street, which has been compounded by the addition of traffic lights to the North of the high street. It is not unusual for the queue for the bridge to reach half a mile long on holiday week end and 	<p>accommodate taking into consideration extant permissions. Flooding issues on the adjacent site can be addressed as part of this proposal and a large area of open space will be provided that will also serve the existing housing estate residents. Traffic modelling has shown that this number of dwellings will have minimal impact on peak traffic flows.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Fridays. Any new domestic building would result in major pressure on the existing very fragile infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction is inevitable if building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl Lane side. • Drainage issues with site. • Infrastructure cannot meet the increased traffic flow over one access (the Stourport bridge). • This area is already congested and air pollution will increase causing health problems to the people living in this area and tourists visiting our small town. • The schools, GP surgeries and local hospital could not meet the needs of hundreds of new residents if they were to live in the small community. • Concerns about the loss of flora and fauna. • The site is too far away from town centre. Not a sustainable location. • The proposed housing site is not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services. • Infrastructure improvements are urgently required North of the bridge without any further development. • Local roads are primarily country lanes. • Very limited employment opportunities in the area. • Options of creating new job opportunities are minimal even with funding which option B does not offer. • Any housing developments across the bridge into Areley Kings will have an effect on the environment and the quality of life of residents. • The view along the valley from Areley Kings Church towards the Abberley Hills is one of middle England's finest and would be destroyed forever should building be allowed to the west of Dunley Road. • Another facet is the lack of public transport evenings and Sundays. • New residents would need to travel through Stourport and over Stourport Bridge to get to their jobs as no large employment opportunities will be created to the west of the river. • There is no scope to widen Stourport bridge and we are told that there is no 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>possibility of an additional river crossing, so adding houses to the west of the river can only be detrimental to traffic flow through the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be invasive to existing green field sites and expand the footprint of Stourport. • Unless and until money is allocated for a new bridge and relief road around Stourport, I really don't think building any more houses in Areley Kings is a viable option. • the LPR makes no mention of the remains of the Roman villa which lie under the Pearl Lane site. Any development would need to ensure that these remains are preserved for research and development by archaeologists in the future. • Part of the proposed development is upon highly productive farmland. • These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable and sustainable site for housing development. • Site is less sensitive than Green Belt sites to the north of town. 	
AKR/15 – Rectory Lane	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields around the area flood frequently. • Traffic congestion is a problem in the area. • The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents. • There is not enough provision for schools, doctors, dentist on this side of the bridge as the current facilities would not handle any more residents. • One main concern is that the Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock. • As building a bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper. • Rectory Lane is not Green Belt but is visually sensitive as adjoins Conservation Area. 	This site is not being taken forward owing to adverse landscape impact.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a brownfield site and is in agricultural use which could be very important after Brexit. • There is insufficient capacity within local schools. Local hospitals are already struggling to cope with demand. • The impact on congestion within Stourport and Bewdley would be unacceptable. • The effect on the B4194 switchback Road, already the scene of fatalities, and Areley Lane would lead to extra traffic. Areley Lane has already become dangerous due to its narrow width. • Pedestrian crossing on Stourport bridge is already, at times, dangerous due to there only being one pathway and its use by cyclists, mobility scooters, dog walkers, etc means that at times one has to walk in the roadway. • Traffic jams already stretch along the Dunley Road past Pearl Lane crossroads at peak times and the access to the Dunley Road could be difficult at times. • Whatever drainage is used the effect of development would lead to extra water flowing into Burnthorne Brook which would lead to additional flooding over the bridge in Areley Lane. • Lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. • If the construction of another bridge was feasible the main objection to the proposed sites would be removed. • Rectory/Pearl Lane would require extra roads even another river bridge! • the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services. • Development of this land would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat. • This area is adjacent to the Malvern Hills District boundary and has already seen growth come forward within Malvern Hills District. • no large employment opportunities will be created to the west of the river. • The area is also home to a large amount of wildlife including birds whose habitat would be ruined • would be invasive to existing green field sites and expand the footprint of Stourport. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services. • Part of the proposed development is upon highly productive farmland. • Development along Rectory Lane would spoil a quiet country walk and the unspoilt scenery. • lack of public transport evenings and Sundays • Local roads are primarily country lanes. • Any development to the west of the river Severn would carry such massive infrastructure costs. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is suitable, deliverable and developable. • Site has good access to local services and Stourport town centre via number of routes. • Access can be provided by upgrading existing service road off Dunley Road. Connections along Ribbesford Road and Rectory Lane could be provided to link into existing rights of way. • Regular bus services run along Dunley Road into Stourport and Kidderminster. • Nearby facilities are within walking distance from site. 	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wyre Forest is an attractive place to live and it is in danger of losing its character and charm if it is extended beyond recognition. • None of the options indicates improvement to the road structure in and around Stourport. • There was no indication of the type of housing that will be built. • Infrastructure cannot cope with the volume of traffic and congestion. Schools and Doctor surgeries are already struggling. • Stourport could only cope with the extra volume if a second bridge were to be built over the River Severn. • Until the council can come up with a plan and the funds to improve the roads and facilities in the Burlish, Lickhill and Kingsway area of Stourport, the idea of building houses as should be scrapped. • Ask people on beforehand where THEY think more houses (especially social 	All allocations have been carefully assessed in terms of impact on highways and available capacity in schools. A review of replacement GP surgeries is being investigated independent of this Local Plan process.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>housing) could be built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to all these sites as in Green Belt, plenty of brown sites still available. • There are sufficient brownfield sites everywhere in Wyre Forest area to accommodate housing needs. • The plan mentions the traffic issues relating to land to the West of Stourport and then proposes to allocate land there - this doesn't seem logical. • It is important that the strategic gap between Stourport and Kidderminster should not be eroded • Stourport has also lost valuable facilities in recent times. It is ludicrous that a town with a river has no swimming facilities for teaching children. • Some sites are close to designated sites and will require particular care in delivery. • Need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist using up to date survey information. • Do not think any homes should be built in Stourport until the ring road that has been talked about for years is put in place. • Appreciate the necessity to provide sites for the Districts housing allocation. However, it is concerning that it is felt this can only be achieved at the expense of the Green Belt. • Further development on the edges of the town would cause deterioration of a valuable landscape. • The document does not seem to appreciate the role of Stourport in the District's economy. • Frequent mention is made of promoting heritage tourism in Stourport but there is no mention of encouraging the facilities to support this, e.g. toilets, parking and provision of facilities for visiting coaches. • There is little mention of sustainable transport proposals in the document, the assumption being made that travel from Stourport area both within and beyond the district will be primarily road based. • Pleased to see, in Stourport on Severn, that there is a wide range of generally smaller sites being considered for allocation and this will assist house builders of all shapes and sizes to be able to access land for development. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 32: STOURPORT ON SEVERN

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• hugely opposed to any more industrial units on Wilden lane• Through traffic needs to be diverted away from the one way system and back to the A449.	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
<p>WA/BE/1 – Stourport Road Triangle</p>	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact it will have on the already chaotic traffic congestion and parking problems generated by nearby school and sports centre. • Concern about the addition to chaos and danger to school children on the Stourport Road. • Current parking and congestion has not been solved in this area. • An addition of 100 dwellings would add to the danger and risk that is currently faced by parents and school children. • The land should be retained for community use. • The Green Belt should not change in this location. • 100 new homes is far too many for this part of Bewdley. • The area is prone to flooding. • There is lots of wildlife around the area including bats, owls, skylarks. • The local schools are already full to capacity. • The local medical centre and hospital is already overworked. • Loss of open visual aspect from neighbouring properties. • The Public Footpath along Riddings Way should be preserved. • A comprehensive assessment of community need is required before land in this area is committed for housing and mitigating measures should be included to offset the current and potentially worsening traffic and parking issues. • Where is the Green Belt going to end? Are we just going to join with Stourport and Kidderminster? • I hope that the old redbrick wall that runs alongside the proposed site and next to the public footpath be preserved. • Site is currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6B. • Disruption to the eco system/wildlife, may affect Riddings Brook footpath. • Unfair allocation and there must be other options the other side of the river. • A significant intrusion into the green gap between Bewdley and Stourport. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are insufficient sites within Bewdley's settlement boundary to 	<p>This site is proposed for removal from the Green Belt and allocation for up to 100 dwellings. The public footpath will be retained and the Riddings Brook opened up and naturalised. The remaining wall from the walled garden to Sandbourne House will be retained and this end of the site will form a large area of open space with pedestrian access through the 'gate' in the wall. The site has good flat access to local facilities.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>accommodate the housing needs of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is a kilometre from the town centre and access to the town centre is easily achieved along well-lit pavements on a flat plain. • The site is opposite the town's leisure centre and is one hundred metres' from the nearest secondary and primary schools. • The site is readily accessible to local services and facilities by foot and local bus services. As such, it is a highly sustainable location for housing development. • There are no physical constraints that prevent the site being released for development. • The site represents one of the best opportunities to release a discreet parcel of land which will not intrude upon the wider landscape and which is also able to achieve a high degree of sustainability in terms of its connectivity to the town centre and other important local services, notably schools and the leisure centre. • The housing should be a mix of affordable homes, homes for the elderly and private housing. 	
<p>WA/BE/5 – Land south of Habberley Road</p>	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already too much traffic along this end of Habberley Road to permit building of 45 dwellings on this land. A smaller number would be more reasonable. • The site would need a road through to meet the round about of the by pass taking traffic away from the houses at this end of Habberley Road. This would also relieve build up of traffic at the no right turn at Catchems End, and the volume of traffic along Bewdley Road because of the enforced left turn. • Traffic flow along Habberley Road has increased greatly. Further development will lead to more traffic on a road that is not wide enough to take it. • The proposed development will be on a road that is already very busy and often dangerous road that gets congested that causes problems for the residents and other road users. • The poorly thought out junction at Catchems End causes many traffic hold ups. • Drainage issues on site. • Impact on openness of Green Belt. The importance of preventing the coalescence and maintaining a Green Belt gap between Bewdley and 	<p>This site is proposed for removal from the Green Belt and allocation for up to 35 dwellings. Access will be in the form of a cul-de-sac from Habberley Road. Further investigation into drainage issues is underway. A wide green buffer will mark the new Green Belt boundary.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>Kidderminster.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is near to the Mercure Hotel and would not enhance the area to prospective clients. • Plans for the Safari Park hotel will increase traffic in this area. • Schools/GPs will not cope. • Concerns that consent for development of the site would pave the way for future developments on adjoining land. • The road system barely copes as it stands and will no longer be a small country town. • This is a low lying piece of land which is frequently waterlogged, and it may not be possible to naturally drain surface water into any local watercourse and to pump could be an expensive option. • Damage to the local environment/wildlife. • Planning history shows a potential bronze age burial mound. • Site is currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6b. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site encroaches into the Green Belt in a relatively narrow gap between Bewdley and Kidderminster. If a developer provided a link road between Habberley Road and Kidderminster Road then release of site from Green Belt would be acceptable. 	
BR/BE/6 – Land off Highclere	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would increase traffic through Welch Gate. Development should be avoided West of the River Severn in Bewdley to avoid adding to the increasing congestion and air quality problems already faced by the town. • Main access from the town to the site will be Park Lane. This is already a very busy road (particularly at peak school times) and poses serious threat to pedestrians utilising the route. An increase in traffic flow will therefore increase this risk. • Ecological Importance of the site. Ancient Woodland is present to the south of 	This site is no longer proposed for allocations owing to biodiversity and drainage issues. See Site selection paper and Sustainability Appraisal

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>the proposed area for development. Housing and increased 'hard landscaping' will produce run off which will ultimately produce pollution and undue pressure on Snuff Mill Brook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To walk into Bewdley is dangerous down Park Lane with no footpath and the climb back up Park Lane or Wyre Hill is daunting and many would be unable to tackle it. To catch a bus they would have to walk up and down from Hales Park, which again is not practical for many, especially with heavy shopping. • Development in the Highclere area would inevitably add more traffic passing through the Welchgate / top of Load Street area which is an Air Quality Management location. Any additional air pollution in this area should be avoided and additional traffic would only make the air quality worse. • Development off Highclere would lead to serious accidents on roads - narrow and twisty, no pavements. Unsuitable proposal. • Loss of amenity land. Site is well used for recreational pursuits – dog walking, informal play. • Impact on traffic flow through Bewdley. It's on top of the hill, so although within 0.5 mile of Load street, not easily accessible. Very unlikely that new residents (especially elderly) would walk down and back up after visiting the shops. • The land is a habitat for wildlife and should be preserved. • The site has high landscape value the water run off into Snuff Mill Brook would have a detrimental effect. • Access in / out of the site is unsuitable for any increase in traffic. • Additional traffic generated by development in Highclere would cause gridlock in this area. • Both Park Lane and Wyre Hill roads are dangerous and narrow and cannot do with increased traffic of any kind. • Loss of land of recreational and amenity use, including environmental and nature aspects. • For every property built there will be a minimum of two vehicles and no bus service as the access is unsuitable for large vehicles. • Develop the area as a nature reserve, as an asset to Bewdley. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is foolish to extend the urban sprawl further west into open countryside. • There is no road link between Hernes Nest/Highclere; there is no through road. • This particular site can be seen right across the valley and any development would impinge greatly on the views. • These green fields are a buffer to heavy traffic on the bypass and consequent air pollution, provide a pleasing appearance to the entrance to Bewdley town as well as provide an important green space for wildlife. 	
WA/BE/3 – Catchems End	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is within Green Belt and makes significant contribution. Development would reduce openness and urbanise land. • It will seriously diminish the openness of this narrow and highly sensitive part of the Green Belt between Kidderminster and Bewdley. • This proposal is seen to compromise the established Green Belt principles of preventing coalescence, sprawl and encroachment and the preservation of the setting and special character of the historic town Bewdley. • Western section of site adjoins church (listed building) and is partly in flood zone 3. • This proposal would bring a huge amount of extra traffic to the area at the Kidderminster Rd end of the Bewdley by-pass. This will be exacerbated by the proposals for future development at West Midlands Safari Park. • The field next to All Saints Church is a 'green' landmark in Wribbenhall and needs to be protected as should be the wall bordering it. Both are part of the local heritage. • The addition of so many dwellings will put immense pressures on local resources causing crowded schools and crippling the transport network. The town would have its tourist industry affected by not being able to visit when roads are gridlocked. • The section of Kidderminster Road from Catchems End Chip Shop to the by-pass island is very congested most of the day and any additional traffic would only make matters worse especially when you add the traffic from the new WMSP Hotel. 	<p>This land is proposed for removal from the Green Belt and allocation for 76 dwellings. Much of the development will be kept to the rear of existing dwellings on Kidderminster Road so that the entrance to Bewdley still has a rural feel. The western parcel will be retained as public open space with the Riddings Brook opened up into a more natural corridor with a footpath/cycle link alongside connecting through to the proposed development.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The A456 and B4129 in Wribbenhall are already very busy, and to build new homes in this area would cause even more congestion. • To build more houses in this area at a time when services are stretched makes no sense. We are seeing cuts to Fire Services, Health Service and Schools. • Would schools in our area be able to accommodate the new families new houses would bring? • Loss of open aspect from neighbouring properties. • Would like space adjacent to Wribbenhall Church to remain as open space. • Hill at Maypole Piece should be retained as undeveloped land. Any floodable land should only be used as open space. • This site would make a significant contribution to the housing need, would not have a significant detrimental effect on the landscape and have easy and safe access to main roads and pavement access to schools. • Impact on tourism in Bewdley. Concerned that Bewdley needs to be careful not to morph into a community suburb. Impact on sense of community if more people commute from Bewdley. • Impact on local infrastructure - schools and local transport. • The area to the rear of Lodge Close historically floods. The gardens of some properties in Lodge Close are consistently under a considerable amount of water for most of the winter. • Site is currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6B. • Affect on approach to town/sprawl effect of built up environments. • Whilst there is no "right to a view" in legal terms, is loss is not necessarily irrelevant when it comes to planning permission. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern End adjoining All Saints Church. Support for a very modest number of houses on the southern end of this site but any development should provide housing, a cemetery extension, car parking for the church/town, and an area of public open space to mitigate its loss of openness and take account of 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>drainage issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer site WA/BE/3 Catchems End to be designated for housing instead of site BR/BE/6 Land off Highclere. • Catchems end development would be more suitable than Highclere, as Catchems End gives direct access to the road network. • The site is in close walking distance to a number of local facilities including three public bus routes which run regular services. • The site at Catchems End would be able to provide appropriate contribution to support improvements to the local highways improvements, associated with the impacts of the development. • The site can contribute 3.48 hectares of public open space to the community 	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bewdley Fire Station site should be carried forward into Policy 33. • There is a need for housing but Bewdley is full up so not possible. • Welch Gate is the most polluted spot in the Wyre Forest because of emissions. What is being done to solve the issue of poor air quality in the town centre and the traffic congestion in Welch Gate? • Object to any large-scale housing west of the river • Suggest a policy for the redevelopment and/or enhancement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The riverside buildings from Bridge House to the Rowing Club, perhaps to provide additional housing and car parking. ○ The Workhouse site in High Street • It is surely more sensible to have a plan that would not disrupt an area that already has a traffic problem particularly at holiday times. • Areas that have better links to major roads and good public transport would be more sensible than those shown for the Bewdley area. • Would it not be more viable to create say a new town with new infrastructure that would then be viable rather than overloading existing? • How would the Medical Centre and the schools cope? • With young families moving into the area we need to ensure that there is ample green space for them • We wish to support the development of Bewdley, as outlined in policy 33 and the core sites identified. 	<p>Fire Station site and land to the rear is proposed for allocation</p> <p>If access could be improved, this area may be suitable for formal car park provision. Some of this area is prone to flooding and so would not be suitable for further residential development.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 33: BEWDLEY

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wribbenhall will have to bear the development – they may assist with road costs i.e. Safari Park. • Area between town and Forest is very sensitive. • It would make sense, therefore to favour sites for future housing development which are as near as possible to Kidderminster to help minimize miles travelled. • It would seem sensible to confine Bewdley's future housing development to sites east of the river until those sites are fully saturated. • Bewdley already has substantial traffic and air pollution problems due in substantial part to the amount of housing east of the town centre, • Bewdley must take on a supportive role to Kidderminster in the provision of housing, • object to the limited scale of growth that is currently proposed from housing allocations in Bewdley and consider it necessary to plan for further development in order to fully support the economic and housing needs of the area. • Plan only proposes 4.6% of dwellings in Bewdley. Core Strategy proposed 10%. • Bewdley centre has lots of empty commercial buildings that should be changed into high quality living accommodation. • If development of any green field land is considered essential, then the identified spaces on the Kidderminster side of Bewdley seem to be the least bad option. • Will the old wall Sandbourne drive be kept intact, or will this also be knocked down and lose more of Bewdley's character. • The whole of Wribbenhall will be a block of houses from Catchems End right down to The Great Western, and from Old Styles' Mill right up to the now Stourport Triangle. No greenery, no fields, no hedges, no trees, just houses. 	<p>Any proposals for conversion of upper floors of commercial buildings can come forward under current planning policy.</p> <p>Policy is for all developments >2 Ha to provide 40% as green infrastructure. This will help to ensure any existing hedgerows and trees are not only retained but that additional planting is carried out to enhance developments for the benefit of both residents and wildlife.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
WA/UA/4 – Allotments, Upper Arley	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of this site would be acceptable if the allotments are genuinely redundant. • All the houses (not just some of them) should be affordable houses, of a smaller design, and for the people of the Parish. 	This site will be brought forward in consultation with the Parish Council to ensure that the provision meets local requirements.
BR/RO/1 – Land at Clows Top	Objections/Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing allocation at Clows Top for 30 dwellings needs to be considered in the context of the SWDP which allocates land adjacent to Highbrae for 17 dwellings and any proposals coming forward from Shropshire Council in order to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided and to avoid an over concentration of development within the village. • Strong objections to use of site for Travelling Showpeople. Would prefer something for the community or low cost housing for locals. • No main drainage to site. • Dangerous crossroad next to site. • Limited visibility on exit of proposed site. • A456 is already dangerous due to speeding. • Lack of schools, doctors etc. • Difficult access to and from the site, turning in and out would be difficult. • The land on the site is unstable and is falling away. There is movement around the perimeter of the site, this before any heavy vehicles and trailers are using the area. • There is a lack of adequate access to services and utility infrastructure • The cumulative impacts of the site would harm the character and appearance of the area. • I think it is affordable housing we need at Clows Top. • There are four other sites identified in the plan for Travelling Showpeople all of which are more suited to this purpose. • Land would be better served to the community as it is i.e. a garage or similar which would offer a service which would benefit residents. • Little public transport. 	A decision has been taken to remove this site from the Local Plan as it is not considered viable to bring forward owing to the cost of connecting the site to mains drainage. The site is currently in commercial use.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No local police or hospital. • Should be kept as a core housing site and not used for Travelling Showpeople. • Would like to see something for the community. <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support residential development on this site because it will help to sustain the village and local community. • Support for affordable housing on site to encourage young people to stay in the village and help sustain local businesses and services. • Would like to see houses built here for local families. • This housing development is indeed supported by the majority of all within the village parish. 	
BR/RO/4/6 – Land adjacent Tolland, Far Forest	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local amenities cannot cope with existing housing • Plough Lane would need to be widened. • Increased traffic congestion • Negative impact on countryside. • Current sewerage systems would not be able to cope with new development. • Site is landlocked with narrow entrance. • Development of Orchard House land would have to be accessed off Plough Lane. Road is heavily used by lorries (especially from quarries) and residents of Cleobury Mortimer plus school traffic. • Bus service is unreliable and infrequent. • Countryside and natural habitats will be lost. Habitat of rare species. Beautiful ancient orchards will be replaced by houses. • The damage to wildlife and natural habitats will be incalculable. • It would not be inappropriate to also develop land to the east of Plough Lane. • Detrimental impact on character and landscape of this area. • Egress from Plough Lane onto Cleobury Road (A4117) is dangerous and at a steep incline with limited views in either direction. • Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties. • Loss of Dark skies. These are very much part of our village, important to its 	<p>The decision has been taken not to allocate these sites through this Local Plan. Further ecological assessment has been undertaken and the final report is awaited. If when the housing needs survey for Rock Parish is updated a requirement is found that cannot be accommodated elsewhere, these sites may need to be reconsidered. Only very limited development would be allowed with the potential to develop the orchard further for the benefit of the wider community.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<p>character. Dark skies are also of great importance to wildlife.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very little local employment. People to go further afield, again increase of carbon footprint. • Increase in noise, light and air pollution that would have a negative effect on the health of local residents. • Storm water currently a problem and would be heightened due to any development. • Do not need any more houses in Far Forest – there are plenty for sale. • School is full. • Proposed development at Far Forest is approximately six acres which is huge compared with the rest of the village and contrary to Policy 6F. • The village has no public "green space" despite being out in the country. • Building out at Far Forest will create car commuter traffic to Kidderminster and the West Midlands. • The Council should consider redefining the boundary of the village. • The infrastructure at present cannot cope with more residents. GP surgeries, Fire and Ambulance services are all stretched. • Sewerage and water has been a problem in the village for a long time; electricity can also be a problem with innumerable power cuts. • There is no indication of need for this level of housing locally. • Wyre Forest rural development is disproportionately centred on Far Forest with 60 of 105 (57%) of properties proposed here. • A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out on these sites. There may be endangered species local to this area. • Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology: <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Tolland Bungalow and Orchard House - Plough Lane is more of a track. Site is appropriate infill site but may need to be limited to about 5 dwellings. Orchard House site - acceptable for infill but not to be accessed off A4117. 	

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
BR/RO/7 – New Road, Far Forest (S) (N)	<p>Objections/Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic is already horrendous and will be made worse with more dwellings. • Dangerous junction on to main road. • Congestion along New Road at school times and too many parked cars. • Children at risk due to traffic increase. • Lack of services locally (doctors etc.) - leading to pollution as people would have to travel to appointments by car. • Bus service is unreliable and route is awful; takes over an hour to get to Kidderminster. • No jobs locally - again causing more pollution as they will have to travel. • Countryside and natural habitats will be lost. • Village too small - not enough facilities. • Views will be spoilt. • Brownfield sites in Kidderminster could be used. • Sewage system is inadequate at the moment and would not be able to cope with the additional dwellings. • Loss of agricultural land and wildlife. • Facilities in Far Forest are not suitable for an increase in population as it will cause more traffic and pollution. • Stress on utilities, localised flooding and poor sewerage system, no mains gas currently in village. • Low water pressure. • Insufficient broadband. • Doctors already over subscribed. • Negative impact on the village, currently a small rural village, will become a housing estate. • Village has no public green space. • Negative impact on tourism. • Housing not needed in Far Forest. • People enjoy the current countryside - local people would not have any benefit from the proposals. 	<p>This site has been ruled out for future development on highways and biodiversity grounds.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 additional houses would simply overwhelm the village and the character of the village would be lost to the detriment of the current residents. • Loss of Dark skies and detrimental impact on flora and fauna. • School is full. • Bungalows rather than houses could be built elsewhere in the village. • Far Forest is an open and widespread rural settlement. The proposed developments would urbanize the village. • No local Police, Fire or Ambulance service. 	
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of sites proposed under this policy have likely biodiversity implications and so we reiterate the need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist on any of the sites listed under this policy using up to date survey information. • The plan does not provide sufficiently for windfall housing sites in areas in the west of Kidderminster, beyond Bewdley. • The plan should review all the local settlement boundaries to establish the extent to which small additional sites might contribute to the significant housing problem. • PDL within the Green Belt at Cursley Distribution Park could be made available through site rationalisation. This would require the land to be released from the Green Belt and allocated under Policy 35. • Potential loss of wildlife and harm to the landscape. • Various protected species are located on the proposed development land. • Harm to the Landscape Protection & Hedgerows. • Concern at the increase of traffic. • Sewerage System in Far Forest is still a major ongoing issue. • All sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs. • support the redevelopment of Alton Nurseries. • New estates are not needed. • Local employment ideas are to be commended. However, WFDC must be careful not to negate agricultural/rural opportunities by removing arable/other 	<p>The decision has been taken to amend settlement boundaries in the west of the district (outside of the Green Belt) to allow for limited infill development of up to 6 dwellings.</p> <p>Cursley Distribution Park is to be allocated as a Previously Developed Site in the Green Belt for employment.</p> <p>Alton Nurseries will be redeveloped with 4 dwellings along the front of the site with the remainder of the site allocated for employment uses as an extension to Bewdley Business Park.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION KEY ISSUES TO SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST

Site	Key Issues Raised	WFDC Officer Comments
	agricultural land.	

Appendix 4 - Summary of Consultation Responses to the Local Plan Review
Preferred Options (Reg 18) Consultation (June 2017)

APPENDIX 3C - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES
CONTENTS TABLE

		Page
SECTION 30: KIDDERMINSTER TOWN		
AS/1	Comberton Place	1
AS/5	Victoria Carpets Sports Ground	1
AS/6	Lea Street School	3
BHS/2	Bromsgrove Street	3
BHS/11	Green Street Depot	No responses
BHS/16	Timber Yard, Park Lane	5
BHS/18	Blakebrook School	5
BW/1	Churchfields	6
BW/2	Limekiln Bridge	6
BW/3	Sladen School	7
FPH/6	Oasis, Goldthorn Road	8
FPH/8	SDF and adjacent land	No responses
FPH/10	Silverwoods phase 2	No responses
FPH/18	Naylor's Field	8
FPH/23	Silverwoods phase 1	No responses
FPH/24	Romwire	10
FPH/25	Rear of Vale Industrial Estate	11
FPH/28	Land at Hoobrook	No responses
FPH/29	VOSA site	No responses
OC/11	Stourminster School site	12
LI/1	Ceramaspeed	No responses
MI/26	Ratio Park, Finepoint	No responses
MI/34	Oakleaf, Finepoint	No responses
WFR/WC/18	Sion Hill School site	13
FPH/1	Settling Ponds	16
SECTION 31: KIDDERMINSTER URBAN EXTENSIONS		
WFR/WC/15	Lea Castle Hospital	34
BW/4	Hurcott ADR	50

Appendix 4 - Summary of Consultation Responses to the Local Plan Review
Preferred Options (Reg 18) Consultation (June 2017)

APPENDIX 3C - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES
CONTENTS TABLE

		Page
OC/4	Rear of Baldwin Road	83
WFR/CB/7, OC/5/6/12/13N	East of Offmore	148
WFR/CB/7	Land off Birmingham Road	204
OC/5	Husum Way	208
OC/6	East of Offmore Farm	212
OC/12	Comberton Lodge Nursery	229
OC/13(N)	Stone Hill North	230
WFR/ST/1	Captains & the Lodge	232
FPH/27	Adjacent Easter Park (Employment)	260
OC/13(S), WFR/ST/2, AS/10	Spennells fields	261
OC/13(S)	Stone Hill South	593
WFR/ST/2	Land off Stanklyn Lane	595
AS/10	Rear of Spennells & Easter Park	603
WFR/WC/16	Lea Castle Hospital extension (S)	604
WFR/WC/32	Lea Castle Hospital extension (E)	657
SECTION 32: STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN		
LI/2	Wyre Forest Golf Club, corner of Kingsway	718
LI/6/7	Lickhill Road North	754
AKR/1	Bridge Street Basins	782
AKR/2	Cheapside	783
AKR/7	Swan Hotel / Working Men's Club	784
AKR/20	Carpets of Worth	786
MI/1	County Buildings	790
MI/3	Parsons Chain	791
MI/5	Baldwin Road	No responses
MI/6	Steatite Way	792
MI/18	North of Wilden Lane Industrial Estate	796

Appendix 4 - Summary of Consultation Responses to the Local Plan Review
Preferred Options (Reg 18) Consultation (June 2017)

APPENDIX 3C - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES
CONTENTS TABLE

		Page
MI/33	Wilden Industrial Estate	796
LI/5	Burlish Crossing	797
MI/17	Stourport Manor	840
AKR/14	Pearl Lane	842
AKR/15	Rectory Lane	871
SECTION 33: BEWDLEY		
WA/BE/1	Stourport Road Triangle	900
WA/BE/5	Land south of Habberley Road	908
BR/BE/6	Land off Highclere	921
WA/BE/3	Catchem's End	961
SECTION 35: RURAL WYRE FOREST		
WA/UA/4	Allotments, Upper Arley	971
BR/RO/1	Land at Clows Top	972
BR/RO/4/6	Land adjacent Tolland, Far Forest	981
BR/RO/7	New Road, Far Forest	1025
BR/RO/21	Alton Nurseries, Long Bank	No responses
BR/RO/26	Walnut Cottage, Bliss Gate	1088
SECTIONS 30, 31, 32 ,33 and 35: NOT SITE SPECIFIC		1090

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
AS/1 – Comberton Place				
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP0957	AS/1	Comment	This includes what should be an opportunity site for a Park and Ride car park related to the station. Additional P+R capacity is very much needed on the line to Birmingham, as the car parks at Hagley and Stourbridge fill up quite early in the morning.
AS/5 – Victoria Carpets Sports Ground				
Kidderminster Golf Club	LPP01774	AS/5	Object	<p>Kidderminster Golf Club wishes to record a very strong objection to develop the Victoria Sports Ground (VSG) for housing. The reasons for the objection are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding. The site floods significantly and often and is within Flood Zone 2. The significance and impact of this has not been appreciated in the site’s HELAA Assessment. It is bounded by and drains to the Hoo Brook which accepts the majority of the surface water run-off from the 2000 house Spennells Estates. Previous schemes to develop the site have all sought the raising of its ground levels to ensure a flood free development. The seriousness and impact of this has been underplayed. • There is a very special case to retain the Golf Club, not only for the economic benefits and visual attractiveness it brings to the area and the town in general, but for the property values and rateable values that roll from it. <u>A housing development on this site could have serious implications on the viability and playing of golf at KGC.</u> • Loss of Sport facility/Playing field. The proposal is in conflict with the plan which seeks to protect and safeguard community facilities (See paras 20.5 and 20.6). Sport England objected to previous non-sporting developments on this site. • There are potential issues with proximity of certain holes to roads and housing. New housing would add to this and also prevent the Golf Club from being able to re-plan the golf course should legal/HS issues restrict its present playing area. • The site is a prominent and important open space on a major throughway of the town. Its loss to bricks and mortar will deplete its green, open value. • Ecology. The adjoining Golf Course has a habitat for wide ranging flora and fauna, some

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>of which could include protected. Two pools are in close proximity to the site. The site should be surveyed before rezoning this land in the Plan-making process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic. There is an issue with traffic both vehicular and pedestrian. Access to the site is difficult given the high volume of traffic in the area both on the A449 Trunk Road and the Spennells Valley Road and the proximity to the traffic island. Concerned about the probable use of Barnetts Lane by children going to the Comberton Schools. Barnetts Lane is narrow, with no footpaths and a danger to all users. There is no realistic alternative for pedestrians. This housing site development is lacking in forethought and is very ill considered.
Sport England	LPP0218	AS/5	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated PRIOR TO being informed by the built and playing field strategies. Loss of playing field. Is it surplus, how is the loss to be mitigated and how does it accord with the PPS? If there is a fresh application it will be considered in the light of NPPF par 74 and SE Policy to protect playing field.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0778	AS/5	Object	Victoria Carpets Sports Ground - currently allocated as open space - not used since 2003. Para.74 of NPPF still applies - has assessment been done to show it is surplus to requirements? Also in Flood Zone 2 - in accordance with para.100-104 of NPPF, allocation for development is inappropriate if alternatives available with lower flood risk.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01437	AS/5	Object	Victoria Carpets Sports Ground - currently allocated as open space - not used since 2003. Para.74 of NPPF still applies - has assessment been done to show it is surplus to requirements? Also in Flood Zone 2 - in accordance with para.100-104 of NPPF, allocation for development is inappropriate if alternatives available with lower flood risk.
Victoria Carpets	LPP01497	AS/5	Support	We are supportive of the proposed allocation and welcome the opportunity to engage with the plan-making process. The site is allocated for an indicative 45 residential units. The site is deliverable and a planning application will be submitted shortly. The emerging plan

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				acknowledges that appropriate flooding mitigation would need to be provided as part of the site's development. A Flood Risk Assessment will be submitted in support of the planning application and this is attached. A sequential test has also been undertaken as part of the planning application (also attached).
AS/6 – Lea Street School				
Stourport High School	LPP04342	AS/6	Object	AS/6 – Lea Street School – Part of site is in use as school education offices, this may be temporary, allocation not Framework compliant on this basis. No indication of when this use will cease. For the site to be allocated for development there must be a “reasonable prospect” that the site is available. There is a period of uncertainty about when site could be delivered and as such this test is not met.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0779	AS/6	Object	Lea Street School - SHLAA states part of site still in use and thus allocation is not NPPF compliant. Must be reasonable prospect that site is available for it to be allocated.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01449	AS/6	Object	Lea Street School - SHLAA states part of site still in use and thus allocation is not NPPF compliant. Must be reasonable prospect that site is available for it to be allocated.
BHS/2 – Bromsgrove Street				
	LPP04381	BHS/2	Comment	Mixed use development on 'Bromsgrove St' (excluding the Glades site).
Wyre Forest Green Party	LPP01489	BHS/2	Comment	Many other attractive old and empty buildings are ideal for conversion to attractive town centre living. We support the regeneration of the area around the former Glades and Magistrates Courts, principally for apartments. We feel the proposal for a multiplex cinema is out of proportion with the demand in the District, which is already met by a regional company. We feel that additional shops and restaurants in this area are not desirable or economically sustainable.
	LPP02212	BHS/2	Object	Having viewed the plan and attended one of the drop in sessions, we wish to make the following

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>observations. As none of the proposed developments directly affect us we feel our comments are objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are disappointed that there is no consideration given in these plans to the dire needs of Kidderminster town centre. However we would mention that the erstwhile Forest Glades site and other parts of Bromsgrove Street is an unsuitable area for a commercial retail island, but should be considered as an area for housing development only. • Development to date has got away with insufficient affordable and social housing. The need for the later in Kidderminster is very apparent and should be addressed more strenuously.
	LPPO3352	BHS/2	Object	Mixed use development on 'Bromsgrove St' (excluding the Glades site).
	LPPO2211	BHS/2	Object	<p>Having viewed the structure plan and attended one of the drop in sessions, we wish to make the following observations. As none of the proposed developments directly affect us we feel our comments are objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are disappointed that there is no consideration given in these plans to the dire needs of Kidderminster town centre. However we would mention that the erstwhile Forest Glades site and other parts of Bromsgrove Street is an unsuitable area for a commercial retail island, but should be considered as an area for housing development only. • Development to date has got away with insufficient affordable and social housing. The need for the later in Kidderminster is very apparent and should be addressed more strenuously.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
BHS/16 – Timber Yard Park Lane				
Gemini Properties	LPPO1195	BHS/16	Object	The land in Gemini Property's control is identified as a mixed use development opportunity. We support this. However policy and supporting text is very limited and narrow on what form development should take on this gateway site. KCAAP provides detailed guidance and this should be replicated in the Local Plan Review. KCAAP lists site as being suitable for range of uses including C3, A3-5, B1(a), D1 and D2. Could also be suitable for C2. Adjoins Weavers Wharf and could potentially expand this area with bridge over canal and additional parking. On going discussions are being held with WFDC. A planning application is likely to be submitted in advance of the Local Plan reaching examination. Local Plan policy will thus be informed by the emerging planning application and discussions.
Sport England	LPPO4368	BHS/16	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. BHS/16 Timber Yard, Park Lane: appears to include a DW sport and fitness centre. How does this fit with the Built Sports Facility Strategy? Is it surplus? How does the proposal meet NPPF Par 74?
BHS/18 – Blakebrook School				
	LPPO2	BHS/18	Comment	This paragraph speaks of the potential for a cycle path/pedestrian path in relation to St John's Close (and Church View). It is difficult to understand how this may be achieved; currently, St John's Close is sealed off from the Blakebrook school site and is accessed via St John's Street. The dwellings on St John's Close are served by a private drive
	LPPO30	BHS/18	Comment	The residents of St Johns Close, own St Johns Close, it is private land and therefore not applicable to a pedestrian/cycle link.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPPO781	BHS/18	Object	County Buildings and Blakebrook School - includes listed chapel and TPOs. Question whether capacity is too high at 35dph.
Stourport High School	LPPO4341	BHS/18	Object	BHS/18 – County Buildings and Blakebrook School – Site includes a listed Chapel that needs to be retained. TPOs on site. Quantum of development is inappropriate. Unlikely to develop 47

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				dwelling as would require gross density of 35 dph. Capacity should be reduced.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01450	BHS/18	Object	County Buildings and Blakebrook School - includes listed chapel and TPOs. Question whether capacity is too high at 35dph.
BW/1 - Churchfields				
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01451	BW/1	Object	Churchfields - mixed use site proposed for 230 dwellings. Current application for 95 dwellings/offices on part of site. Question deliverability of rest of site as subject to tenancies. Suggest capacity is reduced significantly.
Stourport High School	LPP04343	BW/1	Object	BW/1 – Churchfields – Mixed use site expected to deliver 230 dwellings. Question the deliverability of the the site, capacity of the site should be reduced.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0782	BW/1	Object	Churchfields - mixed use site proposed for 230 dwellings. Current application for 95 dwellings/offices on part of site. Question deliverability of rest of site as subject to tenancies. Suggest capacity is reduced significantly.
BW/2 – Limekiln Bridge				
	LPP04376	BW/2	Comment	Protect Limekiln Park (existing basket ball court).
Higgins Bailers	LPP0309	BW/2	Support	Supports zoning of BW/2 for residential.
Sport England	LPP04369	BW/2	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. BW/2 Limekiln Bridge: the site includes a MUGA. Is this to be protected, relocated or is it surplus? How does it meet with NPPF Par 74?
Stourport High School	LPP04344	BW/2	Object	BW/2 – Limekiln Bridge – Deliverability of site is questionable. No evidence to show site is viable. Site consists of a series of industrial premises and a former ball court and open space. The open space elements of this site would be subject to the policy test Paragraph 74 of the Framework. In accordance with the adopted and emerging Plans the employment element

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				of this site must be clearly shown to be surplus to requirements through robust evidence. As no such evidence reallocation cannot be supported.
	LPP03353	BW/2	Object	'Limekiln Bridge': Protect Limekiln Park (existing basket ball court).
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0783	BW/2	Object	Limekiln Bridge - question deliverability of site as new link road required to bring site forward. Former ball court subject to para. 74 of NPPF. Employment part of site - need to show it is surplus to requirements. No evidence exists so cannot support reallocation.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01452	BW/2	Object	Limekiln Bridge - question deliverability of site as new link road required to bring site forward. Former ball court subject to para. 74 of NPPF. Employment part of site - need to show it is surplus to requirements. No evidence exists so cannot support reallocation.
BW/3 – Sladen School				
Wyre Forest Green Party	LPP01490	BW/3	Comment	There is waste land where Sladen School on Hurcott Road once stood as this was demolished in 2009. This is also the case for Sion Hill School where planning permission has been granted on this site but progress has not been made.
	LPP029	BW/3	Object	The Sladen school land was provided by the Church for the specific purpose as an educational facility. What is the status of the covenant that forbade other uses? Does it lapse a period of time after the land was last used (presumably when the school closed), if so when does it lapse?
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01453	BW/3	Object	Sladen School - school already demolished. However, Sport England may require large area of sports field to be retained. Capacity of 72 should be reduced.
Sport England	LPP04370	BW/3	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. BW/3 Sladen School: this will give rise to the loss of playing field. Is this in compliance with NPPF Par 74 and SE Policy? Is the loss supported by the PPS - is the playing field surplus?
Stourport High	LPP04345	BW/3	Object	BW/3 – Sladen School – Sport England may require a large area of sports field to be

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
School				retained, may not be possible for site to deliver 72 dwellings. Capacity of site should be reduced accordingly.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0784	BW/3	Object	Sladen School - school already demolished. However, Sport England may require large area of sports field to be retained. Capacity of 72 should be reduced.
	LPP02644	BW/3	Support	It is about time the old school of Sladen was used for building houses but please improve the road access at the Horsefair first.
FPH/6 – Oasis, Goldthorn Road				
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0785	FPH/6	Object	Oasis, Goldthorn Road - Although currently allocated, site has not come forward. Delivery is questionable and it should be removed from plan.
Stourport High School	LPP04346	FPH/6	Object	FPH6 – Oasis, Goldthorn Road. Site was allocated for development in the Site Allocations and Policies Plan of July 2013. It has not come forward for development. Its delivery is highly questionable, should to be removed from the plan.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01454	FPH/6	Object	Oasis, Goldthorn Road - Although currently allocated, site has not come forward. Delivery is questionable and it should be removed from plan.
FPH/18 – Naylor's Field				
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0786	FPH/18	Object	Naylor's Field - maintained as open space - subject to para.74 of NPPF- should be protected unless assessment has shown it to be surplus to requirements or it would be replaced elsewhere. If no assessment, should not be allocated.
	LPP03445	FPH/18	Object	Naylor's field as I am aware has always been used for sporting activities. Today it is still used by children playing football etc. The proposed development of 35 dwellings would be totally out of character with the area.
Stourport High School	LPP04347	FPH/18	Object	FEH/18 – Naylor's Field. Identified as area of open space, therefore, subject to requirements of Paragraph 74 of the Framework. It is protected for open space purposes unless an assessment

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				has been undertaken which has shown the site to be surplus to requirements or the open space would be replaced elsewhere. Not aware of evidence demonstrating how the requirements of Paragraph 74 of the Framework have been met. As a consequence the allocation should be removed.
Sport England	LPPO4372	FPH/18	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. FPH/18 Naylor's Field: If this site is playing field the loss needs to be justified under NPPF Par 74, SE Policy and in line with the PPS.
	LPPO3214	FPH/18	Object	<p>Please find below a number of objections to the inclusion of Naylor's Field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents access to fields will be restricted • Community event held on fields • Spoil the view from the house <p>Have made numerous requests to purchase all or part of Naylor's field for gardens, Worcestershire County Council and More recently Wyre Forest District Council have made no final decision however stated in writing that "they do not support any housing scheme" and that historically the land had "educational use" as playing fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used as a community asset • The loss of habitat for wildlife. • Sutton Park Road itself is already busy and congested. • Use brown field sites not green field
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPPO1455	FPH/18	Object	Naylor's Field - maintained as open space - subject to para.74 of NPPF- should be protected unless assessment has shown it to be surplus to requirements or it would be replaced

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
 ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				elsewhere. If no assessment, should not be allocated.
FPH/24 - Romwire				
Place Partnership Ltd	LPP01097	FPH/24	Support	<p>The three emergency services welcome and support the recognition within paragraph 30.8 that it is proposed to construct the Wyre Forest Emergency Services Hub on part of the former Romwire site (FPH/24). HWFRS own the freehold of the site, as shown on the plan enclosed as Appendix 1, and have the funding to enable delivery of the project. We request that the proposed use for FPH/24 shown in Table 30.0.1 is amended from 'E' (employment) to 'M' (mixed use), to reflect the fact that the new hub will be a <i>Sui Generis</i> use. A supportive policy supporting delivery of the new hub is important, as it will provide the following advantages to Wyre Forest District upon completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a large 'pool' of on-call fire fighters from a bigger catchment area – thus improving their availability and the resilience of emergency cover in the District; • With the Hub Station, the whole of the District will receive an immediate, full-time, 24/7 response service rather than the current on-call provision (which can be affected by staff unavailability) in Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn; • Improved day-to-day communications and joint working at emergency incidents; • Joint emergency services training for serious incidents; • The exchange of local intelligence about vulnerable people and risks to the community; • Co-operation in tackling anti-social behaviour and other problems; • Facilities and space for specialised and joint training programmes; • Coordination with voluntary sector partners; • Community facilities (meeting rooms and demonstration units) for crime and fire prevention campaigns; • Enable the delivery of more targeted home fire safety checks across the District; • Facilities and space for voluntary sector partners to use;

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid necessary and expensive refurbishment costs for Bewdley and Stourport, and replacement costs for Kidderminster, in the post 2020 period. While the Fire Authority would receive no special assistance towards these costs, the full £2.38million of the cost of the Hub Station would come from the Government’s grant (which cannot be used for any other purpose); • Fire cover will be provided in a more sustainable way than at present; • Running costs of the new station would be considerably lower than for the three existing stations; and they may be shared with the police as a partner in the Hub Station; and • The vacated fire station sites in Kidderminster, Stourport-on-Severn and Bewdley provide opportunities for regeneration. <p>The existing HWFRS station in Kidderminster is not currently allocated by Policy 30. However, it is a site that will now come forward for redevelopment and therefore could be covered by the policy. Our view is that the site is suitable for housing (Use Class C3) or a mixed-use scheme. However, as there is currently a Place Review of the District being undertaken by the Council and PPL jointly, we suggest that the precise allocation should be agreed via discussions through that process and then confirmed by Policy 30 in a future draft of the Local Plan.</p>
FPH/25 – Rear of Vale Industrial Estate				
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP0968	FPH/25	Comment	FPH/25 Rear of Vale Industrial Estate. We agree the conclusions of the assessment sheet, but there is some adjacent vacant land at the north end of the sewage works whose inclusion in the development should be encouraged.
North Worcestershire Water Management	LPP0916	FPH/25	Comment	Re site FPH/25 Rear of Vale Industrial Estate. It needs to be bear in mind that this site did not form part of the outline approval of the British Sugar site and as such the wider surface water drainage strategy agreed for this site has not taken this site into account. This means that there is no provision made in the overall scheme to accept any discharge from this site and alternative routes will need to be explored. This could be discharge into the canal (unable to reach

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				agreement for British sugar on this) or discharge underneath the canal into the Stour (expensive).
OC/11 – Stourminster School				
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01456	OC/11	Object	Stourminster School - playing fields on site will be subject to para.74 of NPPF. Need to have evidence of how this has been met if allocate.
Stourport High School	LPP04348	OC/11	Object	OC/11 - Stourminster School Site – Part of this site consists of an area of playing fields. The playing fields are subject to the policy test put in place by Paragraph 74 of the Framework. Clear evidence needs to be provided on how the requirements of Paragraph 74 of the Framework have been met in order for this site to be allocated for development.
	LPP04364	OC/11	Object	We do not have the amenities to support development on such a large scale Kidderminster general hospital is almost reduced to cottage status .increased pressure on other services i.e. Doctors dentists etc. not to mention schools which are at full capacity due to closures of many local schools. Kidderminster has not the capacity to employ the extra volume of people unless companies are willing to move to the area we would need possibly two thousand five hundred jobs. The pollution with a development on this scale this will be quite an issue. There will be a constant problem with dust because of the nature of the ground. Noise would be a problem during the construction. Light pollution would be a more permanent problem. We then have the issue of public rights of way and wildlife habitats, these fields have been used by walkers dog walkers horse riders cyclists. Transport link problems will not be solved by the construction of a link road which will serve only to move traffic problems a little further up the road.
Sport England	LPP04371	OC/11	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. OC/11 Stourminster School: some playing field loss appears to be an impact. Is this in compliance with NPPF Par 74, SE Policy and is it supported by the PPS?
Stourport High	LPP04340	OC/11	Object	OC/11 - Stourminster School Site – Part of this site consists of an area of playing fields. The

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
School				playing fields are subject to the policy test put in place by Paragraph 74 of the Framework. Clear evidence needs to be provided on how the requirements of Paragraph 74 of the Framework have been met in order for this site to be allocated for development.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0787	OC/11	Object	Stourminster School - playing fields on site will be subject to para.74 of NPPF. Need to have evidence of how this has been met if allocate.
WFR/WC/18 – Sion Hill School				
	LPP03096	WFR/WC/18	Comment	Sion Hill School Building. A point of major disquiet, it has become a focus for anti-social behaviour and thus there is a danger of serious injury. It should be demolished immediately.
Wyre Forest Green Party	LPP04353	WFR/WC/18	Comment	There is waste land where Sladen School on Hurcott Road once stood as this was demolished in 2009. This is also the case for Sion Hill School where planning permission has been granted on this site but progress has not been made.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01457	WFR/WC/18	Object	Sion Hill School - allocated for 60 dwellings but has permission for 46. Capacity should be reduced to reflect this as already counted as commitment.
	LPP03531	WFR/WC/18	Object	We do not have the amenities to support development on such a large scale Kidderminster general hospital is almost reduced to cottage status .increased pressure on other services i.e. Doctors dentists etc. not to mention schools which are at full capacity due to closures of many local schools. Kidderminster has not the capacity to employ the extra volume of people unless companies are willing to move to the area we would need possibly two thousand five hundred jobs. The pollution with a development on this scale this will be quite an issue. There will be a constant problem with dust because of the nature of the ground. Noise would be a problem during the construction. Light pollution would be a more permanent problem. We then have the issue of public rights of way and wildlife habitats, these fields have been used by walkers dog walkers horse riders cyclists. Transport link problems will not be solved by the construction of a link road which will serve only to move traffic problems a little further up the road.
Sport England	LPP04373	WFR/WC/	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		18		be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. WFR/WC/18 Sion Hill School Site: Whilst development appears to be limited to the brownfield element of the school site it will be important to ensure there are no indirect impacts on the playing field and positive measures put in place to ensure the playing field is accessible to the community and maintained/managed. Input is required from the PPS.
	LPP04994	WFR/WC/18	Object	<p>I write mainly in connection to the potential for housing on Lea Castle site, Stourbridge Road (by the Park Gate Pub) and Sion Hill site as these are the areas that will affect me most. I am not opposed to building houses and light business units on the site but I am are very concerned with the impact over 600+ houses will have added to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites (bold above) and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, doctors and people. The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities and does not need increased pressure. I am very concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road will have massive impact on traffic flow and safety. Exiting via The Crescent will make it very difficult for people exiting Castle Road safely onto main A449. The bend leading up to the Cookley turn is a bad bend where there are frequently accidents/near misses. At peak times it is very difficult to exit onto the A449 towards Kidderminster.</p> <p>Axborough Lane will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the Stourbridge Road if people exit via The Crescent. This road is narrow with a blind summit and very poor visibility for exiting at both ends.</p> <p>I am concerned that Cookley will become a 'rat run' to and from Kidderminster via Lea Lane. Increased traffic on this road would be dangerous, the road is very unsafe, very narrow and runs past a Primary School and doctors with a tight turning T-junction at the village end and busy T junction at the Lock Pub end. Perhaps it should be considered <u>that Lea Lane be made one way only?</u></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
 ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO5003	WFR/WC/18	Object	<p>LEA CASTLE SITE The roads, around this site already have many problems. The site which was Sion Hill School is planned for 100 – 150 houses both this road & the Wolverley road converge on to the crossroads of the A449 which is a very fast road. You have the Cookley turning which goes into the village, another accident BLACKSPOT. From there you have the Crescent, then onto Axborough Lane & the Island Pool & crossroads. All of this area has experienced many accidents & fatalities.</p> <p>THE PARK GATE PUBLIC HOUSE A451 Stourbridge Road, both this junction & the whole of the Stourbridge Road again is a fast road experiencing many accidents & fatalities. When considering the large number of houses in this area consideration should be whether it is a safe environment for the increased traffic. & the fact each household has a least 2 cars to each family.</p> <p>LEA CASTLE SITE footprint The avenue of trees & woodland & wildlife, i.e. bats, owls etc. The fact is builders don't take this into consideration when building on these sites. If it is necessary to build on this site, serious consideration should be given to building low density housing i.e. one or two bedroom bungalows of which there is a serious shortage for the older generation in the Wyre Forest area. Providing a regular bus service from the site, alleviating the use of vehicles leaving the area.</p> <p>HOSPITALS KIDDERMINSTER hospital has downgraded & is still being considered for further reductions, as is REDDITCH Hospital and they can't help as they are over subscribed! WORCESTER cannot cope with the number of people attending the hospital, A FACT, yet still Worcester is experiencing extensive housing in its areas. Where are all the additional people to go when they need medical help! DOCTORS surgeries are full in Wyre Forest putting further pressure on the medical profession. The District Nurses are in the same position.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				SCHOOLS are at full capacity. With all the redundancies that have taken place recently. Wyre Forest is no longer a hive of production.
Stourport High School	LPP04349	WFR/WC/18	Object	WFR/WC/18 – Sion Hill School – Site is allocated for development of 60 dwellings. It has planning permission for 46 dwellings (application reference 15/0305). Allocation should have capacity reduced to reflect this permission. In any event, as the site has the benefit of planning permission is already counted as a commitment and its inclusion in Policy 30 will result in double counting.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0788	WFR/WC/18	Object	Sion Hill School - allocated for 60 dwellings but has permission for 46. Capacity should be reduced to reflect this as already counted as commitment.
FPH/1 – Settling Ponds				
	LPP04503	FPH/1	Comment	Wilden Marsh between Wilden Lane and River Stour is a SSSI site being a wet nature reserve, primarily used for wet grazing.
	LPP03292	FPH/1	Comment	Wilden Marsh (FPH/1) The proposed mixed use for this site is totally inappropriate to this area, lying adjacent to the nationally important SSSI and nature reserve. This area should again be retained as a buffer between development and the relatively rare and protected marshland habitat.
Wyre Forest District Council	LPP04337	FPH/1	Comment	Proposed development areas immediately adjacent to some of our Districts most valuable wildlife areas. There is a real risk of increasing disturbance pressure on these sensitive areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FPH/1 Settling ponds due to the sites immediate proximity to Wilden SSSI. <p>Sites will be subject to current planning regulation and biodiversity concerns will make development more complicated and may even restrict the nature available developable area.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP04338	FPH/1	Comment	Northern part of site has already has development opposite. Need to maintain buffer between development and SSSI but should be possible to make some land available.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO48	FPH/1	Object	I am against development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, home to many toads, frogs, polecats and protected species such as otter and great crested newt use the lagoons. More than 1000 common toads walk through the field each year to mate in North Pond. The field borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis. The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor. There would be an increase in light and noise pollution, and disturbance from cats, dogs, and people. Both the vibrancy and vitality of Wilden Marsh will be greatly negatively affected if such a development goes ahead. The Wilden Lane traffic would be horrendous – it is already horrendous.
	LPPO2440	FPH/1	Object	I also note that there are proposals to build on the site of the settling lagoons along Wilden Lane. This would be environmentally destructive to this green corridor which is abundant with wildlife and would create further traffic chaos in Wilden Lane, especially at Hoobrook island, where severe congestion exacerbated by the new traffic lights on Worcester Road, and other very poor traffic management is causing high levels of pollution in the immediate area. The loss of amenity to local residents caused by constant traffic queues is already real and apparent, and further development in this area can only make an already bad situation much worse.
	LPPO2844	FPH/1	Object	Objects to any use of the Green Belt, especially the Lagoon field on Wilden Marsh, a Site of Special Scientific Interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of wildlife parks • Land unsuitable for human habitation • Domestic/industrial activity would destroy the Marsh, which is also a flood plain. • Already traffic congestion in area; further housing could bring the whole of North/South traffic to a standstill.
	LPPO3375	FPH/1	Object	Object - Too close to marsh and wetland.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP04339	FPH/1	Object	Settling Ponds - Green Belt - need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Green Belt assessment advises there is an absence of defensible boundaries at this location. Need evidence before it can be allocated.
Stourport High School	LPP04351	FPH/1	Object	FPH/1 – Settling Ponds – Site currently within Green Belt, “exceptional circumstances” need to be demonstrated for the site to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development. The Council’s Green Belt assessment advises that this site has an absence of clear defensible boundaries, a key consideration for releasing land from the Green Belt identified by the Framework. No evidence on how the “exceptional circumstances” test can be passed justifying the release of the site from Green Belt. As such, its allocation is highly questionable and should be removed.
	LPP04354	FPH/1	Object	Settling Ponds. Too close to marsh and wetland.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP04334	FPH/1	Object	FPH/1 – Settling Ponds – This site is currently within Green Belt. As a consequence “exceptional circumstances” need to be demonstrated for the site to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development. The Council’s Green Belt assessment advises that this site has an absence of clear defensible boundaries, a key consideration for releasing land from the Green Belt identified by the Framework. There is no evidence on how the “exceptional circumstances” test can be passed justifying the release of the site from Green Belt. As such, its allocation is highly questionable and should be removed.
	LPP04357	FPH/1	Object	There are many alternative brown field sites in the area , please do not let any development on Wilden Marsh to go ahead
	LPP04358	FPH/1	Object	I strongly believe this area should remain for the use of nature. There are countless brownfield sites in Kidderminster which should be developed first. Massive mistake to do this.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	LPP04335	FPH/1	Object	We wish to object specifically to the allocation of site FPH1 as we consider development here will lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the adjacent SSSI and the Wilden Marsh Nature Reserve. This is a particularly significant issue because the site has been included as a Core Site

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
 ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>in the Local Plan with Option A proposing employment and Option B proposing housing. Both options are likely to have impacts that we do not believe can be effectively mitigated because of the limited space available and the very close proximity of development to the SSSI and reserve. In light of this we are extremely surprised to note that the Sustainability Appraisal scored Option A as a minor negative and Option B as neutral in terms of the impact on the designated site and we seriously question the underlying assumptions made to reach this conclusion, especially given the commentary in the consultation document regarding the need for further hydrological study. Whilst additional hydrological information will be welcome it is important to note that impacts are likely to include, but may not be limited to: probable alterations in hydrology, adverse effects arising from noise and light disturbance (including with respect to protected and priority species including bats and birds), the potential for increased access (including unauthorised access) and pressure from domestic pets, fragmentation and isolation of the northern end of the marsh from the rest of the ecological corridor in which it sits with associated reductions in ecological connectivity that may lead from this. Further information demonstrating how all of these issues can be reconciled with the allocation proposed must form part of the evidence base prior to finalising the Plan. In connection with this it is essential to recognise that the council has a statutory duty to take steps to protect and where possible enhance the SSSI under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and we cannot see how this duty can be discharged in light of the significant effects anticipated. Taken together the comments above suggest that the site should be removed from the plan and that its allocation on present evidence would be unsound.</p>
	LPPO3551	FPH/1	Object	<p>FPH/1 Settling ponds /lagoon field redevelopment. (A and B) I am shocked and saddened that this is even being proposed. It would be devastating to the local area to allow all natural land to be consumed by housing or industry. The suggestion that it would be used for more industrial units would also ruin the area with traffic, noise and light pollution and ultimately reduce the desirability of the village and road which is a thriving residential area not a main road to be developed into industrial units. We are small community on the outskirts of Kidderminster and Stourport and should be kept separate and valued as a</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>more desirable countryside location to live.</p> <p>Wilden lane has small pockets of houses starting with the smart estate at the North end then leading on to original housing, some dating back 150 years interspersed by the nature reserve, the old miners' cottages, some larger family homes, the village, school, Church, pub and farms. Any mass development or industrial development detracts from the look of the lane and would destroy prettiness of the road and future success of the village.</p> <p>The road itself cannot possibly support any more traffic at either end as well as the fact that cars race down Wilden lane in parts and more traffic would likely cause more accidents and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and residents. If the Wyre Forrester council want to make a positive impact on the road reduce the speed limit to 40 between the village and the McDonalds island, manage proper footpaths along the road, Forbid access for HGV's and install traffic lights at the island.</p> <p>Also, I am personally against any development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, and home to many toads, frogs and polecats, and protected species such as otter and great crested newt. Thousands of common toads walk through the Lagoon Field each year to mate in North Pond. Also, the Lagoon Field borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>I would welcome any opportunities to protect the road I live on, the nature that inhabits it and the residents of Wilden lane from any negative developments that do not 100% support the community and our quality of life.</p>
	LPPO3645	FPH/1	Object	The current problem posed to residents in the Wilden Lane area is traffic surrounding the Hoobrook Island. The introduction of more housing will only exacerbate this issue further, leaving residents more unhappy with the congestion they face when leaving their homes.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				The area is a site of specific scientific interest and is home to many protected species such as otters, essentially destroying a part of our local area that makes Worcestershire the natural and beautiful place it currently is. The marsh is also home to a family of cows which help to both improve the environment and enrich the soil. This is a valuable asset to the local area which will be seriously disrupted in the event of erection of housing or light industrial areas.
	LPP03658	FPH/1	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lagoon field provides many animals a safe haven to feed and nest, otters and great crested newts are regular visitors as well Muntjac deer. 2. As the name suggests the lagoon field is a floodplain and Mother Nature has a nasty habit of biting back when interfered with. 3. The Lagoon field is a buffer zone between the new Silverwoods development and Wilden Lane. 4. The traffic is already horrendous most days especially Fridays leaving local residents unable to travel towards Kidderminster due to the traffic queue from the Hoobrook island. Local residents have to plan their journeys with military precision. We have not got the infrastructure to cope now so why build more houses /factories! 5. There are also rare orchids growing on Wilden Marsh and Cattle grazing, how will this new development interfere with their status? 6. I feel this pocket of land should be gifted to the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust where it can be cared for properly with the help of the Wilden Marsh Warden and be grazed by the Wilden Marsh cattle which are loaned from the council. 7. Being so close to a Site of Specific Scientific Interest, these plans are far too close for a positive impact on the local area.
	LPP01979	FPH/1	Object	As a resident along Wilden Lane we totally object to these lagoons being built on. Not at least for the many species of protected birds and wildlife but over the years of being here Wilden has turned into a living hell as the traffic has slowly got worse and worse due to the lack of thought and planning of the road structure. We are all virtually prisoners in our own homes and can't venture out of our homes at certain times of the day; the roads around here just can't take

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				anymore traffic. You have wrecked Hartlebury Common tried to take the Green Belt at Spennells and now trying to spoil the wildlife and lagoons here!! There are plenty of other sites like Lea Castle Hospital site, the site where the pub was on Barnes Hill, the site where Sion Hill School was, the list is endless! Spend the money revamping all the derelict properties that you have boarded up and gone to rack and ruin!! SO WE SAY : NO to the building on Wilden for the sake of the wild life and our sanity NO NO NO!!!!!!
	LPPO2025	FPH/1	Object	<p>If projected need for the number of houses up to 2034 is correct, I accept that some Green Belt is needed for development but there doesn't appear to be any priority given to sites with obvious wildlife value. Looking at Kidderminster two sites come to mind which stand out compared to most of the sites highlighted which are under grain crops at the moment</p> <p>Settling Ponds FPH/1. The area around this former lagoon site is either owned or managed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust, and the actual lagoons have become willow and alder wetland. The land is an important and valuable local wildlife asset, and home to many creatures some of which have protection in their own right. The development of the site can only add pressure to a location which currently acts as a buffer between a busy road and a SSSI.</p>
	LPPO50	FPH/1	Object	<p>I am against any development of the former Lagoon Field, the land is an important valuable local wildlife asset. I help with conservation work in this area I know that it is home to rare and protected plants and animals such as otters and great crested newts. The field borders an improving SSSI, acts as a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a flood plain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor.</p> <p>An increase in light and noise pollution from the proposed work and the new development, and then disturbance from cats, dogs, and people which could affect the wildlife in this area.</p> <p>Concerned that the traffic on Wilden Lane, which is already very bad would worsen making</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				commuting even more difficult.
	LPPO526	FPH/1	Object	I object on the grounds that it will be detrimental to the general area and the SSSI site bordering this area in particular. This site "feeds" the SSSI site and use for industrial housing will have a long term effect on flora and fauna. Additionally the infrastructure and access to the site is insufficient to support any increase in traffic flow along Wilden Lane towards Kidderminster. This road is always congested at peak times and the relief road has not alleviated this.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO960	FPH/1	Comment	Northern part of site has already has development opposite. Need to maintain buffer between development and SSSI but should be possible to make some land available.
	LPPO3743	FPH/1	Comment	Do you really consider this a worthy contender for housing? There are many alternative brown field sites in the area, please do not let any development on Wilden Marsh to go ahead.
Wyre Forest District Council	LPPO1255	FPH/1	Comment	Proposed development areas immediately adjacent to some of our Districts most valuable wildlife areas. There is a real risk of increasing disturbance pressure on these sensitive areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FPH28 Settling ponds due to the sites immediate proximity to Wilden SSSI. <p>Sites will be subject to current planning regulation and biodiversity concerns will make development more complicated and may even restrict the nature available developable area.</p>
	LPPO59	FPH/1	Object	I am against any development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, home to many toads, frogs and polecats, and protected species such as otter and great crested newt. Thousands of common toads walk through the field each year to mate in North Pond, borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis. <p>The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				There would be an increase in light and noise pollution, and disturbance from cats, dogs, and people. Both the vibrancy and vitality of Wilden Marsh will be greatly negatively affected if development goes ahead. The Wilden Lane traffic would be horrendous – it is already horrendous.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	LPP0561	FPH/1	Object	No constructive evidence why the "settling ponds" need to be developed for housing. This land was used by the BSC for cleaning purposes after or before manufacturing the Sugar Beet. Not sure but this area thought to be possibly contaminated. Surely drainage issues exist as well.
	LPP049	FPH/1	Object	<p>I am against any development of the former Lagoon Field, the land is an important valuable local wildlife asset. I help with conservation work in this area it is home to rare and protected plants and animals such as otters and great crested newts. The field borders an improving SSSI, acts as a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a flood plain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor.</p> <p>An increase in light and noise pollution from the proposed work and the new development, and then disturbance from cats, dogs, and people which could affect the wildlife in this area.</p> <p>Concerned that the traffic on Wilden Lane, which is already very bad would worsen making commuting even more difficult.</p>
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01458	FPH/1	Object	Settling Ponds - Green Belt - need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Green Belt assessment advises there is an absence of defensible boundaries at this location. Need evidence before it can be allocated.
	LPP04056	FPH/1	Object	I wish to object to the proposal to allow development upon the former Settling Lagoons site at Wilden Lane, FPH/1. The adjacent SSSI has been protected and nurtured by a dedicated group of volunteers working with the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust to provide a Nature Reserve for the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
 ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>protection of the flora and fauna alongside the River Stour and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal. It is a site of great importance to local wildlife, including protected species such as otters and the greater crested newt as well as a whole array of other animals such as deer, toads, frogs, foxes, badgers, polecats and a large heronry. The measure of any civilised society is how it looks after the less privileged in its community and those unable to speak for themselves. The wildlife of Wilden Marsh Nature Reserve currently moves freely from and to the marsh across Wilden Lane to the woodlands on the eastern side through the site of the former settling pools. This would become almost impossible with any development upon the settling lagoons and would inevitably impoverish the SSSI site.</p> <p>There has already been a major development on the western side of the SSSI, with the large Silverwoods residential and industrial estate. A development to the east of the SSSI would squeeze the green corridor to an impossible degree, inevitably causing the existing wildlife occupying the site to be disturbed and frightened away.</p> <p>The settling lagoons site is used by the wildlife in the SSSI as a valuable buffer zone between the protected grounds of the SSSI and the busy roads of Wilden Lane (B4193) and the nearby A449. The resident frog and toad populations cross this site regularly each year as they move to breed in North Pond. I believe that the Settling Lagoons should be added to the existing SSSI in order to provide a more realistic nature reserve that Kidderminster could and should be proud of - a 'gem' in its local area.</p> <p>If this development was to take place, there would be increased noise, light and air pollution which would have a massive negative effect upon the wildlife of the SSSI. The inadvertent disturbance and damage caused by people with their cats and dogs living upon or using the settling lagoons site would drive the natural wildlife away, impoverishing this natural gem.</p> <p>Surely the pre-eminent principle is supposed to be that any development should not adversely affect a SSSI and this would inevitably be the case if any development was to take place upon</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>this site.</p> <p>The SSSI and the Settling Lagoons is far too important as a nature reserve to allow any development to take place here. There are already a number of industrial buildings within Wyre Forest that have been standing empty for years, with no-one interested in occupying them, so why is the Council insisting upon building more? The carpet industry in Kidderminster has been in decline for the past 40 years and recent announcements by Brintons and Victoria Carpets show that this decline is likely to continue. This is very likely to create further large scale industrial sites to become available for development in the near future.</p> <p>As far as needing more residential housing, the projected figures for population growth in the Wyre Forest are very speculative and appear to grossly exaggerate the likely changes. The population of Wyre Forest has only grown by a net 1000 or 2.7% in the last 15 years, so why has it been necessary to project a figure of 6000 residences needed in the Wyre Forest region in the next 16 years? This is far in excess even of the inflated 8.1% figure in the Amion Report and even more so than projections from the 2011 census.</p> <p>I urge the WFDC to reverse the decision to include this site in its Local Plan for development and instead negotiate with the existing owners to add this site to the existing SSSI as an enlarged Nature Reserve. This would be for the benefit of the existing wildlife and as a site for the local community to be proud of and to leave to future generations as a sign of our civilised values.</p>
	LPP02426	FPH/1	Object	I strongly believe this area should remain for the use of nature. There are countless brownfield sites in Kidderminster which should be developed first. Massive mistake to do this.
	LPP04359	FPH/1	Object	<p>I strongly object to the plans to either build housing or light industrial sites on Wilden Marsh due to a plethora of reasons.</p> <p>I appreciate the need to build more housing to accommodate Worcestershire's growth in population, however the current problem posed to residents in the Wilden Lane area is traffic</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>surrounding the Hoobrook Island. The introduction of more housing will only exacerbate this issue further, leaving residents more unhappy with the congestion they face when leaving their homes. Also, this will extremely disrupt wetland restoration methods and monitoring as the marsh is part of Worcestershire's Flagship Reserves.</p> <p>Additionally, the area is a site of specific scientific interest and is home to many protected species such as otters, essentially destroying a part of our local area that makes Worcestershire the natural and beautiful place it currently is. The marsh is also home to a family of cows which help to both improve the environment and enrich the soil. This is a valuable asset to the local area which will be seriously disrupted in the event of erection of housing or light industrial areas.</p>
	LPP04352	FPH/1	Object	<p>As a resident along Wilden Lane we totally object to these lagoons being built on. Not at least for the many species of protected birds and wildlife but over the years of being here Wilden has turned into a living hell as the traffic has slowly got worse and worse due to the lack of thought and planning of the road structure. We are all virtually prisoners in our own homes and can't venture out of our homes at certain times of the day; the roads around here just can't take anymore traffic. You have wrecked Hartlebury Common tried to take the Green Belt at Spennells and now trying to spoil the wildlife and lagoons here!! There are plenty of other sites like Lea Castle Hospital site, the site where the pub was on Barnes Hill, the site where Sion Hill School was, the list is endless! Spend the money revamping all the derelict properties that you have boarded up and gone to rack and ruin!! SO WE SAY : NO to the building on Wilden for the sake of the wild life and our sanity NO NO NO!!!!!!!</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	LPP04336	FPH/1	Object	<p>We wish to object specifically to the allocation of site FPH1 as we consider development here will lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the adjacent SSSI and the Wilden Marsh Nature Reserve. This is a particularly significant issue because the site has been included as a Core Site in the Local Plan with Option A proposing employment and Option B proposing housing. Both options are likely to have impacts that we do not believe can be effectively mitigated because of the limited space available and the very close proximity of development to the SSSI and reserve.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
 ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>In light of this we are extremely surprised to note that the Sustainability Appraisal scored Option A as a minor negative and Option B as neutral in terms of the impact on the designated site and we seriously question the underlying assumptions made to reach this conclusion, especially given the commentary in the consultation document regarding the need for further hydrological study. Whilst additional hydrological information will be welcome it is important to note that impacts are likely to include, but may not be limited to: probable alterations in hydrology, adverse effects arising from noise and light disturbance (including with respect to protected and priority species including bats and birds), the potential for increased access (including unauthorised access) and pressure from domestic pets, fragmentation and isolation of the northern end of the marsh from the rest of the ecological corridor in which it sits with associated reductions in ecological connectivity that may lead from this. Further information demonstrating how all of these issues can be reconciled with the allocation proposed must form part of the evidence base prior to finalising the Plan. In connection with this it is essential to recognise that the council has a statutory duty to take steps to protect and where possible enhance the SSSI under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and we cannot see how this duty can be discharged in light of the significant effects anticipated. Taken together the comments above suggest that the site should be removed from the plan and that its allocation on present evidence would be unsound.</p>
	LPP04366	FPH/1	Object	<p>Objects to any use of the Green Belt, especially the Lagoon field on Wilden Marsh, a Site of Special Scientific Interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of wildlife parks • Land unsuitable for human habitation • Domestic/industrial activity would destroy the Marsh, which is also a flood plain. • Already traffic congestion in area; further housing could bring the whole of North/South traffic to a standstill.
	LPP04379	FPH/1	Object	<p>I am strongly opposed to the Options suggested. Settling Ponds. Too close to marsh and wetland.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP04355	FPH/1	Object	<p>With regard to the proposed development on the Lagoon field off Wilden Lane. There are many reasons this development should not go ahead:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lagoon field provides many animals a safe haven to feed and nest, otters and great crested newts are regular visitors as well Muntjac deer. 2. As the name suggests the lagoon field is a floodplain and Mother Nature has a nasty habit of biting back when interfered with. 3. The Lagoon field is a buffer zone between the new Silverwoods development and Wilden Lane. 4. The traffic is already horrendous most days especially Fridays leaving local residents unable to travel towards Kidderminster due to the traffic queue from the Hoobrook island. Local residents have to plan their journeys with military precision. We have not got the infrastructure to cope now so why build more houses /factories! 5. There are also rare orchids growing on Wilden Marsh and Cattle grazing, how will this new development interfere with their status? 6. I feel this pocket of land should be gifted to the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust where it can be cared for properly with the help of the Wilden Marsh Warden and be grazed by the Wilden Marsh cattle which are loaned from the council. 7. Being so close to a Site of Specific Scientific Interest, these plans are far too close for a positive impact on the local area.
	LPP04356	FPH/1	Object	<p>FPH/1 Settling ponds/lagoon field redevelopment. (A and B)</p> <p>I am shocked and saddened that this is even being proposed, hundreds of houses have just been built on the Sugar beet site, it does not need to extend to Wilden lane and block off the natural oasis that is there between Wilden other developments. It would be devastating to the local area to allow all natural land to be consumed by housing or industry, I can only image that the 100 houses would be another Kidderminster estate, people need to think bigger to help</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster be a more desirable place to live, not build soulless housing by the hundreds.</p> <p>We are small community on the outskirts of Kidderminster and Stourport and should be kept separate and valued as a more desirable countryside location to live.</p> <p>Wilden lane has small pockets of houses starting with the smart estate at the North end then leading on to original housing, some dating back 150 years interspersed by the nature reserve, the old miners' cottages, some larger family homes, the village, school, Church, pub and farms. Any mass development or industrial development detracts from the look of the lane and would destroy prettiness of the road and future success of the village.</p> <p>The road itself cannot possibly support any more traffic at either end as well as the fact that cars race down Wilden lane in parts and more traffic would likely cause more accidents and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and residents. If the Wyre Forrest council want to make a positive impact on the road reduce the speed limit to 40 between the village and the McDonalds island, manage proper footpaths along the road, Forbid access for HGV's and install traffic lights at the island.</p> <p>Also, I am personally against any development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, and home to many toads, frogs and polecats, and protected species such as otter and great crested newt. Thousands of common toads walk through the Lagoon Field each year to mate in North Pond. Also, the Lagoon Field borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>I would welcome any opportunities to protect the road I live on, the nature that inhabits it and the residents of Wilden lane from any negative developments that do not 100% support the community and our quality of life.</p>
	LPPO4360	FPH/1	Object	I also note that there are proposals to build on the site of the settling lagoons along Wilden

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Lane. This would be environmentally destructive to this green corridor which is abundant with wildlife and would create further traffic chaos in Wilden Lane, especially at Hoobrook island, where severe congestion exacerbated by the new traffic lights on Worcester Road, and other very poor traffic management is causing high levels of pollution in the immediate area. The loss of amenity to local residents caused by constant traffic queues is already real and apparent, and further development in this area can only make an already bad situation much worse.
Stourport High School	LPPO4350	FPH/1	Object	FPH/1 – Settling Ponds – Site currently within Green Belt, “exceptional circumstances” need to be demonstrated for the site to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development. The Council’s Green Belt assessment advises that this site has an absence of clear defensible boundaries, a key consideration for releasing land from the Green Belt identified by the Framework. No evidence on how the “exceptional circumstances” test can be passed justifying the release of the site from Green Belt. As such, its allocation is highly questionable and should be removed.
	LPPO4042	FPH/1	Object	The proposed mixed use for this site is totally inappropriate to this area, lying adjacent to the nationally important SSSI and nature reserve. This area should again be retained as a buffer between development and the relatively rare and protected marshland habitat.
	LPPO3351	FPH/1	Object	Settling Ponds. Too close to marsh and wetland.
	LPPO527	FPH/1	Object	I object on the grounds that it will be detrimental to the general area and the SSSI site bordering this area in particular. This site "feeds" the SSSI site and use for industrial housing will have a long term effect on flora and fauna. Additionally the infrastructure and access to the site is insufficient to support any increase in traffic flow along Wilden Lane towards Kidderminster. This road is always congested at peak times and the relief road has not alleviated this.
	LPPO2027	FPH/1	Object	If projected need for the number of houses up to 2034 is correct, I accept that some Green Belt is needed for development but there doesn’t appear to be any priority given to sites with obvious wildlife value. Looking at Kidderminster two sites come to mind which stand out

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN
ALLOCATIONS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>compared to most of the sites highlighted which are under grain crops at the moment</p> <p>Settling Ponds FPH/1. The area around this former lagoon site is either owned or managed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust, and the actual lagoons have become willow and alder wetland. The land is an important and valuable local wildlife asset, and home to many creatures some of which have protection in their own right. The development of the site can only add pressure to a location which currently acts as a buffer between a busy road and a SSSI.</p>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0789	FPH/1	Object	Settling Ponds - Green Belt - need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances. Green Belt assessment advises there is an absence of defensible boundaries at this location. Need evidence before it can be allocated.
Associated British Foods Plc	LPP0753	FPH/1	Support	<p>Support removal of FPH/1 Settling Ponds from Green Belt and allocation for development. The release of the developable part of this site for housing will not threaten permanence of Green Belt boundary as adjoining land is SSSI or FZ2/3.</p> <p>Site is in suitable and sustainable location especially for housing.(option B) as adjoins existing settlement, is located in largely residential area with associated facilities, is close to employment areas (Hoobrook Link Road has improved access), is easily accessible to town centre and has strong links to main road network and rail network.</p> <p>Site is available - in single ownership (ABF) and surplus to requirements. Only northern 4 Ha promoted for development. Remaining 10.4 Ha has potential ecological interest - recreation/amenity potential.</p> <p>ABF also owns 21 Ha of Wilden Marsh SSSI which borders the site. Other SSSI land is owned by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust. The SSSI is in unfavourable but recovering condition due to recent water level management. All of the SSSI is managed by WWT.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO POLICY 30 – KIDDERMINSTER TOWN ALLOCATIONS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Site is deliverable as demonstrated by evidence base documents -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development prospectus (Feb 2015) - principle site characteristics, relevant ecological considerations, analysis of site constraints and opportunities • transport appraisal (Apr 2017) - considers potential for both residential and industrial development - concludes that site is easily accessible and there are no constraints to development at this location • Phase 1 hydro-geological and geo-environmental assessment (Apr 2017) - site is near River Stour and located over permeable aquifers. Concerns that development could potentially change properties of groundwater entering SSSI (Natural England). Initial findings are that risks range from very low to moderate. Phase 2 study commissioned by ABF to involve bore holes and trial pits. Expect to complete autumn 2017. • Landscape & ecological management plan (June 2017) - describes issues, site potential, management objectives and delivery over 25 years. • Bio-diversity accounting report (June 2017) - enhancements proposed by above management plan to wider site would result in significant net biodiversity gain for priority grasslands, wet woodlands and scrub mosaic and open water. <p>Housing development of the site would enable wider benefits in terms of ecological and recreational enhancements of the remainder of the site. However, allocation for employment would only give marginal gains. Employment Land Review refers to strategic locations such as on A roads and the South Kidderminster Enterprise Park LDO. This site does not meet such criteria. It is close to housing so would be less attractive to industrial and warehouse operators. In terms of viability, residential development would enable the desired ecological and recreational planning benefits as well as potentially financing long term management of SSSI. An employment allocation would require substantial grant funding to do this.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Homes England	LPP0819	Comment	HCA supports the inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital site as a proposed allocation for 600 dwellings as part of a mixed use development, and its removal from the Green Belt. However, it is noted that the policy refers to the provision of 1.96ha or employment land on the site. This should be re-worded to be around 1.2ha to be consistent with the area of proposed employment land included within the outline planning application for the site. The HCA also supports the inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital Extension site, which is proposed as an allocation under Option B for a residential development of 360 dwellings, and removal from the Green Belt. It is considered that this is a sustainable location for further development to support the 600 dwellings at the former Lea Castle Hospital. Although within the Green Belt, it is evident that some sites will need to be removed from the Green Belt to deliver the overall housing needs of the District. The site is has clear robust boundaries, being bounded by the A451 to the west, and Axborough Lane to the north, as well as proposed development to the west. This representation should be read in parallel with the accompanying Supporting Document, which includes high-level technical work in relation that has been undertaken for the Lea Castle Hospital Extension site to support its proposed allocation and emphasise its suitability for development. The report also includes a Concept Masterplan which demonstrates how the site could be developed and demonstrates that at a net density of around 27 dwellings per hectare, the site could support around 360 dwellings. The HCA requests that the wording under Option B is changed to state that the indicative number of dwellings (subject to detailed masterplanning is 360) .
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP01004	Comment	<u>Lea Castle Hospital</u> . A major brownfield site in the Green Belt. Is inappropriate for it to remain derelict but its boundaries re too widely drawn. Talbots Hill Coppice should be retained. Shelter belts which screen site should be retained and adjacent land should be planted up. Undeveloped land in centre should be retained as a park. Sports field should be retained and field to south should be excluded to retain gap between Kidderminster and Lea Castle. Village centre facilities should be at centre of site not southern gateway. Road junctions need amending on A451.
Wyre Forest District Council	LPP01253	Comment	Concerns related to potential impacts on biodiversity at Lea Castle site as it has a large amount of rare and protected biodiversity on site.
	LPP01934	Comment	Do not object to Lea Castle being developed for housing we believe the Chestnut Coppice area should be left undeveloped to preserve the current visual appearance from the road and act as a natural visual screen for the housing development behind. This will help to maintain the impression that the village of Cookley remains separate

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			from the expanding suburban areas of Kidderminster.
	LPPO1943	Comment	Infrastructure doesn't exist to support 600 dwellings at Lea Castle e.g. school places, doctors etc. Traffic issues arise and the proposed access points lead out onto busy roads that have high incidents of accidents. Cookley is a village and should remain as such. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be developed as such. A mixed development at Lea Castle where up to 300 care home places could be accommodated would make sense. It would still need sensible road layout works for access but removes the need for school places. Add to the care home/sheltered housing a shop, a doctors, a recreational park and a bus service, up to 200 homes could be added. The care home would provide employment for local residents which would alleviate some of the problems people have getting to and from work.
	LPPO2821	Comment	I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed but must be done sensitively to support local infrastructure/need unlike current plans. Support residential development at Lea Castle on the brownfield and save woodland.
	LPPO2822	Comment	I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed but must be done sensitively to support local infrastructure/need unlike current plans. Support residential development at Lea Castle on the brownfield and save woodland.
	LPPO3034	Comment	The current large scale development at Silverwoods and the forthcoming Core developments at Lea Castle etc. will satisfy the housing needs for some years to come. Also, the 1404 vacant dwellings will act as a buffer to give time to react to any new housing requirements.
	LPPO3100	Comment	This brownfield site is appropriate for development. However, the access onto two very busy main roads will need careful consideration.
	LPPO3230	Comment	While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	LPPO3640	Comment	I agree to development on Lea Castle on the blue print only. Our infrastructure is already stretched to full capacity,

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			with the A449 already an accident hot spot with no provisions in place from yourselves to solve this, so adding more onto this would mean catastrophic consequences. I see no reason for development to remove trees, woodlands or wild life habitats in the name of progress.
	LPP04247	Comment	I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed but must be done sensitively to support local infrastructure/need unlike current plans. Support residential development at Lea Castle on the brownfield and save woodland.
	LPP04467	Comment	Support re-use of Lea Castle but only if a sustainable settlement is created. Otherwise this will impact adversely on neighbouring areas.
	LPP04636	Comment	While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland and wildlife habitat.
	LPP05103	Comment	<u>Proposal.</u> Having studied the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review we propose and support a plan to develop the Lea Castle site (WFR/WC/15) and adjacent sites (WFR/WC/32) and (WFR/WC/16) bounded by Wolverhampton Road, Stourbridge Road and Axborough Lane being the only real option. This area would provide a good number of dwellings (2000+) with local amenities to compliment this size of development such as a primary school a good bus service etc., all served by existing good roads with a minimum of major infrastructure provisions. If the town council adopts this proposal it would be vital to improve/widen Hurcott Lane to improve traffic flow from the Lea Castle site to the Birmingham Road. This would also provide a very useful relief road for those travelling from the Northeast of Kidderminster wishing to connect with the A456 Birmingham Road to then travel in the direction of Birmingham.
	LPP0408	Object	The current infrastructure will not support another 600 houses at Lea Castle. Using ONS average figures we are talking approximately: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 800 vehicles on to already very busy roads. • 1400+ new residents.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over 200 schoolchildren <p>Cookley school has already been extended and is at capacity. Medical facilities are stretched. The A449 is a very busy road, at certain times of day it is already very difficult coming out of Cookley. For this proposal to be successful extra schooling and medical facilities and great improvements in road safety would be needed.</p>
	LPP0442	Object	Why is the whole of Lea Castle Hospital site proposed for removal from the Green Belt? Planning approval has ALREADY BEEN GIVEN (so this isn't a consultation) on the core site. There is a band of trees that have been left as screening as part of the planning permission - why aren't these left as Green Belt to protect them into the future?
	LPP0624	Object	Building 600 dwellings (or more) on Lea Castle is not sustainable - the current plans allow for no additional facilities such as doctors surgeries or schools and would place a huge burden on Cookley's resources. Such a development would be equivalent to doubling the size of Cookley and effectively annex the village to Kidderminster. This appears to be completely opposite to the organic growth mentioned in Vision & Objectives - Table 3.0.1 part I. Development at Lea Castle has already been approved but document states that the site still needs to be removed from the Green Belt.
	LPP0660	Object	I strongly object to the development of the orange, purple and blue zones in and around Lea Castle, as this will join Cookley Village a rural community to Kidderminster Town and therefore lose the village status It is not necessary to build on as there variety of brown belt land still to be redeveloped nearer to the town centre which would meet the school, doctor, roads needed for the extra people.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0791	Object	Lea Castle Hospital - Site Allocations Plan identifies site as suitable location for business (B1), health and sports facilities, residential institutions (C2) and residential (C3) uses. Emerging plan now suggests that sites should be mostly residential. Where is evidence that site has been marketed as mixed use led scheme? It is inappropriate for site status to be changed. Sports pitch and open space on site will be subject to para.74 of NPPF. SHLAA advises that site is considered achievable subject to viability. We are not aware of any viability evidence for residential development of the site. Our view is that this allocation is inappropriate.
Churchill and Blakedown	LPP01025	Object	Independent traffic study commission for Leas Castle application suggests increased traffic on A456 and at Blakedown Station. Only routes form site to station are single track lanes. This makes site unsustainable since it

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Parish Council			lacks viable access for all people. Oppose any threat to SSSI at Hurcott/Podmore - hope to see Hurcott Lane made village access only. Also concerned about increased traffic on Waggon Lane leading into Churchill. Lea Castle would be in catchment for Blakedown School which is already oversubscribed. All of these matters need to be resolved prior to development being approved.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPP01441	Object	Concerns with sites: Lea Castle Hospital - Site Allocations Plan identifies site as suitable location for business (B1), health and sports facilities, residential institutions (C2) and residential (C3) uses. Emerging plan now suggests that sites should be mostly residential. Where is evidence that site has been marketed as mixed use led scheme? It is inappropriate for site status to be changed. Sports pitch and open space on site will be subject to para.74 of NPPF. SHLAA advises that site is considered achievable subject to viability. We are not aware of any viability evidence for residential development of the site. Our view is that this allocation is inappropriate.
	LPP01891	Object	Objects to the proposed development of the Lea Castle site and adjacent areas. For Cookley it will wipe out its status as a village, inns, GP surgery, school and church plus its playing fields and village hall. These will all be overstrained by the huge population growth implied. The value of Cookley's properties will undoubtedly suffer a loss. The proposal will blight the villages attractiveness – e.g. p.178, justification 31.2 will involve the destruction of Talbot Wood through which runs a beautiful public footpath. Cookley amenity natural surroundings accessed by such paths must not be blocked or turned into sub-urban alleyways benefit of the natural richness that enhances our well-being. The Anglo-Saxon castle contains a definitive description of the parishes' bounds under King Aethelbald Lea Castle land is in this anciently established parish and not a district of Kidderminster. The Lea Castle land in question was designated to function as a sanatorium. Any future development should continue with a role of the same nature or a senior person's village.
	LPP01951	Object	I would like to object strongly to the proposed development of Lea Castle site and surrounding areas. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is no local infrastructure to support this scale of development. In terms of doctors, schools, shops and transport Cookley is already up to capacity. 600+ houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion having recently been modernized at great cost. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is unbelievable. Additionally the Doctors surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments at the moment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. The population of our village has hardly changed over the last 5 years. In being asked to accommodate 600+ houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. Also this new development would be larger than the whole of Cookley. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current suggested plan does not do this. Where is the proposed development in nearby Wolverley which has 2 primary schools and a high school. Other local action groups are recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	LPPO1958	Object	Concerns regarding the housing development of the Lea Castle site. I understand the plans have gone ahead for housing but many of the residents are concerned it is aggressive and will have an impact on all the nearby villages. I live in Cookley and want to maintain the feel of a village that is separate from Kidderminster. I therefore hope that a large majority of the Green Belt land can be saved to maintain our beautiful landscapes and our village. Otherwise we will lose our village which will become nothing more than an estate that is driven through to get to Kidderminster. It will also have a massive impact on the local primary school and on traffic into and out of the village. Currently a high proportion live within the village and therefore walk to school. I also feel that Kidderminster needs centralised high density housing rather than low density housing on greenfield land. Half of the tower blocks were (rightly) demolished in the Horsefair under a previous plan that involved the development at the bottom behind Sainsbury's. The majority of housing plans since have been low density out of town estates moving the population out of the town centre, increasing traffic into the centre and requiring the construction of additional link roads. A key point should be that in order to meet lower Co2 targets the plan should be promoting centralised housing development that reduces the dependency on car traffic.
	LPPO2003	Object	I object to 600 plus houses being built on the Lea Castle area with no schools/doctors/activities for children. Cookley school and doctors are both full already. I agree that building does need to be done on the Lea Castle area brown sites only. Save our Green Belt. There are plenty of brown sites that could be used prior to damaging our green. This plan has not been thought out as to how these new housing areas will be used and lived in. This is being rushed through due to invested interest by the council.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2150	Object	If there is a need for more housing, there are plenty of brownfield sites around the area. School is full to capacity, as is the medical centre. The Lea Castle site is home to a lot of wildlife. The Crescent cannot support the amount of extra traffic for the development and I fear that it will be unsafe for the residents. Cookley is a lovely village in its own right, it is not an extension of Kidderminster.
	LPPO2333	Object	Comment on Options A and B. I object to Option B due to lack of local infrastructure, schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport. Access/highways infrastructure would not cope with more traffic. As a brownfield site some development necessary but 600 homes too much; Option B would compound the problem. Need affordable housing/sheltered facilities for the elderly; development should be proportionate. I object to Option A as it would link Cookley to Kidderminster. Not a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village; Green Belt will be lost. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when southern Green Belt is removed? If Option A is large enough will extra infrastructure, roads, doctors, schools be provided. No evidence of any extra employment provision so are we just creating a commuter belt. There are brown field sites not on plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park/site of the old quarry on the B4189. Why is Wolverley washed over?
	LPPO2385	Object	<p>Comment on policy section 31 regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle Hospital site (WFR/WC/15), and southern extension (WFR/WC/16) between the A 449 and A451, and south of the A4521 (BW/4). I object to Options A & B on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. - The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some cosmetic changes, additional visibility splays and traffic lights, will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also very close to one of the entrances to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. - In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and doctor’s surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. The existing doctor’s surgery would be overloaded. - I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.</p> <p>While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting Cookley's infrastructure and needs. The current plans do not do this. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	LPPO2472	Object	<p>The council have taken the easy option and chosen to look at greenfield sites offered by landowners wishing to sell this land rather than looking at compulsory designation of brownfield sites owned by commercial interests. They have built new council facilities on the Stourport Road, swimming pool, council offices and services etc, on the West side of town & then want to put 6000 homes on the Eastern side. I would also like to see detailed justification of where the figure of 6000 homes needed comes from. Are the council interested in Kidderminster and the villages of Cookley, Hurcott and Stone, becoming prime commuter belt to entice new residents and increase the council tax revenue? The amount of housing proposed on the Lea Castle site will only add to existing issues on the roads and the community. The A449 will become even more dangerous than it already is. A lack of thought to the schooling of the large amount of children, the lack of medical and local services that will be required to sustain a viable community plus the added traffic into and out of Kidderminster</p>
	LPPO2488	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster. • The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery. <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2499	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster. • The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery. <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	LPPO2503	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster. • The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery. <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	LPPO2624	Object	<p>I object to both A and B on the planned proposal for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development takes over Green Belt land and is not just limited to the Lea Castle development. 2. There are no submitted plans to describe where proposed facilities like doctors shops, schools for us to consider. Although stated in the options that the development will have its own amenities nothing is explaining on plans. 3. I believe that the redevelopment of Kidderminster is needed prior to the development of either site A&B to support jobs and infrastructure, rather than expecting people to commute. This will only increase carbon

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>footprint, and not a sufficient transport infrastructure in Kidderminster to support this.</p> <p>4. No clear explanation on the plans to identify the link roads and what impact this will have on local routes and villages.</p> <p>Under no circumstances should Green Belt land ever be surrendered and this is My main reason for My objection to both plans. So much more needs to be done in Kidderminster in the creation of jobs, transport and infrastructure first.</p>
	LPPO2785	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and unable to take more children. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Breen Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. We should build on brownfield sites first before any Green Belt land is used. I want to keep Cookley as a village and not lose it’s identify and become part of Kidderminster. Kidderminster gets gridlocked at the best of times so how can building this amount of homes at Lea Castle and other areas around the town centre cope with the extra traffic not to mention accommodating additional children at schools in the area.
	LPP02879	Object	Object as lack of infrastructure - Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, visibility splays and traffic lights will not help, also pollution. Agree that a development of Lea Castle site is needed but done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. If relief road built will cause congestion and pollution for Cookley and Caunsall. Do not destroy our Green Belt. No objection to building homes on the brownfield
	LPP03530	Object	I strongly object to the proposals to build over 1700 houses on Green Belt adjacent to Spennells as you well know this is prime agricultural land which will be quite easy to develop thus making quite a killing for the selling land owner and construction company's.
	LPP03537	Object	Whilst we do not object to the Lea Castle hospital site being developed for housing we believe the Chestnut Coppice area should be left undeveloped to preserve the current visual appearance from the road and act as a natural visual screen for the housing development behind. Again this will help to maintain the impression that the village of Cookley remains separate from the expanding suburban areas of Kidderminster.
	LPP03576	Object	<u>Threat to Green Belt land.</u> The scale of the suggested development of both options A and B reach far beyond the footprint of the former Lea Castle hospital site. This would lead to the felling of a large area of woodland, the loss

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of farmland and threats to the natural habitat (for example bats). In addition to the devastating environmental impact of this loss, the potential detriment to the health and wellbeing of the residents of Cookley should not be underestimated.</p> <p><u>Loss of village identity/infrastructure concerns.</u> A large scale housing estate would effectively make Cookley an outlying area of Kidderminster. This would mean the loss of identity of the village and the close knit community ties may weaken. Within the current economic climate, it is difficult to feel reassured that additional infrastructure would be provided to accommodate a significantly increased local population. The same concerns are associated with the capacity of Cookley Surgery. The additional volume of traffic to already busy main roads is also worrying, particularly if there are no pedestrian crossings factored in to the development. The A449 is also an accident black spot.</p> <p><u>Housing provision.</u> I am a strong advocate of prioritising affordable housing in new developments and am concerned that this aspect seems to have been minimised in favour of ‘executive homes’ by a large scale developer. I would urge you to prioritise the expansion of social housing, including part-rent/part-buy options. Any new housing development should be incorporated in to the environment as sensitively as possible and that shared green spaces form a part of this. I believe that Wyre Forest District Council has the opportunity to approach housing development with social and environmental responsibility and innovative design as core principles. The district’s population is not growing at a rate that would necessitate immediate large scale development. By providing desirable accommodation in manageable numbers across the region (including Cookley), housing needs could be met without fundamentally changing the identity of a particular area.</p>
	LPP03864	Object	<p>I object to the plans for Lea Castle. The Infrastructure in, and surrounding, Cookley is inadequate for such a large scale development. The area is surrounded by Green Belt which should not be replaced by concrete due to flooding risks and disturbance to nature. An increase in population will lead to more unemployment and crime. People will be forced to commute, which does not create communities. I do not object to some development on Lea Castle but it needs to be done sympathetically will good infrastructure.</p>
	LPP04067	Object	<p>LEA CASTLE SITE. The roads, around this site already have many problems. The site which was Sion Hill School is planned for 100 – 150 houses both this road & the Wolverley road converge on to the crossroads of the A449 which is a very fast road. You have the Cookley turning which goes into the village, another accident BLACKSPOT. From there you have the Crescent, then onto Axborough Lane & the Island Pool & crossroads. All of this area has</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>experienced many accidents & fatalities.</p> <p>THE PARK GATE PUBLIC HOUSE. A451 Stourbridge Road, both this junction & the whole of the Stourbridge Road again is a fast road experiencing many accidents & fatalities. When considering the large number of houses in this area consideration should be whether it is a safe environment for the increased traffic. & the fact each household has a least 2 cars to each family.</p> <p>LEA CASTLE SITE footprint. The avenue of trees & woodland & wildlife, i.e. bats, owls etc. The fact is builders don't take this into consideration when building on these sites. If it is necessary to build on this site, serious consideration should be given to building low density housing i.e. one or two bedroom bungalows of which there is a serious shortage for the older generation in the Wyre Forest area. Providing a regular bus service from the site, alleviating the use of vehicles leaving the area.</p> <p>HOSPITALS. KIDDERMINSTER hospital has downgraded & is still being considered for further reductions, as is REDDITCH Hospital and they can't help as they are over subscribed! WORCESTER cannot cope with the number of people attending the hospital, A FACT, yet still Worcester is experiencing extensive housing in its areas. Where are all the additional people to go when they need medical help!</p> <p>DOCTORS. Surgeries are full in Wyre Forest putting further pressure on the medical profession. The District Nurses are in the same position.</p> <p>SCHOOLS are at full capacity.</p> <p>With all the redundancies that have taken place recently, Wyre Forest is no longer a hive of production.</p>
	<p>LPP04160</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the plans at Lea Castle on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure • Green Belt • Employment • Community <p>I believe the road network, schools, doctors and local amenities of Cookley and surrounding areas are hugely inadequate. The more Green Belt that is taken away and replaced with concrete will impact on the amount of water that goes into the drains.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP04962	Object	<p>Employment element. Object to development of this land is due to the fact that Cookley will lose its village identity and end up as a Kidderminster extension. This will not be feasible due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recent modernisation of school will not accommodate more than 600 houses in the area. - This area is Green Belt and priority should be redevelopment of brown belt of which there are several around Kidderminster. - Increase in traffic in and around our quiet village <p>- - I do not have any objection to development of red Lea Castle site as this is brown field.</p>
	LPP04965	Object	<p>The Lea Castle sites does need developing, the red area on the plan is in my opinion enough taking into account the closeness of the village and the impact it will have. The options of blue and sandy area are not necessary at this time. I do feel that the brownfield sites have not been given enough consideration.</p>
	LPP0100	Support	<p>Other Alternatives. The most suitable alternative is Lea Castle, the area does not suffer same traffic problems as the Spennells area. Having travelled to Wolverhampton area from Kidderminster for over 40 years I can absolutely confirm this. The site is best suited for access to all areas, i.e. Wolverhampton, Stourbridge, Birmingham, Bromsgrove and Bridgnorth. Access to all major roads is simple.</p>
	LPP0494	Support	<p>I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed, this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I suggest 540 Elderly persons development on Lea Castle Hospital site and no development at Hurcott.</p>
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	LPP01150	Support	<p>Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council are fully supportive of development on the Lea Castle Core Housing Site (WFR/WC/15) providing a full infrastructure is in place to support this level of development on the site.</p>
Wyre Forest Green Party	LPP01493	Support	<p>We support development of a new community on the Lea Castle Hospital and School brownfield site, provided</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration is given to the local environment and ecosystems; • The development is built with good housing principles (as described in section 14, below); • The local community is fully engaged with planning the development; • Infrastructure, such as transport, schools and GPs are provided.
	LPPO2388	Support	<p>We would like to voice our concern to the proposed building developments adjacent to Hurcott Lane and on the Lea Castle site. We support the need to build more affordable housing, particularly on brownfield sites, but feel that without improving the local infrastructure traffic, school and NHS chaos will follow. Despite the tunnel problem at the Lea Castle site, this would be a preferred option, as the infrastructure for schools, health provision, shops and community facilities could be established with 1000+ houses constructed. The issue of Hurcott Lane needs to be addressed. Access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve and preservation of the SSI site needs to be protected. The reality of no pavement and safe pedestrian access along Hurcott Lane to the Nature Reserve needs to be a priority and the volume of traffic restricted. Motorists will inevitably select the Hurcott Lane route to access the Birmingham Road. I'm sorry if developers' profit will be affected by constructing a suitable Eastern by-pass, but Wyre Forest should not allow construction of housing if existing routes and a valued Nature Reserve are compromised and made increasingly unsafe.</p>
	LPPO3076	Support	<p>I am in favour of the Lea Castle site and land next to Lea Castle being developed as long as it does not result in additional pressure being put onto Cookley school. Lea Lane which the school is situated on gets dangerously busy in term time when the school starts and ends each day, so with additional people would only put more pressure onto a lane which is already too busy. People also attend the doctors which is opposite the school this just adds extra pressure on the lane. I can see the merit of developing road infrastructure around the Spennells area to provide relief to the centre of Kidderminster. It makes sense to me to develop just a few areas of the district with large housing sites rather than lots of areas with smaller developments.</p>
	LPPO4424	Support	<p>I support the build on Lea Castle site as this is not a visual impact that will be observed everyday by local people & commuters and therefore will not have a negative impact upon the landscape character.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/15 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL CORE SITE

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP0669	Comment	Broadwaters Heath area - accept that we need more family-sized semis but also need to provide for ageing population who wish to downsize and remain in same area. Suggest extra-care housing should be provided (as at Silverwoods) with shop within walking distance
Wyre Forest District Council	LPP01256	Comment	Proposed development areas immediately adjacent to some of our Districts most valuable wildlife areas. .There is a real risk of increasing disturbance pressure on these sensitive areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BW/4 South Stourbridge rd which is also immediately adjacent to the SSSI's of Hurcott pools and pastures <p>Sites will be subject to current planning regulation and biodiversity concerns will make development more complicated and may even restrict the nature available developable area.</p>
Stanmore Properties Ltd	LPP01513	Comment	Policy 8A states it is anticipated that new greenfield developments will have an average density of 35 dwellings per hectare. BW/4 is proposed for 200 dwellings. The site as proposed to be allocated is 13.80 ha gross. Even allowing for a generous reduction of 35% for Green Infrastructure, 314 dwellings could be provided at 35 dwellings per hectare (13.80 – 35% = 8.97 x 35dph).
Stanmore Properties Ltd	LPP01522	Comment	Objection is made to the number of 200 dwellings which is too low and the site should be allocated for at least 300 dwellings. The reasoned justification states there is currently a planning application on the northern section of the site for 82 dwellings (Application Ref 16/0003/OUTL is for up to 100 dwellings with an indicative layout for 82), leaving 100-118 dwellings for the balance of the site. The balance of the site allocated amounts to 10.2 ha and none of this land is within Hurcott Pastures SSSI or Hurcott Woods Local Nature Reserve. There is a dry valley running through the site, some of which could contribute to green infrastructure in accordance with other policies of the Local Plan Review, but even if 35% of the site was discounted, there remains about 6.6 ha net for development. This alone could accommodate 231 dwellings at 35 dwellings per hectare, which is well above the 100 or so dwellings that that area is allocated for. Overall, the whole site BW/4 should be master planned as one complete site and this would allow for the most efficient layout to be achieved with shared infrastructure, particularly open space. This will lead to the most efficient use of the land and is likely to deliver the greatest number of houses on the site.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Hurcott Village Management Committee	LPP01626	Comment	<p>Observations in relation to the area to the north-east of Kidderminster extending between Hurcott ADR Hurcott Village and the rear of Baldwin Road:</p> <p>BW/4 – Hurcott ADR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If development is extended past the current Miller Homes application site a further 300+ homes could be built. This would have a devastating effect on the traffic using Hurcott Lane which is currently a rat-run between the Birmingham and Stourbridge roads. <p>OC/4 – Rear of Baldwin Road (Green Hill)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is currently designated Green Belt. Building on it would be contrary to County Green Belt policy. The removal of Green Belt should only occur in <u>exceptional</u> circumstances when all other sites (ADR and brownfield) have been built upon. • 450 dwellings on this site would also have a devastating effect on the traffic using Hurcott Lane. This rat-run currently has 12 man-made pull-ins between Hurcott Village and the A456 which indicates its misuse. • Hurcott Lane is used by many pedestrians for recreational purposes including access to the Nature Reserve. Increasing vehicular access with further reduce pedestrian safety. • Development would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSSI. • Green Hill has a considerable elevation when viewed from the Birmingham Road. Any development here would have a visual impact on the landscape resulting in an urban rather than rural approach to Kidderminster. <p>Both sites BW/4 and OC/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing developments on either of these two sites will increase traffic in both Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road. • Both areas are clearly visible from both the Stourbridge and Birmingham roads, and form a vital part of

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the visual landscape. Development would be detrimental to visual landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both areas which were good quality (Grade 3a) agricultural land, are currently being left uncultivated. The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries do not allow building on 3a land, unless excellent reasons are given. • Sites are too close to Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool SSSI. Building anywhere <u>too near</u> will bring human pollution to it – noise, rubbish, people disturbance, car and lorry use etc. which will threaten its continued existence. • Bird-life flourishes in the area. A new survey should be carried out to determine the present diversity of bird life. • An up-to-date survey of flora, fauna and insect life should be carried out to determine the biodiversity in the SSSI, the Nature Reserve and surroundings. • If the land is built on, it will cause urban drift in the merging of Kidderminster with Hurcott Village – against county Green Belt policy. Clearly defined buffer zones for the SSSI will be required to prevent this. • If the land is built on it will cause urban drift as Kidderminster extends along the Stourbridge Road towards Stourbridge and along the Birmingham Road towards Blakedown - against county Green Belt policy.
	LPPO3099	Comment	<p>Hurcott Lane. This has become a rat-run for which it is unsuitable. Traffic here should be limited by a one way system to enable walkers and cyclists to travel safely to the local nature reserve. Kendlewood Road. Any development behind Kendlewood Road should be conducted sympathetically with regard to the two very old oak trees which already have protection orders on them.</p>
	LPPO3121	Comment	<p>Concern to the integrity of Hurcott Village and the lanes to and from the village. That no access be permitted to or from the new estates onto Hurcott Road or Hurcott Lane, any access should be limited to Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road. Hurcott Lane is a Rat Run between Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road, any access here would make the problem worse. Lanes should remain within the green corridor without alteration. The border of the green corridor should extent from the bank on the right hand side of Hurcott Road just above the bridle path, to beyond the tree line</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>on right of the brook that exits Hurcott Pool. The bridle path between Hurcott Road and Hurcott Lane must be preserved. No buildings backing onto Hurcott Road or Hurcott Village and the area between the bank, the bridle path and Hurcott Village would remain within the green corridor. Area between Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool is an important wildlife corridor that extends through Hurcott Woods to Blakedown and beyond and should be guarded as an important natural area. All trees within the proposed site should be preserved.</p>
	LPPO3373	Comment	<p>Hurcott Village is a fairly unique area and no major development should be considered as the character of this little village will be destroyed. The two core housing sites that are either side of Hurcott Village. 'South of Stourbridge Rd': this site should be limited to the proposal by Miller Homes. 'Rear of Baldwin Rd': this site should be limited to the top two fields that face the Birmingham Rd. Hurcott Village will lose its identity and sense of place if development is too close.</p>
	LPPO3466	Comment	<p>The provision of a link i.e. footpath or cycleway will because of the isolated position of existing properties create an increased security and unwanted intrusion risk. At present access has been restricted by the present landowner who has discouraged local residents from using the land. With the growth in development the whole area will be under a much greater invasion than it has been in the past. The proposed pathway will leave the SSSI more vulnerable to unwanted visitors who could harm the ecology and do untold damage to wildlife. It must be remembered that any damage or disturbance intentional or not by anyone is a criminal act. In short the greater the access the more unwanted criminal activity will arise. It perhaps would good to remind ourselves why this area is of vital importance. This is part of the original notification made 11th July 1986. Description and Reasons for Notification: Hurcott and Podmore Pools are situated in the valley of the Spennells Brook near Kidderminster. The site consists of two pools with adjoining woodland and has been selected as an important wetland complex, containing the largest area of wet valley alder carr in the County. Both Pools were constructed in medieval times to provide power for mills. They have rich riparian vegetation zones at their upstream ends consisting of extensive beds of lesser bulrush <i>Typha angustifolia</i> and bulrush <i>T. latifolia</i> with branched bur-reed <i>Sparganium erectum</i>, water plantain <i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i> and greater and lesser pond-sedges <i>Carex riparia</i> and <i>C. acutiformis</i>.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Extensive patches of yellow water-lily <i>Nuphar lutea</i> occur in Hurcott Pool.</p> <p>The woodlands are dominated by stands of alder <i>Alnus glutinosa</i>. A number of other associated tree and shrub species also occur including ash <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>, silver birch <i>Betula pendula</i>, crack and goat willows <i>Salix fragilis</i> and <i>S. caprea</i> and guelder rose <i>Viburnum opulus</i>. The ground flora includes characteristic wetland species such as marsh marigold <i>Caltha palustris</i>, marsh thistle <i>Cirsium palustre</i>, marsh bedstraw <i>Galium palustre</i> and a number of sedge species including cyperus sedge <i>Carex pseudocyperus</i>. Plants uncommon in this part of the West Midlands also occur including greater tussock-sedge <i>Carex paniculata</i>, alternate-leaved golden-saxifrage.</p> <p><i>Chrysosplenium alternifolium</i>, large bitter-cress <i>Cardamine amara</i> and the nationally rare touch-menot balsam <i>Impatiens nolitangere</i> here at its only county location.</p> <p>The open water and woodland form an important habitat for bird life. More than 30 species of birds breed here including great crested grebe <i>Podiceps cristatus</i>, little grebe <i>Tachybaptus ruficollis</i>, kingfisher <i>Alcedo atthis</i> and reed warbler <i>Acrocephalus scirpaceus</i>.</p>
	LPPO3484	Comment	<p>No further developments should take place on the land fronting the Stourbridge Road, north of Hurcott Village, 82 dwellings and the extended site near Hurcott Village, which will make it 200 new dwellings until the junction by the Park Gate is sorted. The junction will not cope with the extra traffic, particularly if more dwellings are built on the Lea Castle site and the Sion Hill site. It is a very dangerous junction where a lot of accidents and fatalities have occurred. An island or islands will not solve the problems.</p> <p>The SSSI site at Podmore is notified under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and was reviewed again in 1986. Interfering with a site of such scientific interest can result in prosecution. The extra dwellings by Hurcott Village will affect the SSSI site at Podmore. This area has been left to mature over the last decade and the intrusion of more people and a pathway/cycle path from the housing estate to Broadwaters Park will destroy the SSSI site and once gone can never be regained. The cycle path and walkway will also provide a big security risk for houses backing onto the land at the rear of the Kendlewood Road houses. The area has been kept safe now for many years by the current land owner erecting very high gates to keep vandals out.</p>
	LPPO3532	Comment	<p>I understand and accept that more housing needs to be built in the Wyre Forest area but I feel it is essential to upgrade, develop and extend road ways/links which are already very busy in order to keep traffic flowing.</p> <p>Also, infrastructure needs to be upsized to cope with the extra population particularly:</p> <p>Schools – In our area I believe Cookley Primary cannot cope with any more capacity and both Cookley and</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Wolverley Secondary school have very restrictive vehicle access and parking capacity.</p> <p>Hospital – Kidderminster Hospital already desperately needs upgrading to serve the people of Wyre Forest and surrounding areas so obviously with more population that would become even more important.</p>
	LPPO3741	Comment	<p>Whatever development is proposed for Kidderminster (whether at Lea Castle, Baldwin Road or Stourbridge Road/Hurcott Lane, it needs to address the dangerous junction between Hurcott Lane and the A456 and the weak road bridge at Hurcott Pool Reservoir.</p> <p>The junction of the A456 and Hurcott Lane is already a dangerous blackspot. The Highways Authority has already acknowledged the danger in part by reducing the dual carriageway to single carriageway access on the approach to and exit from Kidderminster. Hurcott Lane is also used as a rat run between Birmingham Road and the Stourbridge Road, during the morning and evening commutes. This starts in the morning with constant traffic from as early as 5.30am, and that would only massively increase with development either on the Baldwin Road site or at Lea Castle. There is also the issue of whether the road bridge on Hurcott Lane could support any material increase in traffic.</p> <p>One way to address both concerns about Hurcott Lane would be to put bollards across the road adjacent to the access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve, thereby allowing vehicle access to the Nature Reserve from both the Stourbridge Road and the Birmingham Road, but preventing through traffic to anyone other than the emergency services with key access to the bollards. The bollards would need to go across the car park, to prevent people driving into the car park one way and out the other side to maintain through road access. This solution would also reduce traffic from additional development, in a way, which would protect the road bridge and alleviate the need for strengthening works.</p> <p>The Council might also want to consider cutting off Hurcott Road at the point where it narrows to a single track road, maybe putting an additional car park to the side, thereby improving the amenity access to Hurcott Nature Reserve for pedestrians, cyclists and horses. That would make that stretch of road much safer for people who today struggle with oncoming traffic if they try to negotiate that road on foot. Hurcott Nature Reserve is the most beautiful park/reserve on the eastern edge of Kidderminster, within walking distance of the town centre, and has SSSI protection. I would like more people to visit it, see it promoted more in local literature about the town, and make it easier for them to get there without the use of a car.</p>
	LPPO3790	Comment	<p>The band of proposed development on the East side of Kidderminster running from Cookley down to Offmore would not appear to address the core policies of the Local Plan Review (Sections 6 to 11) in encouraging</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the growth of Wyre Forest with Kidderminster at its centre. It would not attract a younger population into the centre of the town but encourage the corridor of growth along the A456 and A451 for commuters to Birmingham and Stourbridge and areas served by Bromsgrove District and Dudley Metropolitan Borough Councils.</p> <p>Wyre Forest's ageing and static population (Table 2.0.1) would not be served by housing that would require greater mobility to access the amenities provided by Kidderminster town centre. The bus services along Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road (25 & 192 run by Diamond) are infrequent and unreliable and any train travel would require a long journey to Blakedown which is almost outside of the WFDC area and in the opposite direction to the town centre.</p> <p>The development of the central business district would seem to be a better way of encouraging growth and making the centre a desirable area to live. Recent coffee shops near Castle Road are a welcome addition and the River Stour and canals could become features rather than inconveniences, similar to Brindley Place in Birmingham. The 'gentrification' of awful eyesores like Crown House and empty carpet factories would improve and encourage investment, while celebrating and preserving the town's heritage.</p> <p>Amenities could be concentrated and developed as part of the town regeneration - like Kidderminster Medical Centre - rather than the band of proposed housing placing extra burden on existing schools and surgeries that are already over-stretched. e.g. St. Mary's, St. George's and Offmore Primary schools or Stanmore House Surgery.</p> <p>Developing semi-rural sites would be detrimental for the district, destroying open spaces and ruining the approaches to the town from the East which are currently green and inviting. The government pledged to protect Green Belt (Theresa May, February 2017) and the Plan Objectives (Table 3.0.2) also aim to "protect and support the role of the Green Belt". The government has reiterated that Green Belt should only be built on in "exceptional circumstances" and "absolutely sacrosanct" (Sajid Javid, Communities Secretary, 2016).</p> <p>Hurcott Woods and Village</p> <p>One area that the proposed core development would engulf is Hurcott Village, with core housing proposed either side of the village and Hurcott Woods. The village is of historic and scientific interest, being developed on a site that is regarded as one of the oldest sites in British papermaking dating back to the middle ages. The woods is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and developing the land around it would destroy much of the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>wildlife it supports. Buzzards, kingfishers, muntjac deer, otters, grebes, herons, woodpeckers, bats and newts are some of the wonderful wildlife regularly seen in the area and the delicate balance of nature needs to be surrounded by Green Belt to preserve it. It should be seen as an amenity and asset by WFDC and a jewel in Kidderminster's crown.</p> <p>The village and woods are served by a single track road, Hurcott Lane, from the North and South ends and an even narrower road, Hurcott Road from the West. Pedestrian access is only via these roads that have no pavements and a national speed limit of 60mph. There are regular incidents and accidents as a consequence of increased traffic from drivers using it as a cut-through from Stourbridge Road to Birmingham Road. Van drivers in particular hurtle through at dangerous speeds and despite the "not suitable for HGV" signs, lorries and coaches are directed by their satnavs through the village. Any housing developments in the area would put unbearable pressure on Hurcott Lane and the bridge and dam that are already showing signs of stress.</p> <p>The village is wholly residential; there are no shops and no pub and the road should only serve residents and those visiting the woods. That is clearly not the case and at least 95% of traffic dangerously speeds through, using it as a short-cut. Any surrounding residential development would put unbearable strain on Hurcott Lane and it is not clear from the Local Plan Review whether an Eastern Relief road would stop this cut-through traffic and could be a very expensive construction given the extra railway bridges that would be needed.</p> <p>The village is currently crime-free and - with no street lighting - free of light pollution. These would inevitably increase if surrounding Green Belt is built on and the area would soon be swallowed up by the contiguous conurbation.</p>
	<p>LPPO3851</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>The area of the Stourbridge Road and the north of Hurcott village has always been quiet area, why change it? you may not of know there was accident caused on the Stourbridge Road out side the Park Gate, meaning the road was closed which claims that the road is dangerous and busy enough as it is.</p> <p>The Hurcott Road is small, busy and dangerous as it is and would not be able to cope with that amount of travellers coming up and down.</p> <p>The footpath/cycle link which could be provided as a way into Kidderminster town centre by going through the woodland behind the houses of the people of Kendlewood Road will be more of a security risk most definitely at night, also it's been on the news more than once about the danger of animals. It will also cause more rubbish and waste.</p> <p>There is no reason why the people can not use the pavement on the Stourbridge Road as it is there so people</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			can walk on it, you could easily make a cycle link down the Stourbridge Road.
	LPP04326	Comment	It is not clear how some areas have been declared 'Core' and some as options (A and B). There should be more options at this stage, and less 'Core'. Lea Castle Hospital is an exception, but BW/4, OC/4, OC/5, OC/6 are all deemed core for no obvious or strong reason. Specific concerns about Hurcott ADR (BW/4). The southern border of this development comes right up against the northern border of the Hurcott Pasture SSSI. This too close. The current plan for the strip next to the Stourbridge Road is far enough.
	LPP04382	Comment	Concern proposed developments either side of Hurcott village would completely change this hamlet. Potential impact of many more vehicles and people accessing Hurcott Wood and how sustainable this would be especially if they use cars to get there.
	LPP04739	Comment	Document References at: 7.1 Is my understanding right from the wording of Policy 7 Green Belt Review that the ADR land from the Stourbridge Road to Hurcott Village has already been designated for development without, as it seems, any consultation? I can see from the planning documents on the WFDC website that Miller Homes has a planning application in for 100 dwellings. If there are only 250 houses on the Silverwoods site then the impact on this area with this amount of housing will be significant. Are any further consultations arranged? We were only invited to consultation about the land behind Baldwin Road. 7.4 There is reference in this document to land being taken out of Green Belt in Hurcott and made into ADR back in 1989. I have lived in the area for almost 40 years so I suspect that the designation for the land was changed when there was a proposal to build the Southern Relief Road (I think that is what it was called) running across from the M5 to Wolverhampton. It never happened and I doubt if the designation was ever reversed. It could be now.
	LPP0192	Object	I would like to express my concern to the proposed expansion north of Kidderminster through Hurcott will destroy the Green Belt and conservation area impacting on residents and wildlife habitats. I do not believe the infrastructure of roads, amenities, schools and is enough to support such a development and would suffer causing major disruption and disadvantage to the existing residents
	LPP0507	Object	I don't believe we need to use the land at Hurcott

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO679	Object	I strongly disagree with both options. Lack of facilities in Kidderminster such as local shops and poor transport links, will not be able to cope with the volume of new homes. Beautiful Green Belt will disappear if plans are granted. Concern for the local wildlife, they will have no where to go if their natural habitat is destroyed, this includes bats which are protected species. The rural feel of the outskirts of Kidderminster will go, but be completely over-crowded with no local amenities to cope with the volume of people. Why are developments proposed on beautiful Green Belt and not derelict industrial sites.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPPO793	Object	Hurcott ADR - Green Belt assessment states that this site prevents urban sprawl and encroachment and is visually sensitive. Development would also reduce openness. These factors must be weighed up in exceptional circumstances test.
Persimmon Homes Limited	LPPO1442	Object	Hurcott ADR - Green Belt assessment states that this site prevents urban sprawl and encroachment and is visually sensitive. Development would also reduce openness. These factors must be weighed up in exceptional circumstances test. This process has not been undertaken, as such the allocation should be removed.
	LPPO2152	Object	The extra traffic, these new houses will bring will make this road even busier, at times it is really bad now. The loss of hedgerows will make a big impact on our wildlife.
	LPPO2588	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hurcott Village is an ancient settlement, mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals in both Option A and Option B, allowing for development on Green Belt land and ADR land either side of the village, would result in it being totally engulfed and overwhelmed by new houses, thus destroying its unique character. In addition, the SSSI at the heart of the village would be under threat with so much development surrounding it. This is a fragile and sensitive location, where water levels are critical to its nature as wet woodland. Further development along the Lane would impact on this site, which is of national importance. There is no mention in the plan of infrastructure to support the developments either side of the village. Hurcott Lane is a single track road with passing places, already under enormous pressure from the volume of traffic using it as a cut through between Stourbridge Road and Birmingham Road. These

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>proposed developments, along with the proposed development at Lea Castle, would inevitably result in a significant increase over the current average of 100 cars per hour using this lane between 8am and 7pm. With no mention of new schools the most likely for those on the proposed site for Miller Homes would be along Hurcott Lane to St. George’s, Offmore, Holy Trinity and King Charles, yet more volume of traffic on a rural single track lane, with a SSSI at its centre. Not to mention the increase in use by commuters driving into Birmingham or to the motorway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 25 Safeguarding the Green Belt – hollow words if the preferred options were to go ahead. The proposals would not protect the Green Belt • Policy 26 A and B - The proposals would not protect the historic environment with regard to Hurcott Village. • The Local Plan review scoping report mentions the hornet robberfly, on Hurcott pastures, being the only siting in the country. As the field has ceased to be grazed (it was a requirement of the landowner to have cattle on the site until 3 or 4 years ago) the fly has probably ceased to exist here. Shame that cutbacks mean that the diversity of creatures in our environment is diminishing and that rare insects are likely to disappear as a result. • One of the reports states: ‘The eastern areas of the District fall within the West Midlands Green Belt and are therefore subject to Green Belt policy which restricts development except for very special circumstances. There are also a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest which could be adversely impacted by new development. These constraints will all be very important factors in considering where new development should be located.’ It doesn’t appear that these constraints have been given much consideration in preparing the preferred options document. • The Hurcott ADR will be allocated for development. This sounds like a done deal, residents have submitted their responses to the application by Miller Homes in 2015, but will we have the opportunity to voice our concerns at the appropriate planning meeting. Will we be advised as to when this will take place? <p>Recent applications in the area have been refused on the grounds that they are inappropriate development in a Green Belt location. Fairly ironic when you consider the proposals in this Local Plan.</p>
	LPPO2628	Object	Whilst we understand the need for a local plan and continued housing development in the Wyre Forest, we

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>must object in the strongest terms to any proposal to use Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Road and down into Hurcott Village. There are a large number of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest, particularly Kidderminster, which either do not appear in the plan or show absolutely no signs of development. These sites, e.g. the former Sladen School, former Sion Hill School, former Stourminster School, the Yew Tree Public House and run down factory and similar sites in and around Kidderminster show no signs of or intention to develop. These sites would significantly contribute to housing development land before any incursion into significantly larger areas of Green Belt land.</p> <p>The Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Rd is well developed agricultural land and contributes to environmental and agricultural sustainability for this area. The Green Belt land provides vital separation from Blakedown, Hagley and from the wider Bromsgrove and West Midlands area. Land here is also significantly higher than the surrounding land and would cause significant visual and environmental impact. This Green Belt land provides numerous wildlife habitats and development would seriously impact on ecological sustainability, biodiversity and the designated SSI areas.</p> <p>Any development behind Baldwin Rd, beyond Offmore and into Hurcott village would be smaller linear developments with no possibility of a community heart, community facilities and ongoing socio-cultural sustainability. These areas would not support the building of a primary school and local schools are already very full, Offmore Primary school which serves this area is full and cannot be extended. Roads in this area are already busy and dangerous with frequent accidents, Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Rd are used daily as 'rat runs/cut through' and increased development would bring this to intolerably dangerous levels. Developments such as behind Baldwin Rd would not generate a large enough financial contribution to roads and infrastructure to manage safety and increased capacity, indeed the development promoter for the rear of Baldwin Rd stated categorically that they would only 'contribute' to a new roundabout at the top of Husum way (a roundabout which would only serve to increase traffic and safety problems)! The promoter also stated that they would not bear any of the expense of roads or infrastructure, let alone a full scale eastern by-pass.</p>
	LPPO2645	Object	A further comment on the potential New House builds near Hurcott surely the road structure is ridiculously inadequate for this type of development without totally destroying the nature area which exists between the two planned Housing developments shown on your plans.
	LPPO2835	Object	I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/Traffic emissions • Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools. • Affect tourism/wildlife/possible flooding. • Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings before Green Belt.
	LPPO2865	Object	<p>Concerned on the impact of the proposed building of 100 homes on land at the junction of Hurcott Lane and the Stourbridge Road (A451), and the effects this would have on Hurcott Lane and the Hurcott Village community. Since this application things have moved on considerably and in fact are quite astounding, not the 100 homes planned but possibly in excess of 2000 home plus industrial units. All this surrounding Hurcott Village.</p> <p>As I have commented before I have no objection to new homes being built, but nowhere on the Local Plan Review 2017 have I seen mentioned the impact this plan would have on local existing communities and the local environment butting up to these proposals, and what will be done to ease the considerably increased traffic flows in these areas and how to protect wildlife and fauna as well as the well being of the people affected. Hurcott Lane is already a traffic nightmare for residents living in the village. The high volumes of traffic have ruined the lane, destroyed the grass verges and the ancient hedgerows. The vehicle pollution emissions and noise levels are already unbearable, with excessive speeds and the increase of HGV's which have caused unsightly passing places and in turn are dumping grounds for fly tippers. It is unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists to venture into the village. This lane needs protecting and preserving now. The development plans will only exacerbate the traffic volumes and will completely destroy the Hurcott community. Hurcott Lane should be closed as a through road and be made accessible for residents and visitors to the Nature Reserve and SSSI site only, then we might see the return of pedestrians and cyclists. There is another lane on the A456 (see enclosed map) that could be utilised for traffic between the A456 and the A451.</p> <p>It is all well and good for the council to take these options to fulfil its obligations, and for the developers to make a healthy profit. They don't have to suffer the consequences. As the saying goes. You have the duty as a council to protect the well being of all. So please think twice about communities such as Hurcott Village that will bear the brunt of future developments. Stop traffic flows in Hurcott before it's too late.</p>
	LPPO2898	Object	Not happy with the proposed pathway/cycleway to run past Stourbridge Road. This is a security risk. The area is very open and quiet and there is easy access to his property.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP02910	Object	I would like to object to the plans to build more housing near Hurcott village. The strategy I would prefer is to better utilise unoccupied commercial buildings and existing brown fields sites firstly, rather than destroying areas of outstanding beauty.
	LPP03020	Object	Development to rear of Baldwin Road/Hurcott Village would worsen traffic access around Hurcott Village (change from top that being a through road?) and affect the nature reserves.
	LPP03058	Object	This path would be routed through an area that is currently beautiful woodland, and which is home to a great variety of wildlife. It is inevitable that construction of said pathway will adversely affect this area. I am very concerned that, with this proposed path running along the bottom of the gardens connected to the properties on Kendlewood road, that this will create a security risk along the proposed route, particularly at night. There should be no reason to disrupt this beautiful woodland area, nor introduce additional security concerns for the residents living on Kendlewood Road.
	LPP03117	Object	I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed, this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I suggest 540 Elderly persons development on Lea Castle Hospital site and no development at Hurcott.
	LPP03315	Object	Hurcott Road cannot cope with more traffic. The area designated is a wildlife haven. There are many sites more suitable within Kidderminster town for housing purposes. There are so many buildings going to waste that could be made better use of. How will schools, hospitals, doctors, fire service be able to cope if more people come to the town. I have lived here all my life and I feel that Kidderminster is a total disaster at present. Something should be done to improve things not make them worse. The affect on pollution with more cars etc. from his planned building of more houses is totally unacceptable in this area.
	LPP03347	Object	'South of Stourbridge Rd': this site should be limited to the proposal by Miller Homes. 'Rear of Baldwin Rd': this site should be limited to the top two fields that face the Birmingham Rd. Hurcott Village will lose its identity and sense of place if development is too close.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			- Employment on 'Land off Birmingham Rd'. All industrial/trade units should be kept within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Zone.
	LPP03355	Object	The area this would run through is, firstly on a site of scientific interest, and secondly in the past, was subject to lot of criminal activity. There is a jetty that runs from Broadwaters heath, across down to Wolverhampton Road, and I have encountered anti social behaviour here. Building on the corner of the very busy Hurcott Lane and an already busy A456, which is already an area for known heavy and speeding traffic, seems absolutely thoughtless and totally badly positioned.
	LPP03438	Object	The proposed development concerns me as many of the sites are important wildlife conservation areas, also access to these sites would be severely compromised and lead to increased volume of traffic on what is already a very congested route. Both the A449 and A451 head to the bottle neck that is the Horsefair.
	LPP03455	Object	Any developments of this traditional land with hedgerows and fields is found to impact negatively in the wildlife habitats. Hurcott Road/Baldwin Road would become very busy to traffic.
	LPP03777	Object	<p>I would like to comment on policy section 31 of the Local Plan Review, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle Hospital site (WFR/WC/15), and southern extension (WFR/WC/16) between the A 449 and A451, and south of the A4521 (BW/4). I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this.</p> <p>- The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some cosmetic changes, additional visibility splays and traffic lights, will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also very close to one of the entrances to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p>- In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. The existing doctor's surgery would be overloaded.</p> <p>I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>stretched infrastructure.</p> <p>While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting Cookley's infrastructure and needs. The current plans do not do this.</p> <p>I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	LPPO3779	Object	<p>We would like to voice our concern to the proposed building developments adjacent to Hurcott Lane and on the Lea Castle site. We support the need to build more affordable housing, particularly on brownfield sites, but feel that without improving the local infrastructure traffic, school and NHS chaos will follow.</p> <p>Any development for Baldwin Road or land off the Stourbridge Road would cause impossible traffic situations for Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road. No traffic count or accident details can illustrate the reality of the dangers for motorists or pedestrians on these routes. The issue of Hurcott Lane needs to be addressed. Access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve and preservation of the SSSI site needs to be protected. The reality of no pavement and safe pedestrian access along Hurcott Lane to the Nature Reserve needs to be a priority and the volume of traffic restricted. Motorists will inevitably select the Hurcott Lane route to access the Birmingham Road. I'm sorry if developers' profit will be affected by constructing a suitable Eastern by-pass, but Wyre Forest should not allow construction of housing if existing routes and a valued Nature Reserve are compromised and made increasingly unsafe.</p>
	LPPO3782	Object	<p>We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health, pollution and social problems.</p> <p>Alternative brown field sites are available along with pockets of derelict land ripe for redevelopment. The amount of development required has also been vastly overestimated and the actual amount needed could be sustained on alternative brown sites (Lea Castle, disused pubs, disused factories such as those in Park Lane, Sladen/Sion Hill schools).</p> <p>Pollution: Any development of these areas would substantially increase the already heavy traffic pollution. We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. Also the speed of this traffic is seriously dangerous, especially to children, the vulnerable and animals. This development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. Add to this an increase in the already incessant traffic noise levels.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I would not wish to see a further increase in traffic using Hurcott Road.</p> <p>The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Road infers that Hurcott Lane will require the road to be blocked for vehicle access at either the Birmingham Road or Stourbridge Road ends but this will not prevent traffic flow just divert more traffic into Hurcott Road increasing pollution and volumes of traffic on roads only designed for local residential traffic which have inadequate flow characteristics.</p> <p>In conclusion, this is not a healthy and community spirited decision to develop the area. Baldwin Road is similarly treated like a rat run and as for the Horsefair how much more can this bottle neck sustain? We are trying to improve the look of this run down area not destroy it and end all hope of engendering a happy community spirit. Extra housing would require a by-pass to be built as the aforementioned roads just cannot sustain more traffic and the pollution it brings.</p> <p>Wildlife: The area is known and loved for its beauty and wildlife. This Green Belt plays an aesthetic role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation and these green fields are the first glorious introduction to Kidderminster on the A451 and A456. Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. Consider the importance of recreational activities in terms of health, wellbeing and tourism. People need space to thrive. Its unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. Compared with neighbouring towns like Stourbridge we are lucky to have such big green spaces. Don't destroy it for future generations when alternative brown or derelict sites are available. Endangered species, indeed wildlife in general would be threatened. Development would seriously impact and cause irrecoverable change to wildlife habitats especially on buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSIs.</p> <p>Some proposed development sites have steep gradients which could raise the risk of potential flooding. The proposed development behind Baldwin Road has the potential to flood, on one side with run off towards the Birmingham Road with a natural hollow in the main road and on the other side run off towards the lower end of Hurcott Road where it is a narrow lane which in turn would run off into the outfall from Hurcott Pool and transfer to Broadwaters with the potential for flooding the adjacent main road.</p> <p>Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is generally much higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and not blend in spoiling the beauty of the area. The field height to the rear of Baldwin Road means that the proposed properties would adversely overlook the existing properties & their gardens at the lower end of Baldwin Road.</p> <p>The Government's own policy regarding planning decisions is to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>interests. In brief all planning decisions must consider location on alternative sites to green fields.</p> <p>Amenities and Community Spirit: We already suffer from a lack of amenities in this area. One shop in which our post office was taken off us. A smattering of shops in Spennells and Offmore. Can local schools accommodate extra housing on this level? Offmore is already full and can't be developed. We no longer have an acute hospital so all this extra population would place more pressure on Worcester Royal already facing special measures. This also raises questions with regards the existing level of doctors, dentists and opticians in the area. Public transport is poor and infrequent.</p> <p>Big developments generally have no community spirit. Building on smaller pockets of land fosters integration. Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP. Doubling the size of Spennells would not be a wise move.</p> <p>Conclusion: We need smaller numbers of houses proposed which can be sustained by brown sites like Lea Castle. Smaller pockets of once used land should be considered like factories on Park Lane, closed pubs (The Broadwaters?) closed schools like Sladen and Sion Hill.</p> <p>We need to reinvigorate existing eyesores such as disused schools & factories which are frequently vandalised and this will improve some of the more rundown areas rather than permanently erode Green Belt sites, which once gone they are gone forever.</p> <p>Don't bulldoze green field sites prior to using up every brown field or derelict site in the locality.</p>
	LPPO3808	Object	<p>It is understood that there is a lack of enough brownfield sites for the Wyre Forest planning department to take advantage of, in consideration of building nearly 6000 more new homes by 2034.</p> <p>However, the proposed options A and B have some serious disadvantages. A major one in our opinion is the likely impact on the two SSSI sites in the Hurcott area. With reference to the National Biodiversity Network data there are species in this area which have been verified that are on the red endangered list and frequent Hurcott Woods and the surrounding fields. We urge you visit the NBN web site and seriously consider the data that has been collected for area around the woods.</p> <p>The proposed linear add-on development to the west of Baldwin Road and Offmore Estate doesn't really seem to encourage the feeling of community, and the facilities on Offmore, e.g. the school wouldn't be able to expand or cope with extra demands on the infrastructure.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and the cost of road and railway bridge improvements would also be a serious financial disadvantage, to development in this area.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3833	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the Hurcott/Baldwin Road development. • Do we need another 20,000 residents? • Where will they come from and where will they work? • Our current infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the influx. • Our town centre is pathetic and has nothing to boost economy. • Planners need to concentrate on today's problems.
	LPPO3906	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Hurcott development. • Loss of countryside and wildlife. • Dangerous and needs blocking off as access is not needed via Hurcott Road - this would protect wildlife and will be safer for pedestrians.
	LPPO3947	Object	<p>Kidderminster East, rear of Baldwin Road and Kidderminster North, south of Stourbridge Road. Building on either side of Hurcott would destroy the attractiveness of this natural environment and considerably reduce the appeal of the district to both residents & visitors. The development rear of Baldwin road is elevated and would be a very visible intrusion on the landscape. The houses will be close enough to the village for it to lose its identity & become a district of Kidderminster. These proposed areas of development would lead to an increase of vehicular movement and the inevitable impact upon air quality very close to a site of SSI. The traffic noise and air pollution would be detrimental to its wildlife. It is government policy "to conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England's wildlife and geology by sustaining and where possible, improving the quality and extent of natural habitat...". It is a Key Principle (1 para vi) for planning decisions to "prevent harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests ". The developments either side of Hurcott go against these policies and principles. There would also be an increase of traffic along the already busy Hurcott Road and adjoining roads leading to Birmingham Road and into the Horsefair. The Kidderminster North developments would also increase the traffic into the Horsefair. This would have an impact on the air quality and therefore residents' health.</p>
	LPPO4109	Object	<p>Objections to the above proposed planning. Hurcott Village is of great historic importance - Character of the village will be lost. There are many sites available better suited to this purpose, i.e. Ferndale 2/300 houses, Lea Castle several hundred houses or Kidderminster town centre which would be ideal for conversion to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>apartments. , bringing homes, trade and a more convivial social atmosphere to the centre. The old factory building to the rear of Matalan, Tower Buildings in Blackwell Street, and The Old Law Courts. These buildings also have historical value and should be retained. More accommodation could be attained by using the space above all the shops in Worcester Street. As town centre accommodation, perhaps residents would not need cars and our public transport infrastructure could be improved by better usage. It is felt that Lea Castle would be better utilised as a site to develop a ‘new village’. I understand that several hundred houses of all types (social, 1,2,3 bedrooms etc) could be constructed here and also have its own social amenities and work sites, thus becoming a sustainable community benefiting employment prospects and hopefully new businesses in Kidderminster. I’m, sure it would be more cost-effective to build there because the access roads are already there and alterations to them would be minimal. Compare this to the devastation caused to Hurcott and surrounds (we do not want our surrounds to become a commuter belt, we want residents to live and work here). Hurcott needs to be made into a cul-de-sac anyway to stop the erosion, dangerous speeds, accidents, volume of traffic and air pollution. RCA short-sightedly and unwisely recommend funnelling traffic into Hurcott Road, through the village. Has anyone from RCA actually been to Hurcott? Heavy traffic flow through Hurcott Lane would increase and although the lane is frequently referred to as a ‘rat run’ Hurcott Road is similarly affected with the approaches from the Stourbridge and Birmingham sides of the lane ‘funnelling’ into Hurcott Road. We frequently have to park on the pavement as it is and even then this only just makes it a single track road. The fumes from all these vehicles is bad due to the village being in almost the lowest dip of the valley, therefore not dispersing. Many front doors are just a few feet from the road itself and the speed of the traffic is frightening, never mind the noise - at all times of the day and night. All horse riding has now ceased due to the attitude of drivers so now they don’t even slow down as they know there will ‘only be pedestrians’. These ‘pedestrians’ include parents with children - walking and in pushchairs, dog walkers, people trying to enjoy one of the few walks locally i.e. getting to the nature reserve via a very pretty lane and road. It should be safe enough for little children to learn to cycle. Cyclists should be able to enjoy this once quiet area but is has become too dangerous. We wholly welcome everyone to enjoy this beautiful area and appreciate the roads leading to the nature reserve. I ask that Hurcott Village be turned into a cul-de-sac by bollards being installed near to the unofficial car park in Hurcott Road at the entry to the village from the Chester Road side, and bollards in the bridge area in Hurcott Lane. The bridge was not built to take all the HGvs (not allowed I know) and quantity of other vehicles that speed over it every day. There is good access to Hurcott Nature Reserve in Perryford Lane (just off the A456 and A451), which seems to be under-utilised. As you must be aware, accidents</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			frequently occur at either end of Hurcott Lane and any proposed housing development in this area would be extremely detrimental to all residents of Hurcott and users of the road and lane. The effect of all the building and continuing activity would be destructive on the wildlife living here, and visiting migratory birds. Making a 'wildlife corridor' is almost laughable. Where are the current birds and animals supposed to live - RCA haven't mentioned this. Animals don't understand they are supposed to use a 'corridor'. We are very fortunate to have seen a slight increase in Skylarks, which are ground nesting birds. Where are they supposed to nest? It is simplistic to say they will 'find somewhere else'. They don't - they become endangered. Many of these creatures are shy by nature and all the ensuing human activity will destroy their habitat and their world. Please have a conscience - they are unable to speak up! We heartily welcome visitors be it cycling, horse riding, walkers, children and older people walking to keep fit to our village. Please keep it as such and do not consider land around Hurcott for building, either now or in the future.
	LPPO4113	Object	Objections - Hurcott Village is of great historic importance. The character of the village will be totally lost if surrounded by new build housing. There are many sites available better suited to this purpose, i.e. Ferndale 2/300 houses, Lea Castle several hundred houses or Kidderminster town centre. It is felt that Lea Castle would be better utilised as a site to develop a 'new village', more cost-effective to build there because the access roads are already there and alterations to them would be minimal. Don't want Hurcott to become a commuter belt. Traffic problems in Hurcott with additional cars, horse riding has stopped, accidents have happened. Make Hurcott Village a cup-de-sac by bollards being installed near to the unofficial car park in Hurcott Road at the entry to the village from the Chester Road side, and bollards in the bridge area in Hurcott Lane. The bridge was not built to take all the HGvs (not allowed I know) and quantity of other vehicles that speed over it every day. There is good access to Hurcott Nature Reserve in Perryford Lane (just off the A456 and A451), which seems to be under-utilised. Destructive on the wildlife living here, and visiting migratory birds.
	LPPO4122	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal. • Kidderminster town centre could be made into affordable housing as it's a dying down for employment. • The infrastructure needed would be huge – schools, roads, shops, amenities. • Hurcott would have more pollution - air pollution is high. • Lorries already whizz past making houses shake - this will get worse. • Hurcott Road is already used as a rat run. • The land below the area designated along the Almer Lodge Road runs into lakes and ponds - home to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			many species.
	LPP04181	Object	I am also concerned that a number of the sites proposed for housing are so close to special areas of countryside that may be damaged by the development – e.g. BW/4 Hurcott ADR.
	LPP04240	Object	<p>We object to the development at Hurcott ADR/BW4 and the development at Lea Castle WFR/WC/15/16.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lane going through Hurcott from the Stourbridge Road to the Birmingham Road will not handle the increased level of traffic and would become a fast, quick entry to the Birmingham Road. The junction at the Park Gate is already an accident spot. • With regard to the Miller Homes application there were proposals for a path/cycle route from this site running along the back of the houses on Kendlewood Road. This is private property and the owner will not give permission for such. • Local schools will not handle the increase in numbers if you allow both proposals. Nor the hospitals which already are not able to cope as mentioned on national news. Worcester Royal is under considerable strain as is Russell Halls hospital. • This area should be left alone for natural wildlife. • The proposed extensions, in one area are unfair to local residents causing a new bottle neck to the entry of Kidderminster. This kind of development is unnecessary in a town with poor employment, hospital provision and over prescribed schools. <p>There are empty buildings in the Kidderminster area that could be developed into homes/apartments so there should be no need to build news homes on these areas of natural beauty/wildlife.</p>
	LPP04293	Object	Concern at development on east side of Kidderminster. Lea Castle is big enough to include services, i.e. shops, schools, surgery and would negate need to develop other sites. Issues of traffic/pedestrian safety/impact on local infrastructure, schools and Hurcott nature reserve, a SSSI. Preserve Green Belt as a buffer zone between Kidderminster/Blakedown.
	LPP04294	Object	The proposed sites either side of Hurcott Village is home to several species of animals and birds (skylarks,

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			linnets, corn buntings etc.) and should be protected. Hurcott Road is already heavily polluted by traffic fumes and several hundred more cars will make it worse for the Horsefair and Hurcott Road residents. There is also a lack of infrastructure and any new development in the Hurcott Road, Baldwin Road and Spennells area would result in children having no primary school places.
	LPPO4310	Object	<p>I am opposed to the plans to develop the land rear to Baldwin Road and the Hurcott village area. I have not been reassured by information that the plans consider the local infrastructure nor the current residents for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current road layouts are not suited for the extra traffic and would need significant alteration to safely incorporate another estate • With an increase of pedestrians (in particular children accessing Offmore primary) there would need to be provision of a suitable crossing. There is a crossing patrol (which I feel is inadequate for the road due to its traffic volume and width) further down the Birmingham road, but I fear people from the new estate would chance crossing the main road, rather than walk the extra distance to the patrol, if no other method is provided. The Birmingham road is a busy arterial route into Kidderminster: increasing traffic here will only increase the risk of injury to crossing pedestrians. • Without a suitable link road, Baldwin road and Hurcott lane would continue to and increasingly be used as rat runs. There is little room to expand these roads. Additionally, Hurcott lane is the primary access to Hurcott woods. More traffic flow here will inevitably increase the risk of pedestrian injury to those using the woods and lane as the road is narrow. • Any bypass linking the Wolverhampton road and Worcester road would require a bridge over the railway line. Creation of such a bridge seems an unlikely prospect due to its expense, requirements for sound buffering and also impact on natural habitats. • The land to the rear of Baldwin road is much higher than Baldwin road itself. Without proper landscaping the new estate would dominate the current houses and have a detrimental impact on our wellbeing and our house prices. Additionally, new build properties tend to have small gardens and I am concerned that the new houses will seem even closer to my boundary because of this and the elevation difference. Any development here needs to be considerably and sympathetically planned. I have not been reassured that this is the case.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am unsure of the necessity for new housing in Kidderminster - unless it is affordable starter homes - though I am concerned that the new development will mainly, if not entirely consist of larger, more expensive properties - which defeats the object I think the government are aiming for. It is also disappointing that Green Belt land is being used and that such use will impact local wildlife, and encroach on the SSSI at Hurcott. <p>Overall I do not feel that sufficient thought has been applied to the proposed development to ensure that it integrates within the local area with as little interference and intrusion as possible.</p>
	LPP04517	Object	<p>I object to all of the Core Sites in the Green Belt to the north and east of Kidderminster on the basis of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) impairing the quality of the rural environment visible from and immediately accessible from Greenhill; 2) noise and air pollution due to increasing the traffic on the roads surrounding (and possibly through) Greenhill and Broadwaters; 3) pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc); 4) pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access on foot. <p>I'd expect a large proportion of the existing retail zone in the centre of Kidderminster, in which the properties are currently vacant, to be reallocated to housing before building on Green Belt. This would have the benefit of regenerating the town centre and putting housing close to local amenities.</p>
	LPP04648	Object	<p>The core site of South of Stourbridge Road (BW/4) incorporating the dry valley has the potential to significantly modify the drainage characteristics of the area and thus any development of this area has the potential to have a significant harm upon the Hurcott Pasture SSSI and the adjacent Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI, adversely affecting their unique setting. Hurcott Pasture is a semi-natural grassland sward of a type which is nationally scarce and declining through agricultural improvement, so development of site BW/4 would make the appropriate management of the SSSI to maintain its ecological interest difficult. The dry valley, as it links into the SSSIs would not be suitable for utilisation as a defined route user to link to Broadwaters. It would have been appropriate to show these designated sites on the proposals map – at present there is no evidence of an applied</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			buffer zone to the SSSI's as the site assessment report indicated would be required. Therefore to maintain an appropriate buffer to the designated sites including the Hurcott Woods LNR the core area should be removed.
	LPP04741	Object	<p>I have confined my comments mainly to the effect of the proposals on the Hurcott area. I leave it up to other members of the public to comment on their own areas of interest.</p> <p>6.16 makes reference to the Green Belt boundary separating towns and relates it to the A456 corridor. This does not reflect in any way on the reason why the Hurcott area is being considered for building when the words say that 'it will be particularly important to ensure that the land remains open'.</p> <p>6.21 mentions the value of tourism to the Wyre Forest and the SVR and Safari Park are mentioned. Having lived with the huge amount of traffic during weekends and holidays using the A456 to reach these tourist areas I struggle to see the point of considering adding more traffic through additional housing in the Hurcott area with a roundabout on the A456 to slow the traffic even more. Tourists won't come if they can only reach a destination through constant heavy traffic.</p> <p>Section 11 A Unique Place -If we are taking this section to look at the character and distinctiveness of an area then I would make the case that there is little sense in proposing building large areas of housing around the SSSI in the Hurcott area which is included in both Options A and B of this plan. The nature reserve of Hurcott Wood and the SSSI areas that feed in and out of the reserve would be severely compromised by building what I have heard is 400 dwellings down Hurcott Lane from the Stourbridge Road to the Birmingham Road. The area proposed in Plan A off the Spennells site has little of interest as far as character is concerned although I know that people who walk their dogs in this area are fond of it.</p> <p>Policy 11D - on page 80/81 under section 3 relates to the biodiversity of a site. Certainly when I went to the meeting about the proposals for the land behind Baldwin Road and presumably that up to the Stourbridge Road focused on visual aspects and the transport problems within Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road but paid little heed to biodiversity of the site. I suspect that developers have little interest in biodiversity.</p> <p>Section 15 Water Management - I didn't notice much about drainage or water management in the proposals</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>from RCA Regeneration and Barberrry for the Baldwin Road site.</p> <p>Section 16 Pollution - What effect would the volume of dwellings proposed along the Hurcott corridor have on the SSSI areas being surrounded by this core option to follow Policy 16A?</p>
	<p>LPP04875</p>	<p>Object</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a study on behalf of Barberrry, proposed developers of Baldwin Road site, the weekday traffic flow along Hurcott Lane between 0700 and 0800 was 103 vehicles, a mean average of 1 vehicle per 3.5 seconds increasing in the following hour to 187 vehicles i.e. 1 vehicle in less than 2 seconds. At any one time there will be a queue of vehicles awaiting exit on to Stourbridge or Birmingham Roads and entry into Hurcott Lane. The traffic continues through the day and increases again after 1500 to a mean average of 1 vehicle every 2/3 seconds for the next 3 hours. There have recently been 4 serious and one fatal accidents at these junctions. • Hurcott Lane is a single carriageway with vehicle forced passing places over steep grass verge with in part restricted visibility. Hurcott Road suffers similar problems with less visibility. • Before any consideration is given to approval of building on either Baldwin Road site or Stourbridge Road, the WFDC and WCC need to resolve these traffic issues which could easily be done by a traffic stop along Hurcott Road by the bridleway 514(B) and the entrance to the nature reserve at Hurcott Lane, thus allowing dual access from Stourbridge and Birmingham Roads but preventing a rat run. It needs to be remembered that Hurcott Pools and Wood is a designated Nature Reserve. It is home to over 30 species of breeding birds and has noted wetland plants and trees. It is a SSSI containing the largest area of wet valley and Alder Carr in the County. A buffer zone will offer insufficient protection for such with the proposed development in such small area. • As to proposals for the Birmingham Road and possible by pass, these would only lead to additional vehicle congestion in the area and any possible benefit would merely transfer the problem. In any event, although it may be possible to persuade a developer to contribute to a road island and to build 2 railway bridges and a by pass is going to cost many millions with limited, if any, benefit and certainly not viable for any developer to contemplate. • I do not believe development of either Hurcott site would offer any benefit to the people of Kidderminster. It would most likely comprise of expensive housing which the majority within the area could not afford and a token amount of so called affordable housing on sites which in traffic terms, are

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			wholly unsuitable.
	LPP04924	Object	<p>I wish to add my comments.</p> <p>We live in Baldwin Road, Kidderminster and enjoy its location within Kidderminster as its easy to commute to work(Dudley/Wolverhampton/Cannock/Solihull)</p> <p>We appreciate that with increasing population and Government policy that there is a requirement for development in Wyre Forest as in most of the UK. However we also feel the right and appropriate sites should be used and all options should be considered and not the easier option chosen!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals to use Green Belt to the East of Kidderminster which involves behind Baldwin Road , Offmore and Comberton is a very extensive area and would be a large development project have a huge impact on the residents of this area both during the development and afterwards. • We are extremely concerned over the impact on the nature reserve at Hurcott Woods which would be cocooned by development around it which would be bad for the wildlife this reserve sustains at present. Not only this but this is a beautiful natural part of Kidderminster which we should be proud to have with its pool and village, but this would be changed dramatically with this development ,as well as endangered species having their natural habitat altered. Air quality in this area would be affected due to development so close causing pollution. • The proposed Eastern By pass to overcome back log of traffic appeared in the meeting and from plans to only connect partly between Worcester side to Birmingham Road so would probably not be as useful as stated as traffic around Birmingham road, Baldwin road, Hurcott Road and Chester Road during peak times is awful, there is no mention of how this would be alleviated with all those new houses which would impact onto the local roads in this part of Kidderminster? Lots of residents do work in Wolverhampton and Dudley side also, this side of town is also highly used not just Birmingham and Worcester side! Would also mean a bridge would be required to cross the railway line another expense? • There was no mention of the Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction with its two give ways and high accident spot, this junction should never have been put in, no one can use it correctly and it causes a lot

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of confusion to drivers. There should be a Roundabout there no matter what development happens. Heaven knows what greater confusion would be caused with traffic volume?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields behind Baldwin road and Offmore are higher than existing residential area so would be visible. • Local schools do not have enough space to expand to allow higher pupil intakes without impacting on the quality of outdoor space these schools have now. Offmore was proposed to increase its intake a few years ago within months of the new school opening and that suggestion was going to take a huge area of outside space away from the school! Education to our children is important and to keep happy children in good schools which are not crammed works better. Beneficial to the children and those working in that environment. Building of new schools is expensive, so to find funds for this in an already strained local budget would be difficult? <p>This number of houses puts a huge demand on the areas where they are planned especially local services as well as school and Health care (we have a struggling Worcestershire NHS Trust already, can it cope with higher demand from a larger population size which it was not built for?) Roads for the town are already well used and struggle with congestion a lot of the time? Concentrating development in one main area like the East of Kidderminster would centralise the traffic problems where as using many smaller sites would disperse it across a bigger area.</p>
	<p>LPP04933</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to make the following observations and comments on the proposed Wyre Forest Local Plan. In particular with reference to the area to the north-east of Kidderminster extending between Hurcott Village and the Stourbridge Road in the north, and Hurcott Village and the Birmingham Road to the south.</p> <p>Concerns and Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas of Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster play a key role in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. • The Local Plan predominantly concentrates proposed development along a wide eastern corridor. Is this

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>not disproportionate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of Green Belt should only occur in <u>exceptional</u> circumstances when all other sites (ADR and brownfield) have been built upon. • Large areas, currently owned by developers who have designated planning permission, are not being developed due to a lack of financial viability. While these areas remain undeveloped Wyre Forest is being forced to consider other sites. Surely the structure and details of the Local Plan should be in the hands of WFDC and not potential developers. • The area between the Stourbridge Road and Hurcott Lane – known as the Hurcott ADR – is under application by Miller Homes for a development of some 150 houses just off the Stourbridge Road. Clearly a development of this nature could easily be extended further towards Hurcott Village up to the Buffer Zone of the SSSI and in doing so encroach onto the habitat of creatures living in and near to the nature reserve e.g. badgers, bats and bird-life. There needs to be some assurance that appropriate care will be taken so as not to not undermine the ecological value of the area. Once destroyed it is gone forever. • Hurcott Lane is currently a “rat-run” between the Stourbridge and Birmingham roads. At peak periods this road turns from a ‘country lane to a very dangerous road as indicated by the vehicular accident rates at either end of Hurcott Lane. There are now 12 man-made pull-ins in the half mile stretch between Hurcott Village and the A456. Further development to the north or south of Hurcott Village will only exacerbate this situation. This issue with Hurcott Lane needs to be dealt with as a matter of urgency before further fatalities occur
Miller Homes	LPP0999	Support	<p>Support Site BW/4, Hurcott Area of Development Restraint (ADR) as a Core Site proposed for allocation in the Kidderminster Urban Extension for housing, with an indicative capacity of 200 dwellings. Site BW/4 is a non Green Belt site which has been endorsed by Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) through successive Development Plan Documents as suitable for meeting longer term development requirements. It is therefore</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>considered to provide the most logical and most sequentially preferable first option for accommodating residential development as a direct extension to the most sustainable settlement in the District to meet the longer term housing need being planned for through this new Development Plan Document in the recognition that there is a significant shortfall of non-previously developed land in the District. It is therefore entirely appropriate for this site to be allocated as a Core Site. Site BW/4 has previously been assessed in the 2009 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), which reports that the SHLAA panel considered that this ADR may be suitable for housing (up to 250 dwellings) if greenfield land releases are required at the end of the Plan period. Whilst the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) identifies in principle that the site is suitable, available achievable and potentially developable after 5 years, it should be noted that this is predicated on the assumption that there is a need to remove the site from the Green Belt and our client wishes to highlight that the site is not in the Green Belt and is actually therefore deliverable within the next 5 years. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Preferred Options consultation document highlights the positive implications of housing coming forward on Site BW/4, including with respect to affordable housing provision. Whilst the SA identifies potential issues relating to the impact of development on biodiversity and the Kidderminster road network, it is considered that these potential concerns can be alleviated or mitigated, as is already being demonstrated through the planning application submitted in outline for up to 100 dwellings (not up to 82 dwellings as stated in paragraph 31.3 of the consultation document and within the evidence base documentation) on the northern part of Site BW/4, which is pending determination. This planning application, submitted by a national housebuilder (our client), provides further demonstration of market confidence in this location, the confirmed availability of the land, and the deliverability of housing development on this site. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises the need to take ‘market signals’ into account in drawing up new development Plans. In terms of the location of Site BW/4, it should be noted that the site is adjacent to the north eastern edge of Kidderminster, with existing residential development along the site’s western boundary. The site benefits from extensive frontage to the A451 Stourbridge Road, which is an existing bus route and has an existing pavement that can be extended up to this site. The nearby Broadwaters area contains a collection of local services and facilities. Residential development is therefore considered to be a suitable and compatible use for this site. In addition, extensive technical assessment has been undertaken with respect of the northern area of Site BW/4 in relation to ecology, drainage, transport, noise, landscape, agricultural land quality, ground quality, sustainability, archaeology and trees. The site is of limited ecological value and limited archaeological interest. The ecological features of most interest are located around the boundaries of the site,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>which can be retained and enhanced through residential development proposals (with the exception of the creation of access points). The site is within flood zone 1 and development can take place on the site without increasing the potential runoff from the site. There are limited views into this site and the impact of development on the landscape can be further reduced through enhanced boundary planting. Sufficient noise mitigation measures can be incorporated into the development to provide appropriate amenity and it is considered that development on this site would not cause an adverse impact on the operation of the highway network and would only have a permanent minor adverse impact on the supply of best and most versatile agricultural land. If the northern area of Site BW/4 is developed first, it can be developed in a way that would not compromise the ability for the rest of this site to be developed at a later date. The wider area of Site BW/4 also offers potential for green infrastructure connectivity through to Broadwaters Park / Podmore Pool and the facilities and amenities in Broadwaters. If housing need requires further land release then there is an opportunity for additional land to come out of the Green Belt in the vicinity of this location. The allocation of Site BW/4 for development would not be dependent on, or prejudice, a wider area being allocated, but the allocation of a wider area would provide further opportunity for creation of a critical mass and provision of additional facilities to further enhance the sustainability of this location.</p>
Stanmore Properties Ltd	LPPO1518	Support	<p>Support is given to allocation Core Site BW/4 Hurcott ADR. There are many reasons to support an allocation on site BW/4. It is a sustainable location and designated in the adopted Local Plan as Area of Development Restraint (ADR) removed from Green Belt to meet long term housing needs. As such, it should take priority over other sites presently in Green Belt.</p> <p>It amounts to about 14 hectares of poor quality agricultural land. It has extensive road frontage to both Stourbridge Road (A451) and Hurcott Lane. Overall, its development would not significantly harm the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessed in the original SHLAA 2009 KO94 as suitable for 250 dwellings (Appendix 2 SHLAA 2009 KO94 Site Assessment Sheet). • Assessed in the recent HELAA (2016) suitable for 320 dwellings. The site is available now and has no known constraints it is considered to be developable in the 1-5 year period (Appendix 3 HELAA 2016 Site Assessment Sheet BW/4). • Physical constraints – none are identified and access is stated as ‘good’

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural heritage – beyond the southern boundary is Hurcott Pastures SSSI; beyond Hurcott Lane on the eastern boundary is Hurcott Woods Local Nature Reserve. • Access to local facilities – a local shop is within reasonable walking distance • Public Transport hourly bus service Monday to Saturday to/from Stourbridge into Kidderminster and beyond to Bewdley and finally Bridgnorth. There is a railway station in Kidderminster providing access further afield. • Timescale - The site is available immediately. <p>The site was originally allocated as ADR in the Wyre Forest Urban Area Local Plan. It was reconsidered in the Wyre Forest Local Plan 1996 and the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review 2004. The credentials of the allocation have been continually reassessed at each review of the plan where it has been concluded it is a sustainable option for meeting long term needs. The Core Strategy/Site Allocations and Policies Plan allocated brownfield not Greenfield sites and the site remains as ADR. Therefore, to date the site has not been needed as needs have been met elsewhere, latterly on brownfield sites with no Greenfield allocations. The evidence base to the District Local Plan Review included a Sustainability Appraisal that assessed the site as being in a sustainable location. The Inspectors Report 2003 considered whether there were any exceptional circumstances to return the land to Green Belt or whether it should be allocated for development. No exceptional circumstances were justified and the site was not needed for development at that time such that it remained as ADR. The Inspector states:</p> <p><i>“I am satisfied that the site would represent a potentially sustainable location for longer term development, if needed. It is well contained by Hurcott Lane and woodland, and development would not result in urban sprawl.”</i> (Appendix 4 Inspector’s Report 2003 Extract pages 7.22-7.24)</p> <p>The Inspector was mindful of the impact that the future development of the land may have on nature conservation interest in this locality and recognised that this would need to be assessed as part of a review of the Plan or at planning application stage and that development proposals would need to be informed by a detailed ecological appraisal, along with any mitigation measures. No objections were raised by English Nature or Worcestershire Wildlife Trust. This assessment is yet to take place but at this stage there is no reason to assume that such ecological interests cannot be dealt with through mitigation. Indeed, my client owns land</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BW/4 – HURCOTT ADR

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			within the Hurcott Pastures SSSI which could be made available for mitigation measures. The site has previously been assessed as sustainable and it is available for development immediately.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO568	Comment	Concern to the integrity of Hurcott Village and the lanes to and from the village. That no access be permitted to or from the new estates onto Hurcott Road or Hurcott Lane, any access should be limited to Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road. Hurcott Lane is a Rat Run between Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road, any access here would make the problem worse. Lanes should remain within the green corridor without alteration. The border of the green corridor should extend from the bank on the right hand side of Hurcott Road just above the bridle path, to beyond the tree line on right of the brook that exits Hurcott Pool. The bridle path between Hurcott Road and Hurcott Lane must be preserved. No buildings backing onto Hurcott Road or Hurcott Village and the area between the bank, the bridle path and Hurcott Village would remain within the green corridor. Area between Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool is an important wildlife corridor that extends through Hurcott Woods to Blakedown and beyond and should be guarded as an important natural area. All trees within the proposed site should be preserved.
	LPPO2642	Comment	A further comment on the potential New House builds near Hurcott surely the road structure is ridiculously inadequate for this type of development without totally destroying the nature area which exists between the two planned Housing developments shown on your plans.
	LPPO3242	Comment	It is not clear how some areas have been declared 'Core' and some as options (A and B). There should be more options at this stage, and less 'Core'. Lea Castle Hospital is an exception, but BW/4, OC/4, OC/5, OC/6 are all deemed core for no obvious or strong reason. Rear of Baldwin Road (OC/4). The development here concerns me for same reason as (BW/4). The Northern third of this development (where it crosses the public footpath) is too close to the SSSI. Development (if this site used) should not go beyond the public footpath. The whole OC/4 concerns me as the height of this land will make the western approach (A456) to the WF very unattractive indeed – for visitors, business and house buyers.
	LPPO3770	Comment	Whatever development is proposed for Kidderminster (whether at Lea Castle, Baldwin Road or Stourbridge Road/Hurcott Lane, it needs to address the dangerous junction between Hurcott Lane and the A456 and the weak road bridge at Hurcott Pool Reservoir. The junction of the A456 and Hurcott Lane is already a dangerous blackspot. There was another serious accident there only last week. The Highways Authority has already acknowledged the danger in part by reducing the dual carriageway to single carriageway access on the approach to and exit from Kidderminster. Hurcott Lane is also used as a rat run between Birmingham Road and

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the Stourbridge Road, during the morning and evening commutes. This starts in the morning with constant traffic from as early as 5.30am, and that would only massively increase with development either on the Baldwin Road site or at Lea Castle. There is also the issue of whether the road bridge on Hurcott Lane could support any material increase in traffic. One way to address both concerns about Hurcott Lane would be to put bollards across the road adjacent to the access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve, thereby allowing vehicle access to the Nature Reserve from both the Stourbridge Road and the Birmingham Road, but preventing through traffic to anyone other than the emergency services with key access to the bollards. The bollards would need to go across the car park, to prevent people driving into the car park one way and out the other side to maintain through road access. This solution would also reduce traffic from additional development, in a way, which would protect the road bridge and alleviate the need for strengthening works. The Council might also want to consider cutting off Hurcott Road at the point where it narrows to a single track road, maybe putting an additional car park to the side, thereby improving the amenity access to Hurcott Nature Reserve for pedestrians, cyclists and horses. That would make that stretch of road much safer for people who today struggle with oncoming traffic if they try to negotiate that road on foot. Hurcott Nature Reserve is the most beautiful park/reserve on the eastern edge of Kidderminster, within walking distance of the town centre, and has SSSI protection. I would like more people to visit it, see it promoted more in local literature about the town, and make it easier for them to get there without the use of a car.</p>
	LPP03857	Comment	<p>I understand that the council has quotas and needs to fulfil their obligation to build homes and wherever you ultimately choose you'll be faced with some form of opposition, I just don't understand why the planning department aren't making these big developers develop all the small plots of land that has already had buildings on previously. Development would spoil our main approach along the A456 completely. Endangered species in this area, the skylarks, owl, hedgehogs, bats and the plethora of beautiful small birds from Bullfinches to Corn Buntings. Not forgetting to mention the squirrels. All of these creatures and many many more inhabit these fields and are enjoyed and observed by those that take the time to watch them I also believe we owe it to the future generations to retain and preserve as much nature, flora and fawner as we possibly can whilst also retaining the green and pleasant land that makes Kidderminster so appealing and the popular town that it has become.</p>
Hurcott Village	LPP04085	Comment	<p>Observations in relation to the area to the north-east of Kidderminster extending between Hurcott ADR Hurcott Village and the rear of Baldwin Road:</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Management Committee			<p>BW/4 – Hurcott ADR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If development is extended past the current Miller Homes application site a further 300+ homes could be built. This would have a devastating effect on the traffic using Hurcott Lane which is currently a rat-run between the Birmingham and Stourbridge roads. <p>OC/4 – Rear of Baldwin Road (Green Hill)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site is currently designated Green Belt. Building on it would be contrary to County Green Belt policy. The removal of Green Belt should only occur in exceptional circumstances when all other sites (ADR and brownfield) have been built upon. • 450 dwellings on this site would also have a devastating effect on the traffic using Hurcott Lane. This rat-run currently has 12 man-made pull-ins between Hurcott Village and the A456 which indicates its misuse. • Hurcott Lane is used by many pedestrians for recreational purposes including access to the Nature Reserve. Increasing vehicular access with further reduce pedestrian safety. • Development would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSSI. • Green Hill has a considerable elevation when viewed from the Birmingham Road. Any development here would have a visual impact on the landscape resulting in an urban rather than rural approach to Kidderminster. <p>Both sites BW/4 and OC/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing developments on either of these two sites will increase traffic in both Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road. • Both areas are clearly visible from both the Stourbridge and Birmingham roads, and form a vital part of the visual landscape. Development would be detrimental to visual landscape. • Both areas which were good quality (Grade 3a) agricultural land are currently being left uncultivated. The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries do not allow building on 3a land, unless excellent reasons are given. • Sites are too close to Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool SSSI. Building anywhere too near will bring human pollution to it – noise, rubbish, people disturbance, car and lorry use etc. which will threaten its continued

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>existence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bird-life flourishes in the area. A new survey should be carried out to determine the present diversity of bird life. • An up-to-date survey of flora, fauna and insect life should be carried out to determine the biodiversity in the SSSI, the Nature Reserve and surroundings. • If the land is built on, it will cause urban drift in the merging of Kidderminster with Hurcott Village – against county Green Belt policy. Clearly defined buffer zones for the SSSI will be required to prevent this. • If the land is built on it will cause urban drift as Kidderminster extends along the Stourbridge Road towards Stourbridge and along the Birmingham Road towards Blakedown - against county Green Belt policy.
	LPPO4383	Comment	Concern proposed developments either side of Hurcott village would completely change this hamlet. Potential impact of many more vehicles and people accessing Hurcott Wood and how sustainable this would be especially if they use cars to get there.
	LPPO5122	Comment	Hurcott Village is a fairly unique area and no major development should be considered as the character of this little village will be destroyed. The two core housing sites that are either side of Hurcott Village. 'South of Stourbridge Rd': this site should be limited to the proposal by Miller Homes. 'Rear of Baldwin Rd': this site should be limited to the top two fields that face the Birmingham Rd. Hurcott Village will lose its identity and sense of place if development is too close.
	LPPO351	Object	I object to the proposals as per the disadvantages provided by Offmore & Comberton Action Group. I currently reside on Baldwin Road and believe the proposals will have an impact on the area in which we live.
	LPPO389	Object	I am concerned about the potential increase in traffic from development at Hurcott behind Baldwin Road. Baldwin Road is already used as a shortcut for traffic avoiding the lights at the crossroads for Chester Road and the Birmingham Road. Traffic is heavy for this residential Road at certain times of day and the junction off the Birmingham road towards Husum Way is a very difficult junction to cross at peak times especially with the odd right of way. This would have to be thought about very carefully so as not to increase traffic congestion in these areas.
	LPPO430	Object	I object to the local plan proposal for land rear of Baldwin Rd and the land East of Offmore/Comberton area.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster is vital in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. • The proposed eastern by-pass would cause additional traffic to the area and the A456 is already an extremely busy road. • The development would have a serious visual impact on the area and impact the eco system of Hurcott village and Hodge hill area. • The development would not be a sustainable community • Offmore primary school is ready full • The school cannot be developed further and in addition King Charles School is also full. • The area at the end of Shakespeare Drive/Husum Way is prone to heavy flooding and additional housing will only exacerbate the problem. <p>My preferred option would be an extension to Option A & B for the land at Lea Castle. This area could easily accommodate the required development and could be made into a sustainable village. A 2 form entry Primary school could be built and then feed the under subscribed Wolverley high school. It would be capable of sustaining a bus service which could also benefit Cookley residents. The transport links are already in place for such a development.</p>
	LPPO454	Object	<p>Proposed development at the rear of Baldwin Road would not be a sustainable community. It would have no 'heart'. Limited facilities we have now include a pub, a garage and a small convenience store. The fields are regularly used - and have been for 30 years or more - with residents (including those from Offmore Estate) walking around the perimeters for exercise and dog walking too. If Green Space were to be provided for children's play, pollution would have to be taken into account especially from Hurcott Lane and the A456. The nearest doctors' practice in Linden Avenue has very limited parking so patients are forced to park on the road, causing a nuisance to the residents. The local Primary schools are full, the nearest one being on a restricted site.</p>
	LPPO580	Object	<p>The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. If this is built on it will reduce the separation between dwellings from Kidderminster, Hurcott and Blakedown. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into Green Belt and would</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSI's. There are no parks or recreational areas in the Green Hill area. If the development were to go ahead in this area the only likely venue for recreation would be Hurcott woods. Due to the proximity there to the proposed development OC/4 people would more likely favour walking. Neither road leading to Hurcott is safe for pedestrians as it is narrow with a lot blind hills and corners. With the increased traffic of both pedestrian and vehicles there would not doubt be an increase in accidents. The habitat for many flora and fauna in Hurcott woods and wool would be over used and would not doubt suffer from an increase in pollution (noise, dog fouls and litter) This would ruin the natural habitat. A Linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no heart and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. Offmore Primary school is full, on a restricted site and can no be extended. The extra dwellings would not have local schools to use so would need to drive to nearby schools. This will increase pollution and worsen the already bad traffic in the surround roads during rush house. The topography to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher that the surrounding area. This would mean the visual impact of a development here would be an eye sore.</p>
	LPPO664	Object	<p>Proposed development of land behind Baldwin Road has number of disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of productive land • impact on wildlife in area • would not be sustainable community - not enough school places • Lea Castle site would allow proper community and require new primary school • Baldwin Road used a rat run - proposed closure of Hurcott Lane will make this worse. • Birmingham Road already accident blackspot
	LPPO719	Object	<p>Strongly object to use of this land for development for housing. Brownfield sites should be used as they are more appropriate and are available</p>
	LPPO739	Object	<p>Concerned re increased traffic if site is developed. Hurcott Road already used as rat run at peak times. Bus service unreliable. Brownfield sites must always be used in preference to Green Field.</p>
	LPPO1860	Object	<p>Objects to new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Reasons are:</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in volume of traffic - a bridge will be required - the impact of A2 very good agricultural land that is valuable land - schooling - the present is at full capacity - concerned about the industrial development at Hodge Hill and the impact it will have on noise and pollution. <p>Supports development of the Lea Castle site and the ADR site between Hurcott Village and Stourbridge Rd. Overall supports 'B' sites as more sustainable with minimum impact on the community and road structure, doctors, schools, shops and welfare.</p>
	LPP01862	Object	Object to OC/4.
	LPP01866	Object	I support Offmore Comberton Action Group (OCAG) and object to proposed housing behind Baldwin Road, Utilise land for development near Lea Castle, better alternatives exist to the North and West of Kidderminster. As stated by OCAG, this Green Belt has an important connection with the SSI's of Hurcott and Podmore and is itself a habitat for thriving wildlife and plants, containing at the moment, a badger sett. This countryside is invaluable and beautiful, used by walkers, dog walkers and people wanting to run/exercise in an unspoilt green area.
	LPP01875	Object	<p>Objects to development of the Green Belt around Offmore / Husum Way because: it separates Kidderminster from West Midlands.</p> <p>Roads already congested – by-pass would cause roads around Hurcott to be used as rat runs.</p> <p>More houses – more schools!! (Offmore already full). A new railway bridge would be needed (very expensive). Shakespeare Drive and Husum Way already flood (more housing less drainage).</p> <p>Wildlife and endangered bird species would suffer.</p> <p>Suggest that Lea Castle would be much more appropriate for development – maybe linking with the Sion Hill Middle School site.</p>
	LPP01916	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objects to new development next to Baldwin Rd. - Suggest Lea Castle as a more appropriate site.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggests Safari park and ring road traffic can be alleviated if it is re-routed via Wribbenhall from the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads. - Concerned about Brexit and questions what will happen to all the farming subsidies when it is introduced. - Raises concern that Hagley is part of the West Midlands conurbation and how long it will be until Kidderminster goes the same way.
	LPPO1997	Object	<p>Objects to new development Baldwin Rd East of Offmore / Comberton due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too much traffic on the Birmingham Rd - No school to put the extra children - No to industrial development - Suggests considering the extension of the Lea Castle site.
	LPPO1999	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the Hurcott/Baldwin Road development. • Do we need another 20,000 residents? • Where will they come from and where will they work? • Our current infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the influx. • Our town centre is pathetic and has nothing to boost economy. • Planners need to concentrate on today's problems.
	LPPO2029	Object	<p>If the projected need for the number of houses up to 2034 is correct, some Green Belt will be needed for development but there doesn't appear to be any priority given to sites with obvious wildlife value. Looking at Kidderminster two sites come to mind which stand out compared to most of the sites highlighted which are under grain crops at the moment</p> <p>Part of OC/4 Land at the back of Baldwin Road. Object to the northern two meadows part of OC/4. The other part of this area has been brought under cultivation the northern two meadows bordering Hurcott Road and straddling a public footpath has considerable wildlife and amenity value. These fields are lowland dry acid</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>grassland and having only been used for pony grazing for many years, have developed to be very good for wildlife from invertebrates to plants and birds. There are numerous records in the Biological, Records Centre for this site but I draw your attention to the Hornet Robber Fly, a Biodiversity Action Plan species which has specialised in these fields, to name just one. Much of the one meadow appears to be scrub but that very mixture of Bramble, Blackthorn, Hawthorn and grassland provides opportunities for insect pollinators. At the moment the Rosebay Willow herb in full flower is an impressive sight with fine standard Oaks as a backdrop. Birds are attracted to the secure nesting opportunities as well as to the numerous seed sources. If the WFDC Ranger Service could acquire this site then it would provide a fine addition to its holding as well as provide somewhere for the new neighbouring communities to use as a breathing space. These two fields are partly on steep sandstone scarps and have always provided recreational use to walkers and sledgers in the winter. Most people in Greenhill and Hurcott will have grown up using the fields, later taking their children to enjoy the open spaces and the views available there.</p> <p>I am not going to say where the alternatives to these sites should be, that is the role of the planners all I ask is that they give the rightful priority to sites like these which have clear wildlife value.</p>
	LPPO2030	Object	<p>I object to the local plan proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land is Green Belt and should remain so. 2. As a bypass road would be necessary for the development of land to the east of Offmore it should NOT be developed. 3. A by-pass would need to be linked to the Birmingham Road over the railway. Bridges are very expensive and private developers would not build one which means that Husum Way road bridge would be used more resulting in more traffic/accidents at the Birmingham Road/Husum Way junction. 4. Offmore primary school is full and has no room for expansion.
	LPPO2069	Object	<p>Baldwin Road is a small part of the proposed overall Green Belt development, too close to Hurcott Woods nature reserve which will affect wildlife. I object to development here. Do not build in and Green Belt land until all brownfield sites are exhausted first.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2074	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not suitable for the development proposed. • Green Belt will be destroyed - most of it agricultural land. • Would need to build a by-pass and rail bridge - costly (time and money). • Other sites are better.
	LPPO2087	Object	We object to Baldwin Road etc. Baldwin Road is a rat run to Hurcott lights now. It would be even worse if this went through.
	LPPO2103	Object	I object to development to the land the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area and I agree with the disadvantages given by the OCAQ-PL.
	LPPO2145	Object	Object to OC/4.
	LPPO2155	Object	Why does this side of town have to lose its Green Belt? We have perfectly good other sites such as the old Blakebrook school, Sladen school or Stourminster school. Kidderminster is a town of very high unemployment, our Doctor's surgeries can not cope, long waiting lists for hospital appointments, full to capacity schools. What about all the empty shops in town and the accommodation above them
	LPPO2179	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Hurcott development. • Loss of countryside and wildlife. • Dangerous and needs blocking off as access is not needed via Hurcott Road - this would protect wildlife and will be safer for pedestrians.
	LPPO2156	Object	I wish to object to the proposed building of houses on the Green Belt land. Kidderminster has a large proportion of unemployment and these proposals will put a huge strain on our already stretched doctors' surgeries, hospital and over crowded schools. Our roads (Land Oak, B'ham Road) are so heavy with traffic
	LPPO2242	Object	Proposed development to rear of Baldwin Rd objections and proposals relating to the provisional development plans.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Summary: Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The A456 is dangerous and has already been reduced from a dual-carriageway to a single lane highway complete with road narrowing, speed restrictors around Baldwin Road so to permit additional traffic into and from this estate would be imprudent. Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road are dangerous and occasionally gridlocked so any additional traffic would be ill-advisable. - Incursion into the Green Belt should not be permitted until ALL brown field development is completed. Linear development along the A456 towards Blakedown and Hagley will negate one of the purposes of Green Belt policy. <p>General response:</p> <p>My primary objection to this proposed development is increased traffic congestion and the inevitable increase in resulting accidents. The A456, which was a dual- carriageway, was deemed as sufficiently dangerous to be modified to a single lane highway complete with traffic calming obstructions around the proposed development area from the Land Oak to Hurcott Lane. To permit the development of several hundred homes and thereby, allow daily ingress and egress of several hundred additional vehicles onto the A456 would be reckless if not criminally negligent. Furthermore the routes to and from Hurcott Village ,which are already perilous, narrow and, occasionally, gridlocked, will, ineluctably, be further congested by this additional local traffic. Visitors walking to the Hurcott lake and woodland area are already risking their safety.</p> <p>My secondary objection is to UNNECESSARILY appropriate Green Belt land for housing. Green Belt was specifically designated to inhibit linear development which, in this case, would inexorably lead to a merging of Kidderminster with Blakedown and, in turn, with Halesowen and Birmingham. This remorseless “creep” should be vigorously resisted except, in extremis, where no alternatives exist. Fortunately, they do!</p> <p>Finally, a development of about 400 homes would not support its own schools, shops etc., and the residents would be compelled to travel to Kidderminster, Stourbridge, Worcester and Birmingham in search of these services thereby exacerbating the traffic problems.</p> <p>I understand that the Council has already identified Brownfield sites for 3000 dwellings. It should be imperative that these sites should be developed BEFORE Green Belt land is requisitioned and developed. The Hurcott hamlet, itself incubated from an historic paper mill and adjacent to SSSI nature reserve, should be preserved along with the lake and woodland as an attractive and valuable leisure amenity for the citizens of Kidderminster and district so that it’s attractions may remain available to all.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2243	Object	<p>Proposed development to rear of Baldwin Rd objections and proposals relating to the provisional development plans.</p> <p>Summary: Objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The A456 is dangerous and has already been reduced from a dual-carriageway to a single lane highway complete with road narrowing, speed restrictors around Baldwin Road so to permit additional traffic into and from this estate would be imprudent. Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road are dangerous and occasionally gridlocked so any additional traffic would be ill-advisable. - Incursion into the Green Belt should not be permitted until ALL brown field development is completed. Linear development along the A456 towards Blakedown and Hagley will negate one of the purposes of Green Belt policy. <p>General response:</p> <p>My primary objection to this proposed development is increased traffic congestion and the inevitable increase in resulting accidents. The A456, which was a dual- carriageway, was deemed as sufficiently dangerous to be modified to a single lane highway complete with traffic calming obstructions around the proposed development area from the Land Oak to Hurcott Lane. To permit the development of several hundred homes and thereby, allow daily ingress and egress of several hundred additional vehicles onto the A456 would be reckless if not criminally negligent. Furthermore the routes to and from Hurcott Village which are already perilous, narrow and, occasionally, gridlocked, will, ineluctably, be further congested by this additional local traffic. Visitors walking to the Hurcott lake and woodland area are already risking their safety.</p> <p>My secondary objection is to UNNECESSARILY appropriate Green Belt land for housing. Green Belt was specifically designated to inhibit linear development which, in this case, would inexorably lead to a merging of Kidderminster with Blakedown and, in turn, with Halesowen and Birmingham. This remorseless “creep” should be vigorously resisted except, in extremis, where no alternatives exist. Fortunately, they do!</p> <p>Finally, a development of about 400 homes would not support its own schools, shops etc., and the residents would be compelled to travel to Kidderminster, Stourbridge, Worcester and Birmingham in search of these services thereby exacerbating the traffic problems.</p> <p>I understand that the Council has already identified Brownfield sites for 3000 dwellings. It should be imperative</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			that these sites should be developed BEFORE Green Belt land is requisitioned and developed. The Hurcott hamlet, itself incubated from an historic paper mill and adjacent to SSSI nature reserve, should be preserved along with the lake and woodland as an attractive and valuable leisure amenity for the citizens of Kidderminster and district so that it's attractions may remain available to all.
	LPPO2278	Object	I am writing to you in response to the suggested planning proposal behind Baldwin Road. Two years ago I enquired about this land and was told that planning is not allowed on Green Belt land. I feel quite aggrieved that the Council is going back on its word.
	LPPO2358	Object	Baldwin Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current infrastructure cannot support suggested numbers. - Already bad traffic would be made worse. - Lack of primary school places. - Negative effect on wildlife
	LPPO2374	Object	I wish to raise my objection to the proposed development for Offmore/ Comberton area and Baldwin Road. There are frequent accidents at Husum Way/ Birmingham Road junction as well as traffic jams in and out of Kidderminster through the Land Oak. So many additional houses is going to increase the amount of traffic dramatically and pollution will increase. Bank holidays will be horrendous, particularly with the development of the Safari Park and the people this will bring to the area. This in turn could actually put people off visiting the area rather than increase tourism in the area. Access to any houses behind Baldwin Road would have to be from the Birmingham Road and where this is positioned is on a blind bend which would be highly dangerous. In addition, the amount of houses will put pressure on the local primary schools which are already at capacity and for King Charles High School which is near capacity and unable to extend further. There are endangered species living in the land which has been put forward to be removed from the Green Belt which must be protected. I question why all proposals for development are to the east side of Kidderminster and nothing proposed for the other parts of town. Development of industrial units by Hodgehill also brings additional traffic to what is an already extremely busy road. The cost of a new bypass which requires two railway bridges would be extortionate and while so many existing roads are desperately in need of resurfacing, is not justifiable.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2398	Object	<p>Object Greenhill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Green Belt important for wildlife - -already heavy traffic would worsen <p>A small development would not bring additional support to area unlike a large one e.g. at Lea Castle, which would inc new school, transport services, community facilities.</p>
	LPPO2563	Object	<p>I would like to object and comment on the proposed building rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area. The land you propose to build on is much higher than the existing Offmore Estate, overlooking nearby properties. The extra traffic would mean more noise and congestion. I appreciate that more houses are needed but more consideration should be given to Lea Castle being the better choice over the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area.</p>
	LPPO2603	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a pristine piece of land. Why tear it up? Other sites have already been built upon in the past. 2. This site is the main entry to the town approaching from the north and east. The proposed building work would be an urbanised eyesore for anyone driving into the town this way 3. This site is raised on a hill - it will tower over houses on Baldwin Road. Other sites aren't on a raised site like this and more easily blend into the landscape. 4. Houses on this site will add to existing traffic into the town and will create extra demand upon existing doctors, schools and other provisions. Other sites, such as Lea Castle would be large enough to warrant their own, new amenities and therefore not add pressure to other locations or require constant trips into the town. 5. Other sites already have existing plumbing and sewerage - Lea Castle, Sladen School site, Sion Hill school site, industrial units off Stourport Road and other disused factory sites within central Kidderminster. 6. These other sites are an eyesore that attract vandalism and metal theft, and should be used first, before fresh green sites are even considered. Why haven't they been built upon if housing is so urgently needed? Please ask the building firm why? 7. The majority of employment is based nearer other parts of Kidderminster. 8. The proposals for an 'Eastern Bypass'. Exactly what is this bypassing? I regularly travel across that section

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of the town - from Birmingham Road over to Bromsgrove at all times of day. There is almost never any congestion at all.</p> <p>9. Birmingham Road at Husum Way is already an accident prone junction which is confusing for some. Any entry or exit onto land to the rear of Baldwin Road will add to the danger considerably. Traffic lights will cause delays and add to the unsightly urbanised approach to the town.</p> <p>10. Finally, it is worth remembering that future generations will judge us by the decisions we have taken and the reasons why they were taken. Ripping up fields, creating a permanent blot on the horizon, just because it pleased building firms, will not be judged favourably.</p>
	<p>LPPO2658</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the Rear (East) of Baldwin Road, Appendix A (OC/4) refers. We consider a plan to develop this area for housing as inconsiderate, inappropriate, short sighted and piecemeal.</p> <p>Inconsiderate - because it will not address the needs of our well established community, we are already starved of local amenities which other areas enjoy.</p> <p>Inappropriate - we are very surprised and disappointed that the council is proposing to allow such erosion of our precious Green Belt land. Development on current Green Belt land will seriously impact on wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Short sighted - because there are many more suitable areas available, with far more development potential to provide a sustainable community.</p> <p>Piecemeal - by adding bits and pieces of development communities are being created with no heart!</p> <p>The residential area bounded by the Birmingham Road and Chester Road North, known locally as the Greenhill Estate has very few amenities - a pub at the Land Oak traffic lights, a fuel station on Birmingham Road and a small shop on Hurcott Road. There are currently approximately 1000 dwellings in this area of Greenhill with a possible 400 or more proposed by a would-be developer. If the land to the rear of Baldwin Road is to be developed for housing, amenities to serve this area and Hurcott village should be provided. For example, a park (shared open space), a village hall/community centre (to facilitate the promotion of community activities) a small group of shops, a good regular/dependable bus service etc., to put a heart into the community! "Twenty is plenty" speed restriction on traffic is needed, because the local roads in this area have become a rat run for drivers avoiding the congestion at the Land Oak Junction. Hurcott Road, Baldwin</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Road and Bruce Road are particularly affected. Also note the sooty deposits on roof tiles in the area, could this be due to air pollution by fumes from increased volume of traffic? Please see the brief below. * A history of “Traffic Calming” in the Greenhill Area.</p> <p>In Conclusion\; This Objection and Proposal is sent in good faith and without prejudice and will hopefully be received in a similar manner. We all have the interests of our local and neighbouring communities at heart. We hope that the council will appreciate some of the local issues raised before making final decision on any development on Green Belt land. * In Brief: A history of “Traffic Calming” in the Greenhill Area.</p> <p>1994 May I remind you that, as early as 1994 traffic in the Greenhill area was a problem. Back in May 1994 a petition bearing over 200 signatures from residents of Baldwin Road, Bruce Road and Coates Road regarding traffic calming was submitted.</p> <p>1995 In March 1995 a letter from special projects stated “I write now to confirm the inclusion of the area on to the County Councils ranked list of future schemes I envisage work will not commence until 1996/97 assuming the current fundings are maintained....”</p> <p>2000/1 Five years later, after the installation of traffic lights at the Hurcott Road/Chester Road junction created a massive increase in the volume of traffic using Baldwin Road and Hurcott Road to avoid the Birmingham Road congestion, a campaign was started. This was by residents of Hurcott Road who organized their own traffic survey, resulting in speed platforms being installed near to Sladen School. The local councillor stated she would be “ pressing for more traffic calming at the Birmingham Road end of Hurcott Road and in Baldwin Road in the next financial year “.</p> <p>2005 Following yet another accident on the bend in Baldwin Road all of the above information was sent to local councillors. No action to date.</p> <p>2017 Since the problem was originally acknowledged in 1995 traffic has become increasingly heavy in the area, Baldwin Road and Hurcott Road are unsuitable for bearing even more traffic that the proposed development will bring.</p>
	<p>LPPO2671</p>	<p>Object</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is Green Belt land and plays a vital part in our community for us and wildlife. We have endangered birds in this area and buzzards, hawks etc. 2. The schools are already full to the max and there is no room to expand. 3. Husum way is already a rat run for the A449. It will cause chaos to the rail as they cannot build another bridge it's too expensive.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. There are far too many deaths and accidents on the A449 Husum way/Hurcott road area due to planning of the junction. 5. There is always extreme flooding by Husum Way Bridge and in Shakespeare Drive.
	LPPO2677	Object	<p>I object to building on land to the rear of Baldwin Road under option A because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans do not include provision of new schools. The development falls in the catchment areas of Offmore Primary and King Charles 1 Schools, both of which are full and have no scope for expansion on existing sites. • The development is on high ground above the town and would be visible for some distance around. To replace the green fields at the edge of the town with a development would significantly affect the visual impact of that side of town. • The need for railway bridge provision makes it very unlikely that an Eastern bypass would ever be built. This development is reliant on such a bypass. • This is a serious incursion into Green Belt and takes away open land that separates us from the West Midlands Conurbation. These fields must not be built on. • The proposal would not create a sustainable community with schooling and village centre facilities. • Proposals to close Hurcott Lane would lead to increased traffic on Baldwin Road.
	LPPO2731	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill; 2. noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters; 3. pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc) 4. Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access by walking.
	LPPO2744	Object	<p>It is understood that there is a lack of enough brown field sites for the Wyre Forest planning department to take advantage of, in consideration of building nearly 6000 more new homes by 2034.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>However, the proposed options A and B have some serious disadvantages. A major one in our opinion is the likely impact on the two SSSI sites in the Hurcott area. With reference to the National Biodiversity Network data there are species in this area which have been verified that are on the red endangered list and frequent Hurcott Woods and the surrounding fields. We urge you visit the NBN web site and seriously consider the data that has been collected for area around the woods. The proposed linear add-on development to the west of Baldwin Road and Offmore Estate doesn't really seem to encourage the feeling of community, and the facilities on Offmore, e.g. the school wouldn't be able to expand or cope with extra demands on the infrastructure. Traffic congestion and the cost of road and railway bridge improvements would also be a serious financial disadvantage, to development in this area.</p>
	<p>LPPO2755</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I am opposed to the plans to develop the land rear to Baldwin Road and the Hurcott village area. I have not been reassured by information that the plans consider the local infrastructure nor the current residents for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • current road layouts are not suited for the extra traffic and would need significant alteration to safely incorporate another estate • With an increase of pedestrians (in particular children accessing Offmore primary) there would need to be provision of a suitable crossing. There is a crossing patrol (which I feel is inadequate for the road due to its traffic volume and width) further down the Birmingham road, but I fear people from the new estate would chance crossing the main road, rather than walk the extra distance to the patrol, if no other method is provided. The Birmingham road is a busy arterial route into Kidderminster: increasing traffic here will only increase the risk of injury to crossing pedestrians. • Without a suitable link road, Baldwin road and Hurcott lane would continue to and increasingly be used as rat runs. There is little room to expand these roads. Additionally, Hurcott lane is the primary access to Hurcott woods. More traffic flow here will inevitably increase the risk of pedestrian injury to those using the woods and lane as the road is narrow. • Any bypass linking the Wolverhampton road and Worcester road would require a bridge over the railway line. Creation of such a bridge seems an unlikely prospect due to its expense, requirements for sound buffering and also impact on natural habitats. • The land to the rear of Baldwin road is much higher than Baldwin road itself. Without proper landscaping

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the new estate would dominate the current houses and have a detrimental impact on our wellbeing and our house prices. Additionally, new build properties tend to have small gardens and I am concerned that the new houses will seem even closer to my boundary because of this and the elevation difference. Any development here needs to be considerably and sympathetically planned. I have not been reassured that this is the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am unsure of the necessity for new housing in Kidderminster - unless it is affordable starter homes - though I am concerned that the new development will mainly, if not entirely consist of larger, more expensive properties - which defeats the object I think the government are aiming for. • It is also disappointing that Green Belt land is being used and that such use will impact local wildlife, and encroach on the SSSI at Hurcott. <p>Overall I do not feel that sufficient thought has been applied to the proposed development to ensure that it integrates within the local area with as little interference and intrusion as possible.</p>
	LPPO2852	Object	<p>Concern at development on east side of Kidderminster. Lea Castle is big enough to include services, ie shops, schools, surgery and would negate need to develop other sites. Issues of traffic/pedestrian safety/impact on local infrastructure, schools and Hurcott nature reserve, a SSSI. Preserve Green Belt as a buffer zone between Kidderminster/Blakedown.</p>
	LPPO2868	Object	<p>Ref: Development behind Baldwin Road and Offmore proposals ‘The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’..... I strongly oppose this particular proposed development on our Green Belt for several reasons. Offmore and Comberton is already a ‘large’ housing estate, with many residents who need the open spaces of the Green Belt. Schools are already over subscribed and small estate roads used as main commuter routes to highlight just two ... any further development around this area will only compound these major concerns. I believe that WFDC have an obligation before embarking on any new development to safe guard and improve the environment/social care of the people already living there and a huge housing estate on the Green Belt which surrounds Offmore would be detrimental for all. I fully understand the need for housing and the compromises which will be needed ... I urge the Council to look for smaller sustainable sites and make certain that the basic NEW infrastructure is in place before the development starts, it is not acceptable for the Council just to accept that the present facilities are adequate.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2884	Object	<p>Object to proposal to develop Green Belt land to the rear of Baldwin Road for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Safety/Road access – Problem for over 20 years - Baldwin Road used as a rat run, excessive traffic as the Birmingham Road and the Land Oak junction cannot cope. • Without a proper bypass that bridges the railway line and joins the Birmingham Road to the Stourbridge and Worcester Roads will get worse. • Do not have the traffic infrastructure to cope with hundreds more residents. • Loss of amenity and privacy - land higher than the houses so any development would be highly visible and impossible to screen. An adverse impact on residential amenity on both sides of Baldwin Road. This field also provides the open space for the people of Greenhill, who have no other open space and suffer from pollution from the heavy traffic. • Development of Green Belt land behind Baldwin Road would have a very detrimental effect Hurcott Nature Reserve and pools and incorporates the largest area of SSSI woodland in Worcestershire and the field behind Baldwin Road is a very important green space that adjoins this nature reserve, providing routes and habitats for wildlife species that are of conservation concern, including woodpeckers, sparrows, starling, owls, kestrels, house martins, frogs, toads, grass snakes, bats, hedgehogs and numerous species of bee, all of which I have seen in or from my back garden. <p>I understand development is necessary but ensure that any development has good road access and facilities.</p>
	LPPO2911	Object	<p>I would like to object to the plans to build more housing near Hurcott village. The strategy I would prefer is to better utilise unoccupied commercial buildings and existing brown fields sites firstly, rather than destroying areas of outstanding beauty.</p>
	LPPO2945	Object	<p>We would also like to comment on the specific development proposed on Green Belt land behind Baldwin Road. This encroaches on the buffer zone needed to protect the SSSI Hurcott Nature Reserve. It will also have a detrimental impact on the landscape, open countryside and character of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road leading to the Village are already rat runs for motorists cutting through from the Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road. Further development of approximately 200 houses

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>proposed by Barberry will increase traffic and add to congestion on these narrow roads. Motorists often drive at speed through the Village and there have been a number of accidents and these will increase. It is also becoming increasingly dangerous for pedestrians walking their dogs or pushing young children in pushchairs along the narrow Hurcott Road to get to the pool and woods. Any diverted traffic proposed by the developers would increase traffic diverting along Hurcott Road from the Village. This road is narrower and has 2 blind bends resulting in motorists using the horn twice to warn on-coming traffic. This contributes to noise pollution in an otherwise quiet area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is Green Belt land which plays a vital role in separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands conurbation. The land to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and an intrusion on the landscape. This proposed development also includes 2 fields going down to Hurcott Village and intrudes on the buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSI. This will impact on the varied wildlife frequently seen in these fields including Roebuck deer, foxes, rabbits, and hedgehogs. The mature trees and various areas of shrub land/hedgerows are also home to a variety of birds including bats as well as in Hurcott Woods themselves. • The current proposal for development of Baldwin Road and Offmore would result in housing without any supporting infrastructure which is not sustainable. <p>We have lived in Kidderminster all our lives and contribute to the economy of Wyre Forest. Please do not include the Baldwin Road site in the WFDC local plan.</p>
	LPPO2951	Object	<p>I object to the above proposed development for many reasons: Lack of infrastructure — Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic. Since the opening of the Stourport link road the traffic on Husum Way has increased considerably and has become a rat run. How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husurn Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular. Offmore School is full and cannot be extended. GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that theses services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is arable land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.</p>
	LPPO2983	Object	<p>The challenges we currently face every morning getting onto Birmingham Road is significant. The traffic is heavy and at times dangerous. Baldwin Road is already used as a cut through, if more houses are built this will only increase. Local infra-structure i.e. GPs and dentists I believe are already struggling with local demand. The junction where Hurcutt Road meets Birmingham Road has had numerous accidents. It is a fatality waiting to happen. I am extremely concerned about wellbeing - we would not be able to move to a similar house that allows us to access outdoor space that is not substantially overlooked. We do not need large detached properties, we need 2/3 bedroomed affordable houses for people like me who are saving for their first property. There are sites around Kidderminster where I believe this can happen. It may not be where the large housing companies want due to not making the profit they are very use too.</p>
	LPPO3002	Object	<p>Kidderminster East, rear of Baldwin Road and Kidderminster North, south of Stourbridge Road</p> <p>Building on either side of Hurcott would destroy the attractiveness of this natural environment and considerably reduce the appeal of the district to both residents & visitors. The development rear of Baldwin road is elevated and would be a very visible intrusion on the landscape. The houses will be close enough to the village for it to lose its identity & become a district of Kidderminster. These proposed areas of development would lead to an increase of vehicular movement and the inevitable impact upon air quality very close to a site of SSSI. The traffic noise and air pollution would be detrimental to its wildlife. It is government policy “to conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England's wildlife and geology by sustaining and where possible, improving the quality and extent of natural habitat...”. It is a Key Principle (1 para vi) for planning decisions to “prevent harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests “. The developments either side of Hurcott go against these policies and principles. There would also be an increase of traffic along the already busy Hurcott Road and adjoining roads leading to Birmingham Road and into the Horsefair. The Kidderminster North developments would also increase the traffic into the Horsefair. This</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			would have an impact on the air quality and therefore residents' health.
	LPPO3067	Object	Object to proposed development in the Offmore Baldwin Road area. Significant road alterations would be needed with a new railway bridge. Eastern By Pass will be expensive, increased volume of traffic will mean Baldwin Road being used even more. An increase in traffic volume on the Birmingham Road /Offmore junctions will increase accident risk. Land behind Baldwin Road is elevated, development will be very visible. This area of Green Belt land is home to a number of endangered bird species which should be protected. Why is all the development being proposed for the east side of town and nothing for other areas? Schools cannot cater for an increased number. Offmore Primary is full and King Charles nearly full. The proposals will not lead to a sustainable community, no community centre, shopping facilities etc,
	LPPO3070	Object	Loss of wildlife.
	LPPO3080	Object	The Green Belt on the Birmingham Road is the gateway to Kidderminster and is enjoyed by visitors from Birmingham. I support the proposed Lea Castle "Sustainable Village". Please do not spoil the Green Belt to the rear of Baldwin road.
	LPPO3105	Object	The proposed land behind Baldwin Road is elevated and any development would overshadow the remaining Green Belt and the existing housing community. Any houses built on this site would put extra pressure on the existing primary schools that, at the moment, have no spare classroom spaces. The number of houses being built on this site would not sustain a school, doctor's surgery, shop or community centre thus no community atmosphere.
	LPPO3112	Object	Object for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic in these areas is already at unacceptable levels and any development would add to the already heavily used rat runs in these areas. • Loss of views and amenity / recreation space for local residents • Any bypass/link road to the east of Offmore would take away current breathing spaces and take up a nature resource and visual beauty • Visual impact of residential development at Baldwin Road (the land is much higher at the rear of Baldwin

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Road)</p> <p>What benefits this proposed development would bring to the area? Surely what is required is employment opportunities. If you build hundreds of houses on Green Belt land it will only attract those who will not work in the area but simply commute out of the area.</p>
	LPPO3139	Object	<p>Green Belt: The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSSI's.</p> <p>Transport and Accessibility: The Horsefair is an Air Quality Management Area. There will be an increase in traffic from the development at the rear of Baldwin Road. Traffic would use Hurcott Road and the Horsefair to access the town centre. Roads around Hurcott Road would be used as rat runs to access the A456 unless another road was built. Baldwin Road is already used as a rat run to avoid congestion at the Land Oak traffic lights. The A456 is a busy road particularly during rush hours and when the additional traffic is queuing to get to the West Midland Safari Park at weekends and holiday times. This has an impact on the air quality and the local roads.</p> <p>Policy 15D: The land is considerably higher than the rest of the area. When this is covered with concrete and tarmac there is a worry that the excess surface water will drain down into Baldwin Road especially in the event of a flash flood.</p> <p>16.3: I agree with the fact that pollution such as dust, noise, fumes and smell will have a detrimental impact on the environment and our quality of life.</p> <p>20: The proposed development at the rear of Baldwin Road would not be a sustainable community. It would have no community 'heart'. The only facilities on this side of town include a public house a garage and a small convenience store. The fields are regularly used by residents (including those from Offmore estate) for exercise and walking dogs. The fields have been used in this way for more than 25 years. There is a Doctors' Surgery located in Linden Avenue which has very limited parking so patients are forced to park on the road causing congestion and annoying the residents. The school in the catchment area is Offmore Primary which is full and on a restricted site. St. George's and St. Mary's are also full so a new school is needed.</p> <p>Policy 27A: iii) Neighbouring Amenity vii) Scale, Height and Massing "Development should provide an</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>adequate level of privacy, outlook ...and should not be overbearing" - At the rear of Baldwin Road the development would be overbearing because of the closeness of the new housing and the fact that the land is higher than the houses in Baldwin Road. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners. viii) See previous comments on rat run, access to A456 and air quality.</p> <p>Policy 28D 28.14: The agricultural land at the rear of Baldwin Road is Grade 2 (very good). At present the fields are productive with barley being grown. I am concerned about the detrimental effect any development would have on the wildlife of the area, as well as the destruction of hedges and mature trees. The Hornet Robberfly has been in the fields for many years along with rabbits, foxes pheasants and a number of different species of birds including skylarks. Skylines, hill features and prominent views of such features e.g. Clent Hills, contribute to local landscape character and as such should be protected from development.</p> <p>To summarise - I strongly object to the land at the rear of Baldwin Road being used for development when there are more suitable sites available.</p>
	LPPO3140	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We object to the proposed development to the east of Offmore/Comberton and Baldwin Road area. • Development would be a visual incursion and cause noise and pollution
	LPPO3147	Object	<p>I want object to the proposed building at the rear of Baldwin Road. We cannot understand why you need to build on this land rather than using Lea Castle site. We have lived in Baldwin Road for a long time and we specifically brought the house due to its location and wonderful view. Our family enjoys the peaceful and beautiful area for walking, cycling and exercise. Lea Castle has all the necessary infrastructure to support a large estate.</p>
	LPPO3149	Object	<p>I object to planned building to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore. I believe this would have a negative impact on wildlife and pose increased pressure on local schools (Offmore is already full). As a local resident I have seen many road traffic collisions on the Birmingham / Offmore turn, therefore with increased traffic this could see more collisions. I believe that the site at Lea Castle would prove a more viable option and have less negative impact on local services and wildlife. The site is on an easily accessible main road and is ready to be developed. There are also 3 local schools within that catchment.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3184	Object	Hurcott Lane often becomes 'rat runs' when traffic problems occur on either the Stourbridge or Birmingham Roads, causing congestion problems and danger to pedestrians walking to/from the Village and Nature Reserve. To fill the area behind Baldwin Road with housing will only exacerbate the problems.
	LPPO3191	Object	<p>Against proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster separates Worcestershire from the West Midlands. • The Eastern By Pass would have to be built from the Wolverhampton Road to the Worcester Road to be of any use as anything shorter would cause roads around the Hurcott area to become heavily congested/rat runs/dangerous. • There are endangered bird species along the bypass route. • As a bypass road would be needed before land to the east of offmore could be developed this means this development should not go ahead • the eastern bypass would need an expensive railway bridge which no developer sound be willing to fund • The elevated position of the western bypass would need at least a 30m tree screen to buffer against traffic noise. • development of Green Belt site will lead to increase in localised flooding as the water course will be disrupted • Development of the land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on protected wildlife habitats and incursion onto the buffer zones SSSIs. • A linear development impact on community spirit and would not include local amenities/increase in anti-social behaviour and crime. • Offmore Primary School already full. • Would not support a new bus route.
	LPPO3247	Object	I'm particularly concerned with the amount of extra traffic that plans to build would create as there is already a long queue of traffic down the Birmingham Road each day in the rush hour am & pm traffic, surely the roads will be gridlocked with considerably more traffic from the proposed amount of homes.
	LPPO3253	Object	1. The local schools are already full to capacity and have no room to expand.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>2. The development behind Baldwin Road would have a huge impact on wild life habitats.</p> <p>3. Access to the new houses would be a big concern - if around 350 houses have been proposed, most households would have 2 cars. The volume of traffic would be ridiculous and very dangerous in that area.</p>
	LPPO3304	Object	<p>Regarding the proposed building of houses to the rear of Baldwin Road, have you considered the impact this would have?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of cars coming onto the main Birmingham/Kidderminster Road. Remember most families have at least one car, some have two or more, a very dangerous place to join to busy flow of traffic. • What about wildlife? • There are other sites suited to this proposal, what about the site of Sion Hill School, or the Sladen School site which has stood empty for 10 years, plus the boarded up properties across the Wyre Forest. • Will any of these houses be offered to people in the council house waiting list, or for those able to buy, probably outsiders. • Then there is the extra strain on other services. Hospitals, schools, public transport etc. <p>I am not in favour of this scheme. This area has always been known as Greenhill. Please let's keep it that way. GREEN.</p>
	LPPO3311	Object	<p>Infrastructure to areas WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any substantial increase in housing. The A456 would require substantial capacity development to deal with the increase in traffic, if this was achieved Husum Way will not cope. An additional road and a bridge over the railway would be required. This is unlikely to happen due to the high development costs and therefore the affordability of the housing scheme. There is currently a high level of wildlife within this area including badgers, foxes, deer and a large variety of birds, including endangered species. This development would have a significant impact on them and should not go ahead. Currently the A456 is a single lane carriageway and would not be able to cope with the proposed industrial development near Hodge Hill Farm. This proposal does not support a sustainable community, does not accommodate a neighbourhood centre and will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. The Offmore primary school is currently at</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			full capacity and cannot be developed as it is on a restricted site.
	LPPO3314	Object	<p>Against plans for housing at back of Baldwin Road, Kidderminster for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic problems - Green Belt land - Wildlife - Threats to public rights of way - GP surgeries already overcrowded - Primary school already overcrowded in WFDC - Air quality
	LPPO3317	Object	<p>Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. If this is built on it will reduce the separation between dwellings from Kidderminster, Hurcott and Blakedown. An Eastern Bypass would need to be built to accommodate the extra traffic caused by the increase in dwellings. This would need to be built from the Worcester Road to the Wolverhampton Road. There are endangered species along this route so it must not be developed. Any eastern bypass would need to cross the railway as the Husum Road bridge is inadequate. If this is not done the excess traffic would bring the area to halt as it would not cope. The expense of building a railway crossing would be extortionate and I doubt the council or developers can afford this. The elevated position of the new road linking the Wolverhampton Road and Worcester Road would mean it'd require at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSI's. There are no parks or recreational areas in the Green Hill area. If the development were to go ahead in this area the only likely venue for recreation would be Hurcott woods. Due to the proximity there to the proposed development OC/4 people would more likely favour walking. Neither road leading to Hurcott is safe for pedestrians as it is narrow with a lot blind hills and corners. With the increased traffic of both pedestrians and vehicles there would not doubt be an increase in accidents. The habitat for many flora and fauna in Hurcott woods would be over used and would suffer from an increase in pollution (noise, dog fouls</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and litter) This would ruin the natural habitat. A Linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no heart and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. Offmore Primary school is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended. The extra dwellings would not have local schools to use so would need to drive to nearby schools. This will increase pollution and worsen the already bad traffic in the surround roads during rush house. The topography to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher that the surrounding area. This would mean the visual impact of a development here would be an eye sore.</p>
Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans	LPPO3321	Object	<p>It is inevitable that some land will have to be removed from the Green Belt for future development. However we believe that there should be a presumption that major future development should have the aim of creating sustainable communities of a size capable of supporting, at least, its own Primary School, village centre with shops and community facilities, if possible some live work units and adequate recreational facilities, and not simply be an ‘add on’ to existing communities. We object to the “Core Sites” around the east of Kidderminster in both Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. • The land in question is Grade 2 Agricultural Land. • There are endangered bird species: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers, Skylarks and Lapwings are present in this land and along the route the “by pass “would have to take from the A456 to the A449. As well as the birdlife there are foxes, badgers, rabbits, muntjac and roe deer present across the area. • Development of land behind Baldwin Rd would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSSI. • Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Rd. is considerably higher than the rest of the area so development would be very visible. • Hurcott Lane and the narrow extension of Hurcott Rd. into Hurcott Village are extremely dangerous roads with far too frequent serious road traffic accidents. Any development of land to the rear of Baldwin Rd. would have to somehow incorporate the existing Hurcott Lane/Birmingham Rd. Junction. • Eastern bypass: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would have to be built from the Wolverhampton Rd to the Worcester Rd to be of any use as

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>anything shorter would cause roads around Hurcott Rd/ Birmingham Rd. to be used as rat runs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would be needed before land to the east of Offmore could be developed. ○ Would need at least one and probably two new Railway Bridges. These are incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for them. ○ The elevated position would need at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. • Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to avoid congestion • Drainage of the land to the rear of the existing Offmore estate is extremely poor. In recent years heavy rain has led to serious flooding into gardens in Prior Close, Chaucer Cres., Offmore Farm Close, Ruskin Close and Munro Close. Even at times of severe drought, the high water table on the Offmore Estate means that if a two foot deep hole is dug in a garden on the lower part of the estate, it rapidly fills with water. • A linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no community “heart” and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. The Cavalier PH, Offmore Evangelical Church and Offmore Primary School are the only “community facilities” on the existing Offmore estate. The proposed extension of the estate would not be able to provide any extra facilities which would be accessible to existing residents. • Offmore Primary School is full, is on a restricted site and can’t be extended.
	LPPO3365	Object	Objects to plans for the Green Belt land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore/Comberton area.
	LPPO3368	Object	Opposes development at Baldwin Road because the area forms a natural separation between Green Belt and Kidderminster Borough and separates the town from the adjacent West Midlands towns. Concerned at lack of employment opportunities in Kidderminster and the impact of a growing population as they have to travel to work and add to road congestion, pressure on schools and Worcester hospital.
	LPPO3417	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing here would remove all the habitats which wildlife that have been identified as at risk depend on. • This land is considerably higher than the surrounding so development would be very visible. The views as you drive into Kidderminster currently help lift the appearance of the area. Building vast amounts of property here is likely to have a further detrimental effect on Kidderminster’s reputation and appeal as a

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>place to visit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction on the Birmingham Road onto Husum Way is already very dangerous and proposing to add to the traffic and congestion in that area would be catastrophic. • People would use the Hurcott Road as a 'rat run' even more then they do now, it is already a dangerous road which has seen many an accident. • To overcome the congestion issue a by pass would need to be built and no development should take place until this has been done. The by pass would need at least one railway bridge, which would be incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for it. • The houses could also prove difficult for a private developer to sell due to the traffic noise from the Birmingham Road and the traffic congestion your proposals will cause. • The community would have no heart and could not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. There would also be no local schools children could walk to as Offmore is already full and cannot be extended. • I appreciate houses needs to be built but they should not all be piled on one area which is what you are proposing.
	LPPO3418	Object	<p>We object to the proposed local plan for rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Green Belt plays a vital role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. 2. Without a by pass, all the roads around Hurcott Road will be used as rat runs to an even greater extent than they already are. 3. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt; additionally, this would impact on wildlife habitats in the buffer zones for Hurcott & Podmore SSIs. 4. Birmingham Road is often already congested; this would be much worse. 5. The proposed linear development would have no community heart. 6. Offmore primary school is already full and cannot be extended. 7. Additional building at a higher level will add to flood risk around Husum way & Hurcott Road.
	LPPO3437	Object	<p>The proposed sites either side of Hurcott Village is home to several species of animals and birds (skylarks,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			linnets, corn buntings etc.) and should be protected. Hurcott Road is already heavily polluted by traffic fumes and several hundred more cars will make it worse for the Horsefair and Hurcott Road residents. There is also a lack of infrastructure and any new development in the Hurcott Road, Baldwin Road and Spennells area would result in children having no primary school places.
	LPPO3448	Object	Families have used the rights of way for children to run free, and see the animals and birds. There are so many other sites where there have already been buildings. There is also the amount of extra traffic on Hurcott Road.
	LPPO3453	Object	Building behind Baldwin Road and the Offmore and Comberton areas would start a potential chain of development into Blakedown and other areas. Leave Green Belt alone.
	LPPO3583	Object	The challenges we currently face every morning exiting Baldwin road onto Birmingham Road is significant. The traffic is heavy and at times just dangerous. It is dangerous the speed some drivers come through and a number of cats have been killed on this road. Local infra-structure i.e. GPs and dentists I believe are only struggling with local demand. The junction where Hurcutt Road meets Birmingham Road has had numerous accidents. It is a fatality waiting to happen. The field at the Back of Baldwin Road is on a hill, it would mean we are completely overlooked. We do not need large detached properties, we need 2/3 bedroomed affordable houses for people like my daughter who is saving for her first property.
	LPPO3597	Object	Reasons for Objection of Proposed Core Housing Site behind Baldwin Road As a resident of Baldwin Road who would be affected if this scheme is approved, my reasons for rejection of this proposed scheme are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in property value • Interruption of rural outlook • Removal of privacy • Light reduction • Additional noise • Disruption throughout development

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in traffic flow • Capacity of local schools • Capacity of health care provision • Removal of leisure facilities • Employment opportunities • Environmental effects • New services costs • Access • Traffic volumes <p>Alternative Development Options for Consideration: The space opposite Homebase on Chester Road South (old sports ground?) The site of the former Sladen Middle School on Hurcott Road The site of the former Sion Hill Middle School on Sion Hill The site of the former Wyre Forest Glades Leisure Centre Unused space within Crown House in the town centre Use of the many empty redundant retail and industrial units around Kidderminster The creation of a “Lea Castle village” on the whole site area of the former hospital</p>
	LPPO3649	Object	<p>I would like to make the following observations and comments on the proposed Wyre Forest Local Plan. In particular with reference to the area to the north-east of Kidderminster extending between Hurcott Village and the Stourbridge Road in the north, and Hurcott Village and the Birmingham Road to the south. Concerns and Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas of Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster play a key role in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. • The Local Plan predominantly concentrates proposed development along a wide eastern corridor. Is this not disproportionate? • The removal of Green Belt should only occur in exceptional circumstances when all other sites (ADR and brownfield) have been built upon.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large areas, currently owned by developers who have designated planning permission, are not being developed due to a lack of financial viability. While these areas remain undeveloped Wyre Forest is being forced to consider other sites. Surely the structure and details of the Local Plan should be in the hands of WFDC and not potential developers. • The proposed development behind Baldwin Road, formerly known as Greenhill, is currently Green Belt. Development on this area would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSSI • Greenhill has a considerable elevation when viewed from the Birmingham Road. Any development here would have a visual impact on the landscape resulting in an urban rather than rural approach to Kidderminster. • Hurcott Lane is currently a “rat-run” between the Stourbridge and Birmingham roads. At peak periods this road turns from a ‘country lane to a very dangerous road as indicated by the vehicular accident rates at either end of Hurcott Lane. There are now 12 man-made pull-ins in the half mile stretch between Hurcott Village and the A456. Further development to the north or south of Hurcott Village will only exacerbate this situation. This issue with Hurcott Lane needs to be dealt with as a matter of urgency before further fatalities occur. • The eastern end of Hurcott Road, extending from Baldwin Road to the junction with Hurcott Lane is used by many people for recreation; walkers, joggers, children in pushchairs and adults in wheel chairs. This is a much valued area of recreation frequently used by many residents on the eastern side of the town who visit the Nature Reserve on foot. These people are often in danger from speeding traffic as they enter and leave Hurcott Village. Once again any development, north or south of Hurcott will increase traffic flow on Hurcott Road - therefore increasing the danger for pedestrian access to the nature reserve.
	LPPO3740	Object	<p>The view was breathtaking. I do remember the solicitor reassuring us nothing would ever be built at the rear as the land was Green Belt, but I do realise in today's terms 'ever' does not mean never. There are approximately 16,000 registered patients at the new medical centre in Waterloo Street. How we would manage if we had to potentially take on hundreds of new patients I cannot imagine.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3771	Object	I wish to lodge my objection to the proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton areas. This involves interrupting a natural wildlife habit- bird sanctuary at Hurcott Pool which has taken years to develop and is hugely supported by nature lovers and walkers - why destroy a beautiful area it is your duty to make sure this valuable area is conserved. Which private developer would pay for a new Railway Bridge which this Eastern By Pass would require? This would be an elevated position which would need screening off! The local school would not be able to cope - so what would your answer be to this problem.
	LPPO3773	Object	I would have serious concerns about the proposed housing developments for Baldwin Road and Offmore surrounding areas. This area of Kidderminster is already congested with school issues, traffic issues, etc., The wildlife habitat in Hurcott Wood and the Green Belt areas of Offmore Farm would be severely affected.
	LPPO3774	Object	The local plan presents us with a series of options for development - all of which involve building on areas of what is currently rural or semi-rural land. We are expected to accept that one of these options is inevitable. Green Belt/Green Field land plays an essential role in sustaining the structure of any urban community. Improving air quality, sustaining wildlife, or simply creating the balance of environment for the physical and mental well-being of the population are all basic requirements for any modern town - it is not something that can just be pushed further out on demand. The fact that councils are being given the green light to remove the protected status of such areas is wrong in principle. The plans describe the proposed developments as land to the rear of Baldwin Road (OC/4). These are fields stretching across to Hurcott which is well known locally as a semi-rural community. It also has important historical significance with its paper-making tradition reaching back to the Middle Ages. This is far more than just another piece of real estate in waiting; for thousands of local residents it is their piece of countryside, for many it is why they chose to live there and why (at the moment) they want to stay there. The area in question is high land – any development here would be seen from a great distance across to the East where the land falls away considerably. The current vista forms part of the rural gateway to Kidderminster– an intrinsic part of the town’s character. Planners and councillors should not underestimate the role of these aspects in separating Worcestershire communities from the West Midlands conurbation and in attracting visitors and consumers from the Black Country and beyond. The prospect of new housing will create stagnation in the local housing market. Buyers will be unlikely to invest in properties knowing that the character of the vicinity is about to change dramatically. The value of these houses will fall so that owners will not be able to get the price they need in order to sell.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Contrary to the wording used within the plan – extending the town will make Kidderminster a LESS desirable place to live. Another area earmarked as “Core housing” is the land to the East of Offmore Farm (OC/6). This farmed land is a key aspect of the local environment and any attempts to develop it will not only add to the strain on infrastructure described elsewhere in this letter, it would dramatically reduce the quality of life of the thousands of families on the estate – as well as adversely affecting the value of their homes. Changing the use of this land would be wrong on historical, political and environmental levels – it should not even be considered. Looking at the maps in the Local Plan document, it is clear that the core housing sites will result in the greatest depletion in Green Belt land and are the most serious threat to the rural buffer that is essential to the character of the town. Building on this landscape would be an affront to the people who live in the community. It would be damaging the lives of existing inhabitants in order to meet an expected quota. Real life quality sacrificed for theoretical need. The local authority’s budget is straining to manage the needs of the existing town population on issues ranging from road maintenance to healthcare. Extending the town on this scale will only worsen the problem. Furthermore we do NOT want an Eastern relief road with the resulting disruption, noise, pollution, corrosion of local character and damage to the environment, it would bring. If an increasing population is the cause of the perceived shortfall in house building more and more houses on Green Belt is not addressing that problem. Neither is it sustainable, for band after band of new developments will eventually deplete the rural spaces between towns to an extent that they are no longer effective as green spaces. Developing the Eastern side of the town will adversely affect the lives of thousands. Surely it would be to the council’s advantage to minimise the number directly affected and therefore the level of opposition that will be directed at them. If there has to be large scale development around Kidderminster, dispersal is preferable to extending an already busy town. This allows new “settlements” to develop their own infrastructure, maintains an element of separation between communities, reducing inevitable problems caused an increased concentration of traffic and population and spreading demand for services (for employment, retail, education, healthcare, transport links etc) across a wider range of towns and communities. It also allows new developments to be designed in a way that has less of an impact visually and environmentally. The council asks if we prefer Option A or Option B. The problem is that, as long as both options include the areas designated as Core housing sites on the Eastern edge of the town neither are going to be acceptable to the majority of people that the proposals affect. Option B is offered as the dispersal option but the swathe of heavy development to the East of Kidderminster makes it anything but. If the council wants to achieve any kind of acquiescence it will need to re-draft these proposals without the core housing</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			sites that appear in the current plans.
	LPPO3775	Object	I object to the proposal for building houses to the rear of Baldwin Rd and the Offmore Comberton area. There is perfectly good land going to waste in the old Lea Castle site, why can't that be used instead? The roads surrounding that area are more robust than the smaller roads surrounding Baldwin Road. The effect on the surrounding wildlife in Hurcott village would be devastating, and while I understand we need more housing surely that shouldn't be at the expense of our beautiful countryside and wildlife? Baldwin Rd is already used as a cut through and the majority of cars do not respect the speed limit and use it as a race track. More housing in this area would just increase this and put the families at risk along this road. What are the plans to support the increased infrastructure that would be needed if we suddenly have hundreds of extra families in the area? Kidderminster Hospital is already at breaking point and where would the children go to school? To cope with the increase of traffic, there would be more roads built, more traffic, more noise pollution and no-one policing the speed limits or behaviour of the motorists. It has already been established that the site at Lea Castle has enough space to accommodate a new school, bus services and plenty of houses. So surely this can be considered as a logical area for development?
	LPPO3778	Object	We would like to voice our concern to the proposed building developments adjacent to Hurcott Lane and on the Lea Castle site. We support the need to build more affordable housing, particularly on brownfield sites, but feel that without improving the local infrastructure traffic, school and NHS chaos will follow. Any development for Baldwin Road or land off the Stourbridge Road would cause impossible traffic situations for Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road. No traffic count or accident details can illustrate the reality of the dangers for motorists or pedestrians on these routes. The issue of Hurcott Lane needs to be addressed. Access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve and preservation of the SSSI site needs to be protected. The reality of no pavement and safe pedestrian access along Hurcott Lane to the Nature Reserve needs to be a priority and the volume of traffic restricted. Motorists will inevitably select the Hurcott Lane route to access the Birmingham Road. I'm sorry if developers' profit will be affected by constructing a suitable Eastern by-pass, but Wyre Forest should not allow construction of housing if existing routes and a valued Nature Reserve are compromised and made increasingly unsafe.
	LPPO3781	Object	We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health,

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>pollution and social problems. Alternative brown field sites are available along with pockets of derelict land ripe for redevelopment. The amount of development required has also been vastly overestimated and the actual amount needed could be sustained on alternative brown sites (Lea Castle, disused pubs, disused factories such as those in Park Lane, Sladen/Sion Hill schools).</p> <p>Pollution: Any development of these areas would substantially increase the already heavy traffic pollution. We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. Also the speed of this traffic is seriously dangerous, especially to children, the vulnerable and animals. This development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. Add to this an increase in the already incessant traffic noise levels. I would not wish to see a further increase in traffic using Hurcott Road. The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Road infers that Hurcott Lane will require the road to be blocked for vehicle access at either the Birmingham Road or Stourbridge Road ends but this will not prevent traffic flow just divert more traffic into Hurcott Road increasing pollution and volumes of traffic on roads only designed for local residential traffic which have inadequate flow characteristics. In conclusion, this is not a healthy and community spirited decision to develop the area. Baldwin Road is similarly treated like a rat run and as for the Horsefair how much more can this bottle neck sustain? We are trying to improve the look of this run down area not destroy it and end all hope of engendering a happy community spirit. Extra housing would require a by-pass to be built as the aforementioned roads just cannot sustain more traffic and the pollution it brings.</p> <p>Wildlife: The area is known and loved for its beauty and wildlife. This Green Belt plays an aesthetic role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation and these green fields are the first glorious introduction to Kidderminster on the A451 and A456. Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. Consider the importance of recreational activities in terms of health, wellbeing and tourism. People need space to thrive. Its unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. Compared with neighbouring towns like Stourbridge we are lucky to have such big green spaces. Don't destroy it for future generations when alternative brown or derelict sites are available. Endangered species, indeed wildlife in general would be threatened. Development would seriously impact and cause irrecoverable change to wildlife habitats especially on buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSIs. Some proposed development sites have steep gradients which could raise the risk of potential flooding. The proposed development behind Baldwin Road has the potential to flood, on one side with run off towards the Birmingham Road with a natural hollow in the main road and on the other side run</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>off towards the lower end of Hurcott Road where it is a narrow lane which in turn would run off into the outfall from Hurcott Pool and transfer to Broadwaters with the potential for flooding the adjacent main road. Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is generally much higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and not blend in spoiling the beauty of the area. The field height to the rear of Baldwin Road means that the proposed properties would adversely overlook the existing properties & their gardens at the lower end of Baldwin Road. The Government's own policy regarding planning decisions is to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological interests. In brief all planning decisions must consider location on alternative sites to green fields.</p> <p>Amenities and Community Spirit: We already suffer from a lack of amenities in this area. One shop in which our post office was taken off us. A smattering of shops in Spennells and Offmore. Can local schools accommodate extra housing on this level? Offmore is already full and can't be developed. We no longer have an acute hospital so all this extra population would place more pressure on Worcester Royal already facing special measures. This also raises questions with regards the existing level of doctors, dentists and opticians in the area. Public transport is poor and infrequent. Big developments generally have no community spirit. Building on smaller pockets of land fosters integration. Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP. Doubling the size of Spennells would not be a wise move.</p> <p>Conclusion: We need smaller numbers of houses proposed which can be sustained by brown sites like Lea Castle. Smaller pockets of once used land should be considered like factories on Park Lane, closed pubs (The Broadwaters?) closed schools like Sladen and Sion Hill. We need to reinvigorate existing eyesores such as disused schools & factories which are frequently vandalised and this will improve some of the more rundown areas rather than permanently erode Green Belt sites, which once gone they are gone forever. Don't bulldoze green field sites prior to using up every brown field or derelict site in the locality.</p>
	LPPO3859	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt acts as a barrier to the joining up to the conurbation spread from West Midlands. • Rat runs could be created causing danger to people. • Other options are more suitable. • Infrastructure would not be able to support the increased population.
	LPPO3863	Object	We are writing in response to the above. Whilst we understand the need for a local plan and continued

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>housing development in the Wyre Forest, we must object in the strongest terms to any proposal to use Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Road and down into Hurcott Village. There are a large number of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest, particularly Kidderminster, which either do not appear in the plan or show absolutely no signs of development. These sites, e.g. the former Sladen School, former Sion Hill School, former Stourminster School, the Yew Tree Public House and run down factory and similar sites in and around Kidderminster show no signs of or intention to develop. These sites would significantly contribute to housing development land before any incursion into significantly larger areas of Green Belt land. The Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Rd is well developed agricultural land and contributes to environmental and agricultural sustainability for this area. The Green Belt land provides vital separation from Blakedown, Hagley and from the wider Bromsgrove and West Midlands area. Land here is also significantly higher than the surrounding land and would cause significant visual and environmental impact. This Green Belt land provides numerous wildlife habitats and development would seriously impact on ecological sustainability, biodiversity and the designated SSI areas. Any development behind Baldwin Rd, beyond Offmore and into Hurcott village would be smaller linear developments with no possibility of a community heart, community facilities and ongoing socio-cultural sustainability. These areas would not support the building of a primary school and local schools are already very full, Offmore Primary school which serves this area is full and cannot be extended. Roads in this area are already busy and dangerous with frequent accidents, Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Rd are used daily as 'rat runs/cut throughs' and increased development would bring this to intolerably dangerous levels. Developments such as behind Baldwin Rd would not generate a large enough financial contribution to roads and infrastructure to manage safety and increased capacity, indeed the development promoter for the rear of Baldwin Rd stated categorically that they would only 'contribute' to a new roundabout at the top of Husum way (a roundabout which would only serve to increase traffic and safety problems)! The promoter also stated that they would not bear any of the expense of roads or infrastructure, let alone a full scale eastern by-pass.</p>
	LPPO3887	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently have inadequate facilities and infrastructure. • Do not need industrial development. • The development would need shops/community facilities. • Will create environmental damage. • The development should include home for older couples and single people.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3900	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt land. • We are a 'Garden of England' area - how long for? • Our heritage needs for these areas to refresh us, tress to sustain air quality and to protect wildlife habitat. • Once Green Belt is gone there is no going back. • When we need more land to grow food in the future it won't be there. • We need breaks between Kidderminster, Stouport & Bewdley. • Wildlife habitats are under enough pressure - leave tem alone.
	LPPO3908	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission was refused 6 years ago to build a semi built onto house. • Were told no new houses were to be built in the area. • Fought for the public footpath to stay at the land behind Baldwin Road. • Accidents on Husum Way, Birmingham Road junctions will only increase - already have many. • Have a lovely view of fields - don't want to look at new builds. • Where will the birds go? • Lack of schools, doctors etc. • Lea Castle would be a better option.
	LPPO3911	Object	<p>The whole area seems to be a series of 'rat-runs' at many times of the day. Hurcott Road, Hurcott Lane, Husum Way and Tennyson Way are all very busy roads some with difficult junctions. Any development on this side of town would need a substantial By-Pass from the Wolverhampton Road to the Worcester Road with possibly two very expensive railway crossings. Hurcott Lane really needs widening to make it safer (not a single track road with passing places) The busy junctions at The Park Gate and Husum Way/Birmingham Road need significant improvements to make them safer. Whichever options are chosen the road network needs significant improvements to maintain safety and minimise congestion</p>
	LPPO3930	Object	<p>I am writing to you to appose the proposal of local plans for the land to the rear of Baldwin Rd and Offmore Comberton area. I dont agree that the east Kidderminster Green Belt land should be built on when there are perfectly good sites for development such as, a sustainable village on lea Castle, I also feel that there is land that could be used at the existing Ferndale estate. There are many reasons why these proposals should not go</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			ahead , An eastern by pass would need at least one new railway bridge, Offmore Primary School is full,is on a restricted site,and cannot be extended, Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to avoid congestion.All these and many more reasons should be carefully considered.
	LPP03946	Object	<p>We are writing to request your consideration not to release the Green Belt land at the rear of our property for development. We understand that all Brown Field sites have already been allocated for development and that additional land needs to be made available in order to support the ever growing population and the local housing need, we believe this does not have to be the land on Baldwin and Offmore. Please see below are reason for objection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We want to protect the Green Belt land and the beauty of the countryside and all the wildlife within it. We have Bat's, Muntjacs, Snakes and a variety of rare birds living in the area. Although, it would appear from proposals that we have seen that a protection zone would be created around the trees on the proposed site, we feel that noise and light pollution would have a major impact on the wildlife. 2. We worry that Kidderminster's boundary would be moving nearer to Blakedown and that the visual approach to the town from the Birmingham Road would change the existing landscape dramatically, parts of the area are much higher and we feel it would be an "eye sore" and it would change the character of the whole area. 3. The local Schools have no capacity to take on additional pupils, the doctor's surgery just about copes. The infrastructure of the bridge at Offmore could not withstand additional traffic, the local roads are already used as "rat runs" from our understanding The Barbury Group have no intention of developing or supporting cost's for any road improvement programmes.
	LPP03949	Object	Development to rear of Baldwins Road/Hurcott Village would worsen traffic access around Hurcott Village (change from top that being a through road?) and affect the nature reserves.
	LPP03952	Object	Objection development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm & Comberton and would like to include Franche and Ferndale:

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope now • The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built • The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation • Loss of wildlife/arable land
	LPPO3953	Object	<p>Object to development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm & Comberton and would like to include Franche and Ferndale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope now • The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built • The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation • Loss of wildlife/arable land
	LPPO3968	Object	<p>Objection to the proposed development of land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton, Kidderminster. I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure - Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic. • We have lived in Husum Way for the past 20 years and have seen the traffic increase tremendously over this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and as we live on the corner of Shakespeare Drive we find it very difficult to get out, particularly since the Stourport Link Road has opened and Husum Way is being used as a cut through.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents living in Husum Way would appreciate — and all agree — that something should be done about Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction before considering more houses being built in and around this immediate area. • How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular. • Offmore Farm School is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. • The Green Belt pays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat. • Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing whereas the land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is ample land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.
	LPPO3970	Object	<p>Objection to the proposed development of land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton, Kidderminster. I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure - Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic. • We have lived in Husum Way for the past 20 years and have seen the traffic increase tremendously over this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and as we live on the corner of Shakespeare Drive we find it very difficult to get out, particularly since the Stourport Link Road has opened and Husum Way is being used as a cut through. • Residents living in Husum Way would appreciate — and all agree — that something should be done about Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction before considering more houses being built in and around this

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>immediate area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular. • Offmore Farm School is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. • The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat. • Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing whereas the land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is amble land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.
	LPPO3981	Object	The options of plan 'A' and 'B' would cause a considerable volume and build up of traffic congestion not to say the loss of agricultural land would be a bad idea.
	LPPO3983	Object	Object to OC/4.
	LPPO3985	Object	I am opposed to any development on Greenfield sites unless all brownfield sites have been developed except those too badly contaminated. I believe that the proposals for building on the east of Offmore OC/6 and the rear of Baldwin Road OC/4 would not result in any meaningful communities. This would also put added pressure on Offmore Primary School which is on a restricted site. Nor development on land to the east of Kidderminster should occur until the by-pass has been constructed and it would need to start at the Stourbridge Road because Hurcott Road and Baldwin Road are already used as 'rat runs' now and would only become much worse. The area to the rear of Baldwin Road down to Hurcott Lane is well used and much loved by walkers, dog owners and anyone interested in the countryside. It would be an eyesore if built on due to its

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			elevation.
Anonymous	LPPO3993	Object	OC/4, OC/5, OC/6, and OC/13. I object to the plans and fully support the counter-proposals outlined by the OCAG-LP to extend the use of land at Lea Castle by adding to options A and B and create a community of around 2500 houses without impinging on good quality Green Belt agricultural land and the lovely natural resources in this area. This community would sustain a new primary school and make Wolverley CE High School viable long term. A bus service, small shopping centre and perhaps even a Doctor's Surgery would also be well supported. No provision for the Eastern By-pass and the current roads in this area could not cope with the increase in traffic. A road junction near the railway bridge on Husum Way would be ridiculous - almost as bad as the ill-thought out and dangerous current Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction.
	LPPO3994	Object	<p>I wish to strongly object to the local plan proposal to develop the Green Belt land to the rear of Baldwin Road. My reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion/Road Safety/Road access – the Birmingham Road and the Land Oak junction simply cannot cope with the current levels of traffic. Motorists therefore use Baldwin Road and Bruce Road as ‘rat runs’ on a daily basis to avoid the regular excessive queuing and congestion on the Birmingham Road/Chester Road junction at the Land Oak. I leave home at 06:30 in the morning yet cannot get off my drive without a wait because of traffic. I have tried parking on the road but have lost 5 wing mirrors in the last few years in ‘hit and run’ incidents, as have many of my neighbours. I understand that there will be no bypass to bridge the railway line or to join the Birmingham Road to the Stourbridge and Worcester Roads and without a bypass these proposals mean traffic in the residential roads of Greenhill (i.e. Baldwin Road, Bruce Road, Land Oak Drive and Hurcott Road) will reach dangerous levels and the Birmingham Road will be gridlocked. We simply do not have the road infrastructure to cope with hundreds more residents (and hundreds more cars) in this part of Kidderminster. Baldwin and Bruce Road were built as residential streets, but are being used as link roads, they are not suitable for this purpose. We have far too much traffic already in Greenhill resulting in congestion, accidents and near misses, damage to parked cars, potholes and high pet mortality rates, we cannot cope with the increase in traffic this proposed development would inevitably create. Loss of amenity and loss of privacy -the field behind Baldwin Road is considerably higher than the houses (there is a Trig point in the hedge) so any development would be highly visible and impossible to screen. This is Green Belt land and has been protected for many years, losing that protection and building on it would

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>have a very negative impact on the residential amenity of the neighbourhood. My house backs onto the field and so I would completely lose any privacy, as the proposed buildings would be so much higher than my house. This field provides an important green space for the people of Greenhill, who have no other open spaces in the immediate vicinity. It also provides a barrier from the pollution on the Birmingham Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the Green Belt land behind Baldwin Road would have a very detrimental effect on local wildlife. Hurcott Nature Reserve and pools incorporates the largest area of SSSI woodland in Worcestershire and the field behind Baldwin Road is a very important green space that adjoins this nature reserve, providing routes and habitats for wildlife species that are of conservation concern, including woodpeckers, sparrows, starling, owls, kestrels, house martins, frogs, toads, grass snakes, bats, hedgehogs and numerous species of bee, all of which I have seen in or from my back garden. <p>Finally, I cannot understand why the proposal to build on the field behind Baldwin Road is in both current options, from a traffic perspective alone this site is a very bad choice and will have a very negative impact on the immediate neighbours, yet apparently no-one considered that? If you simply built the number of houses proposed for the Baldwin Road site on the Lea Castle site instead – you would create no traffic problems for the immediate neighbours?</p>
	<p>LPPO3998</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to development proposals in sites OC/4, OC/5, OC/6, OC/13 as they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • weighed to the east of Kidderminster/disproportionate to the district, should encompass all areas • Could re-create a Birmingham commuter zone not local skill base. The area needs housing to attract a technologically competent workforce. • Loss of good arable land in Green Belt which should not be used where alternative sites are available. • Distribute development to allow for natural expansion to reduce the environmental impact. • Points A or B options would worsen already bad traffic. A new rail bridge to Birmingham Road may be of benefit, but would not alleviate congestion and an eastern by-pass solution is costly and impractical. • Being elevated land in Baldwin Road and east of Offmore/Comberton could cause drainage issues and would have an adverse visual impact. • Local services and amenities would be affected. Schools are full or near to and medical services under pressure, bus services are poor.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Industrial development at WFR/CB/7 Hodge Hill - site unattractive to business investment with limited access options, transport links are restricted; There is no obvious demand/supply chain sector in the vicinity. This is not the way forward. The basis for an alternative proposal is evident where option B housing is considered in conjunction with elements of option A, plus core mixed use sites.
	LPP04001	Object	<p>Object to Baldwin Road/land east of Offmore/Comberton area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss habitat Lack school places Few rural /green areas would remain
	LPP04004	Object	The areas around Baldwin Road and Hodgehill for extra housing would be pointless as schools are already full up. Light industry around Hodgehill would spoil wildlife and the rural look as not much green space would be left.
	LPP04009	Object	I object to proposal for land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Kidderminster and the farm land east of Offmore and Comberton being Green Belt as this would destroy the Green Belt and surrounding area and damage the wildlife habitats of both birds and animals. Also the air quality and noise levels would increase.
	LPP04017	Object	I strongly object to houses being built at Baldwin Road/Offmore, purely on a traffic issue. As I live in Hurcott Road close to traffic lights with Chester Road it is already a nightmare trying to get off my drive. So adding more houses creating even more traffic using Hurcott Road as a rat run is just not on. As stated before there are enough Brownfield sites on which to build a sufficient number of houses, before looking at Greenfield sites.
	LPP04021	Object	Ref: Local plans proposals for the Hurcott/Baldwin Road area. I believe that the use of this 'Green Belt' land for housing development should really be last resort.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hurcott Lanes, Pool and Woods have long been regarded as community leisure areas for all to enjoy the countryside – any developments of this traditional land with hedgerows and fields is found to impact negatively in the wildlife habitats, no matter how ‘sympathetic’ that development might be. • Hurcott Road/Baldwin Road would become very busy to traffic. Surely the WFDC proposals at the Leas Castle site would be more suitable to incorporate community, facilities to sustain a ‘village community’ and, I believe that the site doe snot hold ‘Green Belt’ status.
	LPP04052	Object	<p>I wish to add my comments. We live in Baldwin Road, Kidderminster and enjoy its location within Kidderminster as it’s easy to commute to work (Dudley/Wolverhampton/Cannock/Solihull). We appreciate that with increasing population and Government policy that there is a requirement for development in Wyre Forest as in most of the UK. However we also feel the right and appropriate sites should be used and all options should be considered and not the easier option chosen!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals to use Green Belt to the East of Kidderminster which involves behind Baldwin Road , Offmore and Comberton is a very extensive area and would be a large development project have a huge impact on the residents of this area both during the development and afterwards. • We are extremely concerned over the impact on the nature reserve at Hurcott Woods which would be cocooned by development around it which would be bad for the wildlife this reserve sustains at present. Not only this but this is a beautiful natural part of Kidderminster which we should be proud to have with its pool and village, but this would be changed dramatically with this development ,as well as endangered species having their natural habitat altered. Air quality in this area would be affected due to development so close causing pollution. • The proposed Eastern Bypass to overcome back log of traffic appeared in the meeting and from plans to only connect partly between Worcester side to Birmingham Road so would probably not be as useful as stated as traffic around Birmingham road, Baldwin Road, Hurcott Road and Chester Road during peak times is awful, there is no mention of how this would be alleviated with all those new houses which would impact onto the local roads in this part of Kidderminster? Lots of residents do work in Wolverhampton

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and Dudley side also, this side of town is also highly used not just Birmingham and Worcester side! Would also mean a bridge would be required to cross the railway line another expense?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no mention of the Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction with its two give ways and high accident spot, this junction should never have been put in, no one can use it correctly and it causes a lot of confusion to drivers. There should be a Roundabout there no matter what development happens. Heaven knows what greater confusion would be caused with traffic volume? • The fields behind Baldwin road and Offmore are higher than existing residential area so would be visible. • Local schools do not have enough space to expand to allow higher pupil intakes without impacting on the quality of outdoor space these schools have now. Offmore was proposed to increase its intake a few years ago within months of the new school opening and that suggestion was going to take a huge area of outside space away from the school! Education to our children is important and to keep happy children in good schools which are not crammed works better. Beneficial to the children and those working in that environment. Building of new schools is expensive, so to find funds for this in an already strained local budget would be difficult? <p>This number of houses puts a huge demand on the areas where they are planned especially local services as well as school and Health care (we have a struggling Worcestershire NHS Trust already, can it cope with higher demand from a larger population size which it was not built for?) Roads for the town are already well used and struggle with congestion a lot of the time? Concentrating development in one main area like the East of Kidderminster would centralise the traffic problems where as using many smaller sites would disperse it across a bigger area.</p>
	LPPO4081	Object	<p>I write to object to the Local Plan Review currently being considered for the development of housing to the East of Kidderminster and to the objection of taking out land from The Green Belt to accommodate this namely O/C 4 land to the rear of Baldwin Road Kidderminster. My reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Green Belt land should be released until all Brownfield sites have been developed which would need to include a number of disused and derelict buildings currently within the Kidderminster conurbation and unused land within the town centre. Examples of this is the land currently adjacent to Iceland that has stood empty since the building, formally used by the Heart Foundation, burnt down; the former Jewsons

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>site on Park Lane including a site on Park Lane which has been stood derelict for a couple of decades.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greenhill district of Kidderminster was developed with no common land or park areas. I have lived in Baldwin Road for 22 years and in all this time the local populace have used the land at the rear of Baldwin Road for general recreational purposes including walking/dog walking, picnics and educational walks for children. It has an abundance of wildlife including but not limited to Foxes, Badgers, Rabbits, Deer, Hedgehogs, including many bird species such as Buzzards, Hedge Sparrows, Woodpeckers, Jays, Nuthatches, Starlings, Corn Buntings, Starlings, Swifts, Yellow Hammers, Skylarks, Fieldfares, Blue Tits, Coal Tits, Chaffinch, Owls to name but a few. • This proposed land development is considerably higher than the rest of the surrounding area and would impact greatly on the aesthetics of the Eastern side of Kidderminster. There is also a bridle path that runs through the centre of the proposed land and therefore it would not be possible to access the proposed development from the Birmingham Road to the northern end of the development near Hurcott Village unless access was made via Hurcott Road or Hurcott lane making these potential ‘rat runs’ a problem that Baldwin Road already suffers from since the right of way changes were made to the Chester Road/Hurcott Road traffic lights a number of years ago. This potential hazard would only be avoided if an Eastern Bypass was completed from the A449 Wolverhampton Road intersecting with the Birmingham Road, Bromsgrove Road and finally the A449 Worcester Road a route that would require major infrastructure to cross over the railway lines. • This Green Belt area also allows for some fantastic views of the Clent Hills from the Greenhills conurbation, views that should not easily be dismissed. • The proposed development would also in my opinion have a detrimental effect to the Hurcott and Podmore SSI’s. • A proposed development of this scale would also require the building of education facilities as the current primary schools within the location are full and are such located that they cannot be enlarged. • Consideration should also be given to the need for access to this development of the emergency services due to the downgrading of Kidderminster Hospital as again without an Eastern Bypass ambulances would have no choice but to cut through residential estates in order to travel between Worcester A&E and the proposed development. • Due to the lack of significant employment within Kidderminster I would assume that most of the residents that would occupy these homes would be commuting to either Birmingham or Worcester again without

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the Eastern Bypass infrastructure this would impact on the villages of Blakedown and Belbroughton and the Offmore estate.</p> <p>The reason that people move to and visit Kidderminster and the surrounding areas is that it gives a feel of a rural location when travelling into Kidderminster along the Birmingham Road unlike the route into Kidderminster via the Horsefair which in all honesty is an eye sore and should be an embarrassment to any inspiring forward thinking Council that wants to promote Kidderminster as a town worth investing.</p>
	LPPO4117	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a study on behalf of Barberry, proposed developers of Baldwin Road site, the weekday traffic flow along Hurcott Lane between 0700 and 0800 was 103 vehicles, a mean average of 1 vehicle per 3.5 seconds increasing in the following hour to 187 vehicles i.e. 1 vehicle in less than 2 seconds. At any one time there will be a queue of vehicles awaiting exit on to Stourbridge or Birmingham Roads and entry into Hurcott Lane. The traffic continues through the day and increases again after 1500 to a mean average of 1 vehicle every 2/3 seconds for the next 3 hours. There have recently been 4 serious and one fatal accident at these junctions. • Hurcott Lane is a single carriageway with vehicle forced passing places over steep grass verge with in part restricted visibility. Hurcott Road suffers similar problems with less visibility. • Before any consideration is given to approval of building on either Baldwin Road site or Stourbridge Road, the WFDC and WCC need to resolve these traffic issues which could easily be done by a traffic stop along Hurcott Road by the bridleway 514(B) and the entrance to the nature reserve at Hurcott Lane, thus allowing dual access from Stourbridge and Birmingham Roads but preventing a rat run. It needs to be remembered that Hurcott Pools and Wood is a designated Nature Reserve. It is home to over 30 species of breeding birds and has noted wetland plants and trees. It is a SSSI containing the largest area of wet valley and Alder Carr in the County. A buffer zone will offer insufficient protection for such with the proposed development in such small area. • As to proposals for the Birmingham Road and possible by pass, these would only lead to additional vehicle congestion in the area and any possible benefit would merely transfer the problem. In any event, although it may be possible to persuade a developer to contribute to a road island and to build 2 railway bridges and a by pass is going to cost many millions with limited, if any, benefit and certainly not viable for any developer to contemplate.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not believe development of either Hurcott site would offer any benefit to the people of Kidderminster. It would most likely comprise of expensive housing which the majority within the area could not afford and a token amount of so called affordable housing on sites which in traffic terms, are wholly unsuitable.
	LPPO4200	Object	<p>Without a by pass, all the roads around Hurcott Road will be used as rat runs to an even greater extent than they already are.</p> <p>Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt. This would impact on wildlife habitats in the buffer zones for Hurcott & Podmore SSIs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Birmingham Road is often already congested The proposed linear development would have no community heart. Offmore primary school is already full and cannot be extended. Additional building will add to flood risk.
	LPPO4238	Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed building on land sited to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore. My main concern is the loss of about 2 ½ % of Green Belt land to development when there is a perfectly viable alternative at the Lea Castle site. I fully support the OCAGLP (Offmore Comberton Action Group Local Plans) for a sustainable village at Lea Castle as I see it as a solution to all the problems development brings with the necessary infrastructure that is required to go with it. The Husum Way railway bridge is in my opinion not big or strong enough to support the extra traffic from the proposed Offmore development. There would also be more air pollution and more flood water as a consequence of more housing. Husum Way already floods regularly when there is a prolonged period of heavy rain. The junction at the A456 Birmingham Road and Husum Way is a dangerous road crossing owing to the volume of traffic to and from Birmingham. The strain of extra traffic from any new development would only increase the problem that already exists. Not only will there be the visible impact of housing as the Offmore site is more elevated Offmore Primary School is already full to capacity with no more room to extend.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO4241	Object	It will not deliver the additional infrastructure required to support. Will cause additional problems with traffic in a road that has already become a rat run
	LPPO4244	Object	Objects to the development of Birmingham side of Kidderminster, namely, the site at the back of Baldwin Road. Also the site to the side of Offmore Road estate. Reason: Adverse Road traffic on already congested road junctions. We need to keep the Green Belt buffer zone at this side of Kidderminster. Note: In my opinion the 'Lea Castle Sustainable Village' would be a better site. Reason: This an empty site, not been used for years and would have a lot less impact on the Green Belt and the roads and road junctions surrounding it.
	LPPO4248	Object	First and Foremost it is Prime, High Grade Arable / Agriculture Land. Which will be required when we leave the EU, and certainly not for Housing, or Industrial Development. Offmore and Comberton schools are at capacity, anymore intake would be very detrimental to existing, pupils and staff. At certain times of the day there is a large volume of traffic in and out of the estate, which will increase. The council is supposed to be looking to make the approaches to Kidderminster more attractive and here you are proposing this huge sprawling, development, why on earth ruin something that is already a very attractive gateway to the town? We appreciate houses have to be built and hope a good majority would be affordable to first time buyers / rent and we would support an alternative extended Lea Castle site, which would make it a desirable, practical sustainable community, with all the necessary services. In conclusion the council / Government are saying there are approximately 8,000/10,000 people homeless in Wyre Forest (ie: 5,000 housing) if there are then the type of house that will be built are not suitable. If this is not the case then people will come from outside the district and will commute to work. The bottom line, this country cannot afford a large increase in the population, we do not produce enough of what we consume, you only have to look at our balance of payments deficit. This is why we should not be using farm land for housing.
	LPPO4296	Object	Local Plan proposals for land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore / Comberton Areas - Options OC/4, OC/5, OC/6 & OC/13. Objections: 1. The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster currently plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Before any building work commences the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to be constructed along with the required and very expensive railway crossing / bridge, which would need funding by the proposed developers.</p> <p>3. For this plan to work the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to extend from the A449 Wolverhampton Road all the way to the A449 Worcester Road to be effectual, if not the side roads & lanes in the Hurcott / Offmore / Spennals areas would end up being used as rat runs.</p> <p>4. The proposed housing at the rear of Baldwin Road & Offmore together with the By-Pass itself would be in an elevated position making them very visible and obtrusive.</p> <p>5. The developments at the rear of Baldwin Road & along Hurcott Lane would impact on the buffer zones for the Hurcott & Podmore SSI's and endangered bird species.</p> <p>6. The hundreds of houses planned in this area would have a dramatic effect on the recently built New Offmore Primary School which is at full capacity and can't be extended any further.</p> <p>7. In summary this ribbon development LP is a not sustainable or a community and an alternative proposal needs to be considered.</p> <p>Proposals: The current draft proposals in Options: A & B propose using only some of the land available at Lea Castle.</p> <p>My proposal would be to extend this by not only including both Options A & B but also extend the site to land up to Wolverhampton Road and the rear of the Lea Castle site up to Axborough Lane. In addition further development along the western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill linking up with the development of the disused Sion Hill Middle School site. In addition the old Sladen Middle School site on Hurcott Road has also never been developed since clearance and should also be considered. Advantages of these proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With the additional land proposed a sustainable community of around 2,500 homes could be created. 2. This community would be large enough for a new primary School. 3. This community being within the Wolverly High School catchment area it would positively impact on this schools long term viability. 4. This community would be large enough to sustain a Village Centre & local shops. 5. This community would also be large enough to sustain a bus service and live-work units.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			6. Additional development areas to the North / West of Kidderminster should also be considered, such as the rear of the existing Ferndale Estate where over 200 houses could be accommodated and this area has local shops & a bus service etc.
	LPP04329	Object	I would like to express my concern to the proposed expansion north of Kidderminster through Hurcott will destroy the Green Belt and conservation area impacting on residents and wildlife habitats. I do not believe the infrastructure of roads, amenities, schools and is enough to support such a development and would suffer causing major disruption and disadvantage to the existing residents
	LPP04390	Object	There is only one doctor's practice in this area, it is difficult enough to get appointments as it stands. Adding yet more patients to the ever growing list is unsustainable.
	LPP04516	Object	<p>I object to all of the Core Sites in the Green Belt to the north and east of Kidderminster on the basis of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. impairing the quality of the rural environment visible from and immediately accessible from Greenhill; 2. noise and air pollution due to increasing the traffic on the roads surrounding (and possibly through) Greenhill and Broadwaters; 3. pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc); 4. Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access on foot. <p>I'd expect a large proportion of the existing retail zone in the centre of Kidderminster, in which the properties are currently vacant, to be reallocated to housing before building on Green Belt. This would have the benefit of regenerating the town centre and putting housing close to local amenities.</p>
	LPP04519	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to development at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton. • Lack of infrastructure - hard to exit estate due to volume of traffic on Birmingham Road; crossing is a death trap. • Husum Way traffic has increased already due to it being used as a rat run - how would this traffic be diverted if the development went ahead?

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local school is already full which cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients. • Kidderminster has no A&E and Worcester is in special measures - these services will be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The eastern by-pass and railway bridges are unlikely to be built due to expense. Developers will not provide this funding - which should be built before any development goes ahead anyway. • The Green Belt land is vital for separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands Conurbation. • Wildlife habitats are on this land. • Other suitable areas are not included in the plans where fields are just used for horse grazing and are not arable land like what has been proposed - this will be needed when we leave the EU. • Lea Castle site is a much better proposal. • Lea Castle proposal would be able to support a primary school. • Within the catchment for Wolverley high school which would impact positively on its long term viability. • There are empty sites around Kidderminster which could be used for housing. • The town centre needs regenerating; plenty of empty places could be used for houses/flats. • Should propose development on the north/west of Kidderminster and in Stourport/Bewdley as there are areas which could be developed here.
Anonymous	LPPO4520	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees with the Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans leaflet. • Green Belt development should be the last resort - look at all the brownfield sites still around Kidderminster which could be used. • The town centre has been killed off so pointless looking at development for shops. • Look at potential for residential development in the town. • We have no industry to attract extra people to need the housing. • How will surrounding roads of Hurcott cope with double-triple the amount of cars to houses? • How will doctors and schools cope?
	LPPO4742	Object	I have confined my comments mainly to the effect of the proposals on the Hurcott area. I leave it up to other members of the public to comment on their own areas of interest.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>6.16 makes reference to the Green Belt boundary separating towns and relates it to the A456 corridor. This does not reflect in any way on the reason why the Hurcott area is being considered for building when the words say that 'it will be particularly important to ensure that the land remains open'.</p> <p>6.21 mentions the value of tourism to the Wyre Forest and the SVR and Safari Park are mentioned. Having lived with the huge amount of traffic during weekends and holidays using the A456 to reach these tourist areas I struggle to see the point of considering adding more traffic through additional housing in the Hurcott area with a roundabout on the A456 to slow the traffic even more. Tourists won't come if they can only reach a destination through constant heavy traffic.</p> <p>Section 11 A Unique Place. If we are taking this section to look at the character and distinctiveness of an area then I would make the case that there is little sense in proposing building large areas of housing around the SSSI in the Hurcott area which is included in both options A and B of this plan. The nature reserve of Hurcott Wood and the SSSI areas that feed in and out of the reserve would be severely compromised by building what I have heard is 400 dwellings down Hurcott Lane from the Stourbridge Road to the Birmingham Road. The area proposed in Plan A off the Spennells site has little of interest as far as character is concerned although I know that people who walk their dogs in this area are fond of it.</p> <p>Policy 11D on page 80/81 under section 3 relates to the biodiversity of a site. Certainly when I went to the meeting about the proposals for the land behind Baldwin Road and presumably that up to the Stourbridge Road focused on visual aspects and the transport problems within Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road but paid little heed to biodiversity of the site. I suspect that developers have little interest in biodiversity.</p> <p>Section 15 Water Management. I didn't notice much about drainage or water management in the proposals from RCA Regeneration and Barberry for the Baldwin Road site.</p> <p>Section 16 Pollution - What effect would the volume of dwellings proposed along the Hurcott corridor have on the SSSI areas being surrounded by this core option to follow Policy 16A?</p>
	LPPO4786	Object	<p>I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/traffic emissions • Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools. Affect on tourism/wildlife/possible flooding. • Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings instead of Green Belt.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP04896	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hurcott Village is an ancient settlement, mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals in both Option A and Option B, allowing for development on Green Belt land and ADR land either side of the village, would result in it being totally engulfed and overwhelmed by new houses, thus destroying its unique character. 2. In addition, the SSSI at the heart of the village would be under threat with so much development surrounding it. This is a fragile and sensitive location, where water levels are critical to its nature as wet woodland. Further development along the Lane would impact on this site, which is of national importance. 3. There is no mention in the plan of infrastructure to support the developments either side of the village. Hurcott Lane is a single track road with passing places, already under enormous pressure from the volume of traffic using it as a cut through between Stourbridge Road and Birmingham Road. These proposed developments, along with the proposed development at Lea Castle, would inevitably result in a significant increase over the current average of 100 cars per hour using this lane between 8am and 7pm. With no mention of new schools the most likely for those on the proposed site for Miller Homes would be along Hurcott Lane to St. George’s, Offmore, Holy Trinity and King Charles, yet more volume of traffic on a rural single track lane, with a SSSI at its centre. Not to mention the increase in use by commuters driving into Birmingham or to the motorway. 4. Policy 25 Safeguarding the Green Belt – hollow words if the preferred options were to go ahead. The proposals would not protect the Green Belt 5. Policy 26 A and B the proposals would not protect the historic environment with regard to Hurcott Village. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan review scoping report mentions the hornet robberfly, on Hurcott pastures, being the only siting in the country. As the field has ceased to be grazed (it was a requirement of the landowner to have cattle on the site until 3 or 4 years ago) the fly has probably ceased to exist here. Shame that cutbacks mean that the diversity of creatures in our environment is diminishing and that rare insects are likely to disappear as a result. • One of the reports states: ‘The eastern areas of the District fall within the West Midlands Green Belt and are therefore subject to Green Belt policy which restricts development except for very special circumstances. There are also a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest which could be adversely impacted by new development. These constraints will all be very important factors in considering where

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>new development should be located.’ It doesn’t appear that these constraints have been given much consideration in preparing the preferred options document.</p> <p>Lastly I would point to Planning Application 16/0074 for the single storey construction of a garden room/orangery at 3 Hodge Hill Barns which was refused on the grounds that it was inappropriate development in a Green Belt location. Fairly ironic when you consider the proposals in this Local Plan.</p>
	LPP04923	Object	<p>I object to the local plan core housing proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I’m concerned about any development on the east of the Green Belt - this helps to separate the town from the West Midlands Conurbation 2. An eastern By Pass would need to be built from Wolverhampton Rd to Worcester Road to be of use. This is already an accident black spot. 3. There are endangered bird species along the route the by pass would have to take from A456 to the A449 4. A bypass would need to be developed before the land to the east of Offmore could be developed 5. A new railway bridge would be required to help realise this development, which would be incredibly expensive 6. The bypass would need at least a 30m tree screen to buffer the noise 7. I would question whether the linear development would create any degree of community and social cohesion 8. Offmore school is at capacity with no scope for expansion 9. Development would be very visible due to the elevation of the land 10. Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to help avoid congestion
	LPP04926	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Rd. This road is already used as a rat run from people using Crossley Retail Park and or wishing to avoid the traffic lights at the Land Oak pub. • Husum Way and Borrington Road/Tennyson Road similarly act as an unofficial bypass and development in both these areas will only intensify the increasing use of roads in and around this area. Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Road are just single tracks and cannot accommodate increased volumes of traffic and so this

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>will push more traffic along Baldwin Road. The speeds that some motorists go at in this road are frightening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a visual perspective, the land behind Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. The Green Belt land around Baldwin Road and Hurcott supports much wildlife and is a beautiful gateway to Hurcott Woods and Pool an area enjoyed by many locals. • Offmore is similarly high in places and will have a potent visual impact on the local surroundings. • The land behind Baldwin Road and to the east of Offmore/Husum Way contributes strongly to reducing the impact of urban sprawl from Kidderminster through to Blakedown and then Hagley and the wider West Midlands. • As a gateway into our town and district, our rural/semi rural heritage should be retained. • Offmore Primary School is on a restricted site and cannot be extended. A further school would contribute to additional traffic issues at peak drop off and pick up times. • Development of land to the east of Offmore would create a linear estate which would not be a sustainable community, it would have no community “heart”. Apart from the school the only community facilities on the estate are The Cavalier PH and Offmore Evangelical Church. The shopping precinct contains only a NISA Supermarket, a fish and chip shop and hairdressers; there is no pharmacy or post office and no room to develop them. • Proposed employment development adjacent to Hodge Hill would cause traffic and potentially noise problems and have a huge visual impact on this “rural” landscape. • Proposals for an eastern bypass would require a new railway bridge – how would this be funded and again there is a huge visual impact. • The proposed eastern bypass would also create much traffic noise which would then impact upon the proposed newly built housing “estate” to the east of Offmore and existing residential roads. Further, any eastern by pass which started at Birmingham Rd would exacerbate traffic problems on Baldwin Rd which would be used as an access to that bypass. The only way a satisfactory eastern bypass can be provided is for it to run, at the very least, from the Stourbridge Rd round to The Mare and Colt on the Worcester Rd.
	LPP04927	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Rd. This road is already used as a rat run from people

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>using Crossley Retail Park and or wishing to avoid the traffic lights at the Land Oak pub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Husum Way and Borrington Road/Tennyson Road similarly act as an unofficial bypass and development in both these areas will only intensify the increasing use of roads in and around this area. Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Road are just single tracks and cannot accommodate increased volumes of traffic and so this will push more traffic along Baldwin Road. The speeds that some motorists go at in this road are frightening. • From a visual perspective, the land behind Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. The Green Belt land around Baldwin Road and Hurcott supports much wildlife and is a beautiful gateway to Hurcott Woods and Pool an area enjoyed by many locals. • Offmore is similarly high in places and will have a potent visual impact on the local surroundings. • The land behind Baldwin Road and to the east of Offmore/Husum Way contributes strongly to reducing the impact of urban sprawl from Kidderminster through to Blakedown and then Hagley and the wider West Midlands. • As a gateway into our town and district, our rural/semi rural heritage should be retained. • Offmore Primary School is on a restricted site and cannot be extended. A further school would contribute to additional traffic issues at peak drop off and pick up times. • Development of land to the east of Offmore would create a linear estate which would not be a sustainable community, it would have no community “heart”. Apart from the school the only community facilities on the estate are The Cavalier PH and Offmore Evangelical Church. The shopping precinct contains only a NISA Supermarket, a fish and chip shop and a hairdresser; there is no pharmacy or post office and no room to develop them. • Proposed employment development adjacent to Hodge Hill would cause traffic and potentially noise problems and have a huge visual impact on this “rural” landscape. • Proposals for an eastern bypass would require a new railway bridge – how would this be funded and again there is a huge visual impact. • The proposed eastern bypass would also create much traffic noise which would then impact upon the proposed newly built housing “estate” to the east of Offmore and existing residential roads. Further, any eastern by pass which started at Birmingham Rd would exacerbate traffic problems on Baldwin Rd which would be used as an access to that bypass. The only way a satisfactory eastern bypass can be provided is

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			for it to run, at the very least, from the Stourbridge Rd round to The Mare and Colt on the Worcester Rd.
	LPP04955	Object	I object to the proposal to build to the rear of Offmore, Comberton, Baldwin Rd and also Spennells.
	LPP05008	Object	<p>As a resident that will be negatively affected by the plans to erase a significant amount of the Green Belt land surrounding my home in order to build thousands of new houses that will undoubtedly remain empty for years (£210,000 is NOT affordable, not even close. Maybe in London, but certainly not in the Wyre Forest). I felt it necessary to express my severe displacement with the planned proposal for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton Area for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The houses being built are presumably meant for young families? But where will their children go to school? The local schools are already overflowing. 2. The Green Belt area to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. 3. An eastern bypass would need to be built between the Wolverhampton and Worcester roads, otherwise the roads around Hurcott would be utter chaos. 4. This bypass would require at least one new railway bridge, which would be incredibly expensive. No private developers would pay for it. 5. The visual concern would be an obvious issue, not to mention the impact on local wildlife. 6. The development would create a significant amount of water run-off that could turn Broadwaters into a swamp. I have friends who live in that area who are understandably concerned.
	LPP05153	Object	<p>I wish to object to the planned proposals for the land at the rear of Baldwin Road. I am fully aware that new houses need to be built but I object to the current proposal made for the site I have mentioned. The main reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local schools are already full to capacity and have no room to expand. • The development behind Baldwin Road would have a huge impact on wild life habitats. • Access to the new houses would be a big concern - if around 350 houses have been proposed, most

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			households would have 2 cars. The volume of traffic would be ridiculous and very dangerous in that area.
	LPPO5155	Object	<p>I am objecting to this for reasons stated below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is Green Belt land and plays a vital part in our community. • Wildlife - we have endangered birds in this area and buzzards, hawks etc. • The schools are already full to the max and there is no room to expand. • Husum way is already a rat run for the A449 without adding a bypass which will come out on Husum Way before the bridge as there will be no funding and it will cause chaos to the rail as they cannot build another bridge it's too expensive. • Contact the local police and find that there are far too many deaths and accidents on the A449 Husum way/Hurcott road area due to planning of the junction. • There is always extreme flooding by Husum Way bridge and in Shakespeare Drive and the development areas are higher than Offmore and Comberton so flooding risk will be massive.
	LPPO822	Support	<p>Land east of Baldwin Road</p> <p>Green Belt Site clearly makes positive contribution to openness of Green Belt. However, boundary to rear of gardens in Baldwin Road is not robust as some gardens have been 'extended'. Hurcott Lane to the east is a much more robust boundary. Podmore and Hurcott Pools plus Hurcott village itself to the north give a strong defensible boundary. Birmingham Road to south is also permanent enduring boundary. Mitigation to include linking areas of green infrastructure both new and existing.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact - Visual Appraisal carried out by specialist firm. Assessed Zone of Visual Influence - rolling topography and woodland blocks meant views of site were limited.</p> <p>Drainage and Flood Risk Geoenvironmental desk study and preliminary site appraisal done. Nearest areas at risk of flooding are within valley of Podmore and Hurcott Pools system.</p> <p>Archaeology assessment carried out - potential for medieval agricultural remains and WWII infrastructure.</p> <p>Ecology and Trees Preliminary ecological survey and tree survey undertaken by specialists. Predominantly species-poor improved grassland. Several veteran trees which will need to be protected.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/4 – LAND TO THE REAR OF BALDWIN ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Transport work completed to date shows 2 main improvements would be needed - roundabout at Husum Way plus stopping up of Hurcott Lane. Site well connected by foot and cycle.</p> <p>Public consultation event held in July. Presentation boards attached. Propose to undertake further consultation.</p> <p>Summary site is well located on edge of Kidderminster. Considered to be sustainable location and most logical area to release from Green Belt. Important that Hurcott Village retains its separate identity. Safe and suitable access can be designed and local support for stopping up of lane.</p>
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	LPP01024	Object	<p>Concerned that Parish will become even more of a 'through route' if sites east of Kidderminster are developed. Character will be badly affected if Eastern Relief Road is built. County proposals already mean likelihood of increased commuter traffic for station and school has been expanded. We would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. Kidderminster-Blakedown section narrowed to single carriageway for safety reasons and lateration at Hagley junction mean traffic often backs up to Blakedown. Proposals at Baldwin Road and Offmore would add to traffic levels. Employment proposal at Hodge Hill would add traffic at an accident blackspot. Proposed relief road would bring more traffic onto A456 from A448 and A449. Why is this needed when A450 meets A456 at Hagley? Blakedown village centre - concerns re air quality and pedestrian safety. Suggest traffic lights for junction of Belbroughton Road and moving pedestrian crossing to near Station Drive. Proposed eastern relief road would add further pressure to A456 in village. If A448/A450 junction was improved it would divert traffic from centre of Kidderminster and relieve pressure on A456.</p>
	LPP01961	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objecting to building on Baldwin Road/Offmore sites. • Schools and infrastructure inadequate. • Greenfield sites. • Brownfield sites should be used - especially in the town centre. • Will ruin the countryside.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Anonymous	LPP04044	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees with the Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans leaflet. • Green Belt development should be the last resort - look at all the brownfield sites still around Kidderminster which could be used. • The town centre has been killed off so pointless looking at development for shops. • Look at potential for residential development in the town. • We have no industry to attract extra people to need the housing. • How will surrounding roads of Hurcott cope with double-triple the amount of cars to houses? • How will doctors and schools cope?
	LPP04065	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to development at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton. • Lack of infrastructure - hard to exit estate due to volume of traffic on Birmingham Road; crossing is a death trap. • Husum Way traffic has increased already due to it being used as a rat run - how would this traffic be diverted if the development went ahead? • Local school is already full which cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients. • Kidderminster has no A&E and Worcester is in special measures - these services will be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The eastern by-pass and railway bridges are unlikely to be built due to expense. Developers will not provide this funding - which should be built before any development goes ahead anyway. • The Green Belt land is vital for separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands Conurbation. • Wildlife habitats are on this land. • Other suitable areas are not included in the plans where fields are just used for horse grazing and are not arable land like what has been proposed - this will be needed when we leave the EU. • Lea Castle site is a much better proposal. • Lea Castle proposal would be able to support a primary school. • Within the catchment for Wolverley high school which would impact positively on its long term viability.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are empty sites around Kidderminster which could be used for housing. • The town centre needs regenerating; plenty of empty places could be used for houses/flats. • Should propose development on the north/west of Kidderminster and in Stourport/Bewdley as there are areas which could be developed here.
	LPPO2163	Comment	<p>A detailed response received regarding the proposed development to the east of Kidderminster. A summary of this response is listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If development is to take place in Green Belt land in the east of Kidderminster a new park is needed. Perhaps running from the vacant Stourminster School site, along the brook through connecting to the existing Borrington Park. The school site could be used for parking and the park facilities such as a cafe and a sports club. There could also be provision for a commercial unit – perhaps a restaurant chain. • The edge of the new park would be ideally suited for modern ‘affordable housing’ with views across the park. There should be multiple off road parking spaces to the rear of the properties to avoid the roads being crammed with cars.
	LPPO1992	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local schools are already at full capacity.
	LPPO3037	Comment	<p>The band of proposed development on the East side of Kidderminster running from Cookley down to Offmore would not appear to address the core policies of the Local Plan Review (Sections 6 to 11) in encouraging the growth of Wyre Forest with Kidderminster at its centre. It would not attract a younger population into the centre of the town but encourage the corridor of growth along the A456 and A451 for commuters to Birmingham and Stourbridge and areas served by Bromsgrove District and Dudley Metropolitan Borough Councils.</p> <p>Wyre Forest's ageing and static population (Table 2.0.1) would not be served by housing that would require</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>greater mobility to access the amenities provided by Kidderminster town centre. The bus services along Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road (25 & 192 run by Diamond) are infrequent and unreliable and any train travel would require a long journey to Blakedown which is almost outside of the WFDC area and in the opposite direction to the town centre.</p> <p>The development of the central business district would seem to be a better way of encouraging growth and making the centre a desirable area to live. Recent coffee shops near Castle Road are a welcome addition and the River Stour and canals could become features rather than inconveniences, similar to Brindley Place in Birmingham. The 'gentrification' of awful eyesores like Crown House and empty carpet factories would improve and encourage investment, while celebrating and preserving the town's heritage.</p> <p>Amenities could be concentrated and developed as part of the town regeneration - like Kidderminster Medical Centre - rather than the band of proposed housing placing extra burden on existing schools and surgeries that are already over-stretched. E.g. St. Mary's, St. George's and Offmore Primary schools or Stanmore House Surgery.</p> <p>Developing semi-rural sites would be detrimental for the district, destroying open spaces and ruining the approaches to the town from the East which are currently green and inviting. The government pledged to protect Green Belt (Theresa May, February 2017) and the Plan Objectives (Table 3.0.2) also aim to "protect and support the role of the Green Belt". The government has reiterated that Green Belt should only be built on in "exceptional circumstances" and "absolutely sacrosanct" (Sajid Javid, Communities Secretary, 2016).</p> <p>Hurcott Woods and Village</p> <p>One area that the proposed core development would engulf is Hurcott Village, with core housing proposed either side of the village and Hurcott Woods. The village is of historic and scientific interest, being developed on a site that is regarded as one of the oldest sites in British papermaking dating back to the middle ages. The woods are a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and developing the land around it would destroy much of the wildlife it supports. Buzzards, kingfishers, Muntjac deer, otters, grebes, herons, woodpeckers, bats and newts are some of</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the wonderful wildlife regularly seen in the area and the delicate balance of nature needs to be surrounded by Green Belt to preserve it. It should be seen as an amenity and asset by WFDC and a jewel in Kidderminster's crown.</p> <p>The village and woods are served by a single track road, Hurcott Lane, from the North and South ends and an even narrower road, Hurcott Road from the West. Pedestrian access is only via these roads that have no pavements and a national speed limit of 60mph. There are regular incidents and accidents as a consequence of increased traffic from drivers using it as a cut-through from Stourbridge Road to Birmingham Road. Van drivers in particular hurtle through at dangerous speeds and despite the "not suitable for HGV" signs, lorries and coaches are directed by their sat-navs through the village. Any housing developments in the area would put unbearable pressure on Hurcott Lane and the bridge and dam that are already showing signs of stress. The village is wholly residential; there are no shops and no pub and the road should only serve residents and those visiting the woods. That is clearly not the case and at least 95% of traffic dangerously speeds through, using it as a short-cut. Any surrounding residential development would put unbearable strain on Hurcott Lane and it is not clear from the Local Plan Review whether an Eastern Relief road would stop this cut-through traffic and could be a very expensive construction given the extra railway bridges that would be needed. The village is currently crime-free and - with no street lighting - free of light pollution. These would inevitably increase if surrounding Green Belt is built on and the area would soon be swallowed up by the contiguous conurbation.</p>
	LPP04327	Comment	It is not clear how some areas have been declared 'Core' and some as options (A and B). There should be more options at this stage, and less 'Core'. Lea Castle Hospital is an exception, but BW/4, OC/4,OC/5,OC/6 are all deemed core for no obvious or strong reason.
Anonymous	LPP05095	Comment	It would seem logical to include extra communal areas in development adjacent to existing areas with poor provision or areas that will increase in the number of residents. In the case of the east of Kidderminster where most of the core development is being directed; there is already a lack of provision in terms of a major park due to the fact that the ring road acts as a barrier to residents accessing Brinton Park. If development is to take place in Green Belt land in the east of Kidderminster, then I would suggest a park being designed running from the vacant Stourminster School site, along the brook, connecting to the existing Borrington Park. The existing entrance to the former Stourminster School is ideally connected to the existing main road network and the area

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>on which the school is situated could be used for ample parking and the location of park facilities. In terms of the total new park space generated this could actually be on a similar scale to the existing Brinton Park. It might also be an idea to consider local clubs that wish to expand. There would be a need for facilities for the park and a sports club could provide these. I note that Kidderminster Tennis Club was recently denied planning for a third court in their present location perhaps they could move to the new park? This could be the perfect opportunity to obtain funding, allowing the club to expand and provide great facilities within the park.</p> <p>Lastly, there could be provision for a commercial unit, perhaps located on the opposite side of the lay-by that would allow access to the park. While the tennis club could provide a café style environment for use during the day, allowing a firm such as Miller & Carter (or similar) to open would mean use of the area during the evening for restaurant meals overlooking the park landscape. Sutton Park is an example of this already happening elsewhere, although being a much larger park they have additional commercial outlets adjacent to the park.</p>
	<p>LPPO270</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p><u>Local Plan proposals for land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore / Comberton Areas - Options OC/4, OC/5, OC/6 & OC/13.</u></p> <p><u>Objections:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster currently plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. 2. Before any building work commences the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to be constructed along with the required and very expensive railway crossing / bridge, which would need funding by the proposed developers. 3. For this plan to work the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to extend from the A449 Wolverhampton Road all the way to the A449 Worcester Road to be effectual, if not the side roads & lanes in the Hurcott / Offmore / Spennells areas would end up being used as rat runs. 4. The proposed housing at the rear of Baldwin Road & Offmore together with the By-Pass itself would be in an elevated position making them very visible and obtrusive. 5. The developments at the rear of Baldwin Road & along Hurcott Lane would impact on the buffer zones

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>for the Hurcott & Podmore SSI's and endangered bird species.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The hundreds of houses planned in this area would have a dramatic effect on the recently built New Offmore Primary School which is at full capacity and can't be extended any further. 7. In summary this ribbon development LP is a not sustainable or a community and an alternative proposal needs to be considered. <p>Proposals: The current draft proposals in Options: A & B propose using only some of the land available at Lea Castle. My proposal would be to extend this by not only including both Options A & B but also extend the site to land up to Wolverhampton Road and the rear of the Lea Castle site up to Axborough Lane. In addition further development along the western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill linking up with the development of the disused Sion Hill Middle School site. In addition the old Sladen Middle School site on Hurcott Road has also never been developed since clearance and should also be considered.</p> <p>Advantages of these proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With the additional land proposed a sustainable community of around 2,500 homes could be created. 2. This community would be large enough for a new primary School. 3. This community being within the Wolverly High School catchment area it would positively impact on this schools long term viability. 4. This community would be large enough to sustain a Village Centre & local shops. 5. This community would also be large enough to sustain a bus service and live-work units. 6. Additional development areas to the North / West of Kidderminster should also be considered, such as the rear of the existing Ferndale Estate where over 200 houses could be accommodated and this area has local shops & a bus service etc.
	LPPQ457	Object	I object strongly to developments to the East of Kidderminster. Why are there no proposals for any development

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			on the North/West of Kidderminster. I understand that there is land at the rear of the Ferndale Estate which can be used. Extending Lea Castle would be a viable option as would extend the site from Sion Hill Middle School. Masterplans will be required for each of these allocations so why have plans already been drawn up for building on the land at the rear of Baldwin Road OC/4?
	LPPO511	Object	Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. If this is built on it will reduce the separation between dwellings from Kidderminster, Hurcott and Blakedown. An Eastern Bypass would need to be built to accommodate the extra traffic caused by the increase in dwellings. This would need to be built from the Worcester Road to the Wolverhampton road. There are endangered species along this route so it must not be developed. Any eastern bypass would need to cross the railway as the Husum road bridge is inadequate. If this is not done the excess traffic would bring the area to halt as it would not cope. The expense of building a railway crossing would be extortionate and I doubt the council or developers can afford this. The elevated position of the new road linking the Wolverhampton Road and Worcester Road would mean it would require at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSI's. There are no parks or recreational areas in the Green Hill area. If the development were to go ahead in this area the only likely venue for recreation would be Hurcott woods. Due to the proximity there to the proposed development OC/4 people would more likely favour walking. Neither road leading to Hurcott is not safe of pedestrians as it is narrow with a lot blind hills and corners. With the increased traffic of both pedestrians and vehicles there would not doubt be an increase in accidents. The habitat for many flora and fauna in Hurcott woods would be over used and would suffer from an increase in pollution (noise, dog fouls and litter) This would ruin the natural habitat. A Linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no heart and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. Offmore Primary school is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended. The extra dwellings would not have local schools to use so would need to drive to nearby schools. This will increase pollution and worsen the already bad traffic in the surround roads during rush house. The topography to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher that the surrounding area. This would mean the visual impact of a development here would be an eye sore.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO576	Object	Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. If built on it will reduce the separation between dwellings from Kidderminster, Hurcott and Blakedown. An Eastern Bypass would need to be built to accommodate extra traffic caused by the increase in dwellings. This would need to be built from the Worcester Road to the Wolverhampton road. There are endangered species along this route so it must not be developed. Any eastern bypass would need to cross the railway as the Husum road bridge is inadequate. If this is not done the excess traffic would bring the area to halt as it would not cope. The expense of building a railway crossing would be extortionate and I doubt the council or developers can afford this. The elevated position of the new road linking the Wolverhampton Road and Worcester Road would require at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSI's. There are no parks or recreational areas in the Green Hill area. If development went ahead in this area the only likely venue for recreation would be Hurcott woods. Due to the proximity there to the proposed development OC/4 people would more likely favour walking. Neither road leading to Hurcott is not safe of pedestrians as it is narrow with a lot blind hills and corners. With the increased traffic of both pedestrian and vehicles there would not doubt be an increase in accidents. Habitat for flora and fauna in Hurcott woods and pool would be over used and would suffer from an increase in pollution (noise, dog fouls and litter) This would ruin the natural habitat. Linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no heart and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. Offmore Primary school is full, on a restricted site and can not be extended. Extra dwellings would not have local schools to use so would need to drive to nearby schools. This will increase pollution and worsen the already bad traffic in the surround roads during rush house. Topography to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher that the surrounding area. This would mean the visual impact of a development here would be an eye sore.
	LPPO746	Object	High quality farmland, school full, loss of Green Belt, traffic. Should develop at Lea Castle instead
	LPPO749	Object	Object to development to east of Offmore: loss of wildlife, strain on schools and GPs, rat-running on side roads,

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			heavy traffic. Lea Castle more suitable as would provide GP, school etc.
	LPP0763	Object	I strongly object to the proposed building on land sited to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore. My main concern is the loss of about 2 ½ % of Green Belt land to development when there is a perfectly viable alternative at the Lea Castle site. I fully support the OCAGLP (Offmore Comberton Action Group Local Plans) for a sustainable village at Lea Castle as I see it as a solution to all the problems development brings with the necessary infrastructure that is required to go with it. The Husum Way railway bridge is in my opinion neither big nor strong enough to support the extra traffic from the proposed Offmore development. There would also be more air pollution and more flood water as a consequence of more housing. Husum Way already floods regularly when there is a prolonged period of heavy rain. The junction at the A456 Birmingham Road and Husum Way is a dangerous road crossing owing to the volume of traffic to and from Birmingham. The strain of extra traffic from any new development would only increase the problem that already exists. Not only will there be the visible impact of housing as the Offmore site is more elevated Offmore Primary School is already full to capacity with no more room to extend.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	LPP0794	Object	Urban Extension - East of Kidderminster (N). This is a large scale allocation expected to deliver 1,735 homes. No comprehensive assessments have been undertaken of the entire allocation and the impact its release as a whole would have on the development of the Green Belt. The Green Belt assessment is flawed in this regard. SHLAA states that some parcels have not been put forward by landowners for development. Availability is therefore unknown. It is questionable whether such a large allocation could be built out in the Plan period. The Core sites are very close together, as are the additional sites under options A & B. As the sites are all in the Green Belt, no planning applications can be approved until the Plan is adopted. No dwelling starts are likely until 5 years into plan period, leaving 10 years to complete the build at rate of 1 dwelling per day which is unrealistic. The market could not sustain this number of sales in such a small area. The capacity during the plan period should be greatly reduced by at least 50%.
Offmore Comberton Action Group	LPP01552	Object	It is inevitable that some land will have to be removed from the Green Belt for future development. However we believe that there should be a presumption that major future development should have the aim of creating sustainable communities of a size capable of supporting, at least, its own Primary School, village centre with

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
- Local Plans			<p>shops and community facilities, if possible some live work units and adequate recreational facilities, and not simply be an ‘add on’ to existing communities.</p> <p>We object to the “Core Sites” around the east of Kidderminster in both Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. • The land in question is Grade 2 Agricultural Land. • There are endangered bird species: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers, Skylarks and Lapwings are present in this land and along the route the “by pass “would have to take from the A456 to the A449. As well as the birdlife there are foxes, badgers, rabbits, muntjac and roe deer present across the area. • Development of land behind Baldwin Rd would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSSI. • Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Rd. is considerably higher than the rest of the area so development would be very visible. • Hurcott Lane and the narrow extension of Hurcott Rd. into Hurcott Village are extremely dangerous roads with far too frequent serious road traffic accidents. Any development of land to the rear of Baldwin Rd. would have to somehow incorporate the existing Hurcott Lane/Birmingham Rd. Junction. • Eastern bypass: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Would have to be built from the Wolverhampton Rd to the Worcester Rd to be of any use as anything shorter would cause roads around Hurcott Rd/ Birmingham Rd. to be used as rat runs. ○ Would be needed <u>before</u> land to the east of Offmore could be developed. ○ Would need at least one and probably two new Railway Bridges. These are incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for them. ○ The elevated position would need at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. • Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to avoid congestion • Drainage of the land to the rear of the existing Offmore estate is extremely poor. In recent years heavy rain has led to serious flooding into gardens in Prior Close, Chaucer Cres., Offmore Farm Close, Ruskin

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Close and Munro Close. Even at times of severe drought, the high water table on the Offmore Estate means that if a two foot deep hole is dug in a garden on the lower part of the estate, it rapidly fills with water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no community “heart” and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. The Cavalier PH, Offmore Evangelical Church and Offmore Primary School are the only “community facilities” on the existing Offmore estate. The proposed extension of the estate would not be able to provide any extra facilities which would be accessible to existing residents. • Offmore Primary School is full, is on a restricted site and can’t be extended.
	LPPO1825	Object	I am very concerned by the Core site option to the east of Kidderminster because this being built on Green Belt land, which should be protected at all costs, as per the original aims of the Green Belt. There are many sites within Kidderminster that should be used first, in particular the old law courts and the redevelopment of Worcester Street - replace some of the empty shops with housing/flats and bring life back into the town centre again.
	LPPO1857	Object	Opposes development at Husum Way because the area forms a natural Green Belt separating the town from West Midlands towns. Concerned at lack of employment opportunities in Kidderminster and the impact of a growing population as they have to travel to work and add to road congestion, pressure on schools and Worcester hospital.
	LPPO1861	Object	<p>Objects to new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in volume of traffic - a bridge will be required - the impact of A2 very good agricultural land that is valuable land - schooling - the present is at full capacity <p>Supports development of the Lea Castle site and the ADR site between Hurcott Village and Stourbridge Rd.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Overall supports 'B' sites scattered around the Kidderminster area.
	LPP01880	Object	<p>Objects to the development of Birmingham side of Kidderminster, namely, the site at the back of Baldwin Road. Also the site to the side of Offmore Road estate.</p> <p>Reason: Adverse Road traffic on already congested road junctions. We need to keep the Green Belt buffer zone at this side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>Note: In my opinion the 'Lea Castle Sustainable Village' would be a better site. Reason: This an empty site, not been used for years and would have a lot less impact on the Green Belt and the roads and road junctions surrounding it.</p>
	LPP01883	Object	<p>Objects to development of the land to the east of Offmore. Object due to concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of wildlife • Local schools and GP surgeries would be under further strain. • Side roads would be used for rat runs. • Traffic would be horrendous in the immediate surrounding areas. • Suggest that Lea Castle would be more suitable. • Building on Lea Castle would create a new GP service and new school a possible new village and more housing.
	LPP01908	Object	Objects to any new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Concerned about traffic, the schools already being full and building on a farm on Green Belt land. Proposes building on the old Lea Castle site as an alternative.
	LPP01911	Object	Objects to plan 'A' and plan 'B' due to volume and build up of traffic congestion.
	LPP01920	Object	Objects until extra infrastructure is sorted i.e. schools, road, and medical facilities.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP01921	Object	Objects to sites East of Offmore / Comberton.
	LPP01924	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently have inadequate facilities and infrastructure. • Do not need industrial development. • The development would need shops/community facilities. • Will create environmental damage. • The development should include home for older couples and single people.
Anonymous	LPP01952	Object	<p>OC/4, OC/5, OC/6, and OC/13.</p> <p>I object to the plans and fully support the counter-proposals outlined by the OCAG-LP to extend the use of land at Lea Castle by adding to options A and B and create a community of around 2500 houses without impinging on good quality Green Belt agricultural land and the lovely natural resources in this area. This community would sustain a new primary school and make Wolverley CE High School viable long term. A bus service, small shopping centre and perhaps even a Doctor's Surgery would also be well supported. No provision for the Eastern By-pass and the current roads in this area could not cope with the increase in traffic. A road junction near the railway bridge on Husum Way would be ridiculous - almost as bad as the ill-thought out and dangerous current Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction.</p>
	LPP01986	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We object to the proposed development to the east of Offmore/Comberton and Baldwin Road area. • Development would be a visual incursion and cause noise and pollution
	LPP02018	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt acts as a barrier to the joining up to the conurbation spread from West Midlands. • Rat runs could be created causing danger to people.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other options are more suitable. • Infrastructure would not be able to support the increased population.
	LPPO2040	Object	<p>I object to option A. Green Belt should only be used when all alternatives exhausted not because it is cheaper than brownfield sites. Once our countryside is gone, it's forever. The roads on Offmore Estate/Hurcott Lane have no further traffic capacity and are already used to access the A448. Would any developer fund a new railway bridge necessary for an eastern by-pass? The infrastructure e.g. schools do not have the capacity to expand.</p> <p>Where have the housing figures for the Kidderminster area been obtained? They do not agree with the projections from the census etc.</p> <p>Consider the whole of Kidderminster e.g. Lea Castle/sites to the north-west of Kidderminster not just the east.</p>
	LPPO2047	Object	<p><u>OC5-OC6-OC13 :</u></p> <p><u>Traffic:</u> Local roads are already used as a rat runs and are dangerous for pedestrians. Birmingham Road /Husum Way junction is dangerous. Cost of bridge construction/bypass would be excessive</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> Heavy rain floods road Husum Way/Shakespeare Drive</p> <p><u>Schools:</u> Local schools oversubscribed</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2081	Object	<p><i>I object to development proposals in sites OC/4, OC/5, OC/6, OC/13 as they are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • weighed to the east of Kidderminster/disproportionate to the district, should encompass all areas • Could re-create a Birmingham commuter zone not local skill base. The area needs housing to attract a technologically competent workforce. • Loss of good arable land in Green Belt which should not be used where alternative sites are available. • Distribute development to allow for natural expansion to reduce the environmental impact. • Points A or B options would worsen already bad traffic. A new rail bridge to Birmingham Road may be of benefit, but would not alleviate congestion and an eastern by-pass solution is costly and impractical. • Being elevated land in Baldwin Road and east of Offmore/Comberton could cause drainage issues and would have an adverse visual impact. • Local services and amenities would be affected. Schools are full or near to and medical services under pressure, bus services are poor. • Industrial development at WFR/CB/7 Hodge Hill - site unattractive to business investment with limited access options, transport links are restricted; • There is no obvious demand/supply chain sector in the vicinity. • This is not the way forward. • The basis for an alternative proposal is evident where option B housing is considered in conjunction with elements of option A, plus core mixed use sites.
	LPPO2098	Object	I am objecting to the proposal of planning for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the land east of Offmore/Comberton area. For the destruction of animal habitat, not enough places in the local schools, very few rural areas/green areas left if it went ahead.
	LPPO2099	Object	The areas around Baldwin Road and Hodge Hill for extra housing would be pointless as schools are already full up. Light industry around Hodge Hill would spoil wildlife and the rural look as not much green space would be left.
	LPPO2117	Object	Object to loss of Green Belt to rear of Baldwin Road, Kidderminster/east of Offmore and Comberton which would

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			damage wildlife habitats and affect the air quality/noise levels
	LPPO2142	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schools in area are full. - Visual impact would be very visible - Volume of traffic unsustainable
	LPPO2183	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Green Belt land. • We are a 'Garden of England' area - how long for? • Our heritage is need for these areas to refresh us, trees to sustain air quality and to protect wildlife habitat. • Once Green Belt is gone there is no going back. • When we need more land to grow food in the future it won't be there. • We need breaks between Kidderminster, Stourport & Bewdley. • Wildlife habitats are under enough pressure - leave them alone.
	LPPO2188	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would put a strain on schools and services in the Offmore area.
	LPPO2226	Object	<p>Objection to the proposed development of land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton, Kidderminster</p> <p>I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure - Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic. • We have lived in Husum Way for the past 20 years and have seen the traffic increase tremendously over this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and we find

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>it very difficult to get out, particularly since the Stourport Link Road has opened and Husum Way is being used as a cut through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents living in Husum Way would appreciate — and all agree — that something should be done about Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction before considering more houses being built in and around this immediate area. • How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular. • Offmore Farm School is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. • The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat. • Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing whereas the land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is ample land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.
	<p>LPPO2227</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Objection to the proposed development of land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton, Kidderminster. I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure - Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic. • We have lived in Husum Way for the past 20 years and have seen the traffic increase tremendously over

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and we find it very difficult to get out, particularly since the Stourport Link Road has opened and Husum Way is being used as a cut through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents living in Husum Way would appreciate — and all agree — that something should be done about Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction before considering more houses being built in and around this immediate area. • How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular. • Offmore Farm School is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended. • GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals. • The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. • The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat. • Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing whereas the land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is amble land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.
	LPPO2351	Object	<p>I am so greatly sorrowed by the apparent need to use highly productive Green Belt land to satisfy the needs of housing for this period and maybe more afterwards. The land at Offmore Farm is rolling fields, woods and all manner of wildlife around that at the moment is our pleasure. Apparently this land although Green Belt and intensely farmed is marked in red on the plans and that means it is for developers to do with as they will. If they must we would like to think that consideration is given existing properties and that they could be granted a little</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>space rather than housing butting up to us and totally robbing any views that they have of the Cleve and Malvern Hills and Worcestershire etc. One problem with all this building here, I feel would be extra noise and poor air quality with this much greater intensity, the biggest culprit probably being the transport needs of the modern household. During rush hour times we already experience a lot of effective grid lock with the existing road system as it is, but double this in the locality and it really would be a problem with nowhere to go. There was some talk about an Eastern Bypass being part of the overall plan, joining the Wolverhampton Road (A449) with the Stourbridge Road (A451) Birmingham Road (A456) and the Worcester Road (A449) to the South and M5. I think if the large amount of housing goes ahead then it must be met and serviced by what you could call a large amount of road to match what would certainly be a total change in traffic numbers. We were advised that the developers would possibly pay for this and the necessary railway bridges (two required) so I suppose that if needs must, this will tip the balance for acceptable traffic flows. I can only speak for the Offmore Farm area situation, but all these new homes will bring a lot of new people with children who will all need to use the local facilities. With the Primary Schools all full and nowhere to expand, where would the children go? There are Schools available, but on the opposite side of Kidderminster to the North East i.e. Wolverley / Fairfield area. With a larger population and many of us living longer, but maybe carrying with us health issues means we must mention the NHS. Without more money for new buildings, Nurses and Doctors the local Hospitals can't cope with present numbers. The answer is we need more facilities as well as houses. I hope that maybe some of these thoughts would inspire some out of the box ideas for ways to generate new growth in and around the town that maybe would go towards making Kidderminster bigger and better without totally taking away everything we enjoy.</p>
	LPPQ2352	Object	<p>Too many homes proposed for the Eastern boundary; burden should be spread. I object to proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Green Belt to the East of Offmore includes prime agricultural land/wildlife habitat and it reduces air pollution. - School capacity issue. - Eastern bypass needed before new homes are built including bridges as necessary – who will pay? - If built on, Offmore being elevated would need a tree screen to reduce traffic noise/pollution.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2353	Object	<p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the local plan for the locations of housing on either option A or B will devalue our property. This has been confirmed by a high profile local estate agent. To the loss of Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster which plays a vital part in separating Kidderminster town from Blakedown and the overall West Midland conurbation. To industrial development at Hodge Hill would also require a by-pass to avoid certain congestion. Due to the elevation of the proposed building land to the east of Offmore this will result in major traffic noise – trees would be required to ‘buffer’ the traffic/noise pollution. to the destruction of the beautiful Green Belt landscape to the east off Offmore would result in the loss of annual nesting habitat for endangered/declining bird species i.e., Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers; also ground nesting birds, Lapwings, Skylarks and occasionally Curlew. More common wildlife loss would be to Badgers, Foxes, Hares and protected Bats which are often seen flying overhead to the east of Offmore. All this Green Belt land if proposals are passed to the building of houses would be lost forever! And this is unforgivable. To the proposed building to the east of Offmore where existing houses are bordering the fields on the Green Belt/farmland. This will have a significant visual impact as the ground is elevated. Building in this area will result in loss of privacy for residents, high visibility, light and noise pollution. To a linear development to the east of Kidderminster/Offmore would not create a sustainable community. It would have no community ‘heart’ and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. <p>Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An eastern bypass/ road would need to be built prior to any housing development from the Wolverhampton Road to the Worcester Road to be of any use. A bypass road would be needed before the land to the east of Offmore could be developed. An eastern bypass would need at least one new railway bridge. The building of bridges is extremely expensive. Will a private developer pay for this? Or are you expecting the tax payer to pay the cost?

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offmore Primary School is full. What schools are within the vicinity to accommodate the extra numbers requiring school places? If parents have to travel this will force even more congestion and pollution onto the local roads.
	LPPO2389	Object	<p>We agree with all 10 "Disadvantages listed on the circular known as "OCAG-LP (Offmore Comberton Action Group-Local Plans). In addition, the idea of industrial units between Hodge Hill Farm on the A456 and the farm house near corner of Husum Way simply goes right into the face of current road restrictions made a few years ago to keep traffic in single file and generally slow it down as it approaches Husum Way, a 40 mph limit and the urban development straddling the A456 (Birmingham Road). WE cannot imagine the problem of INCURSION that the need for commercial vehicles coming in and out needing to go west and east of such a development would cause. The Lea Castle development seems far more workable than say extending Kidderminster development eastwards from its current edge. We have informed the RSPB as members, the danger of such units and a proposed Eastern bypass via the outskirts of Kidderminster to particular bird life. (See one of the 10 disadvantages above-mentioned). "Ah, but it's only one incursion." Travelling the country as we do and witnessing new housing and industrial unit development, more traffic congestion. Means we are seeing land taken up from nature on a frightening scale! Similarly the possible future development of fields behind Stanklyn Lane running to the current boundaries of Spennells Estate will remove another current wildlife eco-system, which numerous species of birds rely on let alone other wildlife. The "material drive" of those in power will eventually attack us all, if not destroyed by its own very nature in "Nature's scheme of things." The human race has this problem they always believe they'll get by or round. The people who drive this may not be affected yet, but their descendants will. We will in future be unable to create the space required to keep catering for more traffic and population. We have the dilemma of it's future approach, and ultimate reality.</p>
	LPPO2394	Object	<p>Concerned about the amount of building planned on fields in the area. Any green space in or around towns adds great value. It keeps everyone in touch with nature and enhances lives. It should always be preserved. I feel planners have taken the easy option by just tagging building of houses onto the edge of all areas around the town. It seems they have not given much thought to the effect that destroying green field areas will have on the area. Proposed development will totally destroy the natural and free outlook we and many others enjoy. The</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area behind Offmore is an oasis where we can see badgers, bats, many varieties of birds, and this season, we have a barn owl that flies around the barn in the field behind us. This is something to be cherished, not destroyed. This land is high ground and any building will replace the beautiful sky line and be seen from a long way. The field also has many trees and a stream at the bottom. This I fear will flood if houses are built on the land. Also on the plans there is an 'indicative' line to show where a relief road would be. I can't see where it will start and end. I believe not enough thought has been given to this. As far as I can make out it is marked as being somewhere near Offmore Barns through a farmed field where the badgers, and foxes roam, just at the side of what looks like a planned row of houses. Do the planners really want to spoil the beauty of what we have but let the town centre go to ruin? In conclusion, I object strongly.</p>
	LPP02397	Object	<p>The planners seem to have limited imagination, "just bolt on blocks of houses etc to the outskirts of Kidderminster mainly on the east side."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Option A the route of the relief road has not even been established. Where is the starting point and end point? Who will pay? At least one bridge over the railway line possibly two will be needed. • If Option B is used all building traffic will be required to use the bridge on Husum Way. The junction on the A456 (already dangerous and scene of many accidents) will be in chaos and the surrounding area will be in gridlock. • The planners have put little thought into the damage caused to the Green Belt. The proposed relief road would be an eyesore across the horizon. Valuable wildlife would be displaced if not destroyed. The proposed buildings built on high ground would also be a visual disaster; the runoff from all the buildings proposed would obviously cause flooding problems. As well as drainage problems the proposed buildings would impact greatly on sewage disposal and other services required. • The wellbeing and lifestyle of existing residents would be severely affected. Why so many dwellings? Where are the new householders coming from? I understand the population of Kidderminster has hardly increased for many years. • Offmore Primary School is full, and cannot be extended. What about the education of the new residents? • The Planners plot 15 years of disruption of the local area, houses, roads, industrial units etc being built till

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			2034. Perhaps they should concentrate on development in Kidderminster town centre.
	LPP02427	Object	<p>We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health, pollution and social problems. Alternative brown field sites are available along with pockets of derelict land ripe for redevelopment. The amount of development required has also been vastly overestimated and the actual amount needed could be sustained on alternative brown sites (Lea Castle, disused pubs, disused factories such as those in Park Lane, Sladen/Sion Hill schools). Pollution: Any development of these areas would substantially increase the already heavy traffic pollution. We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. Also the speed of this traffic is seriously dangerous, especially to children, the vulnerable and animals. This development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. Add to this an increase in the already incessant traffic noise levels. I would not wish to see a further increase in traffic using Hurcott Road. The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Road infers that Hurcott Lane will require the road to be blocked for vehicle access at either the Birmingham Road or Stourbridge Road ends but this will not prevent traffic flow just divert more traffic into Hurcott Road increasing pollution and volumes of traffic on roads only designed for local residential traffic which have inadequate flow characteristics. In conclusion, this is not a healthy and community spirited decision to develop the area. Baldwin Road is similarly treated like a rat run and as for the Horsefair how much more can this bottle neck sustain? We are trying to improve the look of this run down area not destroy it and end all hope of engendering a happy community spirit. Extra housing would require a by-pass to be built as the aforementioned roads just cannot sustain more traffic and the pollution it brings. Wildlife: The area is known and loved for its beauty and wildlife. This Green Belt plays an aesthetic role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation and these green fields are the first glorious introduction to Kidderminster on the A451 and A456. Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. Consider the importance of recreational activities in terms of health, wellbeing and tourism. People need space to thrive. It's unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. Compared with neighbouring towns like Stourbridge we are lucky to have such big green spaces. Don't destroy it for future generations when alternative brown or</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>derelict sites are available. Endangered species, indeed wildlife in general would be threatened. Development would seriously impact and cause irrecoverable change to wildlife habitats especially on buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSIs. Some proposed development sites have steep gradients which could raise the risk of potential flooding. The proposed development behind Baldwin Road has the potential to flood, on one side with run off towards the Birmingham Road with a natural hollow in the main road and on the other side run off towards the lower end of Hurcott Road where it is a narrow lane which in turn would run off into the outfall from Hurcott Pool and transfer to Broadwaters with the potential for flooding the adjacent main road. Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is generally much higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and not blend in spoiling the beauty of the area. The field height to the rear of Baldwin Road means that the proposed properties would adversely overlook the existing properties & their gardens at the lower end of Baldwin Road. The Government's own policy regarding planning decisions is to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological interests. In brief all planning decisions must consider location on alternative sites to green fields.</p> <p>Amenities and Community Spirit: We already suffer from a lack of amenities in this area. One shop in which our post office was taken off us. A smattering of shops in Spennells and Offmore. Can local schools accommodate extra housing on this level? Offmore is already full and can't be developed. We no longer have an acute hospital so all this extra population would place more pressure on Worcester Royal already facing special measures. This also raises questions with regards the existing level of doctors, dentists and opticians in the area. Public transport is poor and infrequent. Big developments generally have no community spirit. Building on smaller pockets of land fosters integration. Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP. Doubling the size of Spennells would not be a wise move.</p> <p>Conclusion: We need smaller numbers of houses proposed which can be sustained by brown sites like Lea Castle. Smaller pockets of once used land should be considered like factories on Park Lane, closed pubs (The Broadwaters?) closed schools like Sladen and Sion Hill. We need to reinvigorate existing eyesores such as disused schools & factories which are frequently vandalised and this will improve some of the more rundown areas rather than permanently erode Green Belt sites, which once gone they are gone forever. Don't bulldoze green field sites prior to using up every brown field or derelict site in the locality.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2505	Object	<p>I would like to object to the urban extension core sites to the East of Kidderminster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is Green Belt and plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. The Plan clearly states in Policy 6B that locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt. • Many endangered bird species such as corn buntings, yellowhammers & skylarks also live in this area. • There may be drainage issues with this site a proper investigation into this should have taken place before the area was allocated. • A bypass road would be needed in order to access these new houses properly, so should be considered alongside Option A. To truly operate as a relief road it should be extended to the Wolverhampton Road. This would be a very expensive project as it would need to be built over the railway line. It is unlikely that any developer would want to pay for this. • Offmore & Comberton would not be able to cope with these extra people. Offmore Primary School is already full and on a restricted site so cannot be extended. • The proposed development would not be sustainable and due to its linear nature could not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. • Can the NHS cope? Kidderminster & Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand. • Money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services.
	LPPO2554	Object	<p>I understand that new housing needs to be provided but think there are better alternatives. On both of your plan options you wish to build on the land to the east of Offmore and propose a bypass on these fields thus completely ruining the feel of the local area. I have grave concerns of what the destruction of green areas will mean for the local wildlife. There are many species of birds in the area. These include birds that are listed as being endangered such as Corn Buntings, Skylarks and Yellow Hammers. There are also many hedgehogs and whilst they are not officially listed as endangered, it is a fact that they are in vast decline. Please reconsider your plans for Offmore</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			and think about alternatives. It really would destroy this already established area and cause much upset to local residents.
	LPPO2562	Object	I wish to lodge my objection to the proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton areas. This involves interrupting a natural wildlife habit- bird sanctuary at Hurcott Pool which has taken years to develop and is hugely supported by nature lovers and walkers - why destroy a beautiful area it is your duty to make sure this valuable area is conserved. Which private developer would pay for a new Railway Bridge which this Eastern By Pass would require? This would be an elevated position which would need screening off! The local school would not be able to cope - so what would your answer be to this problem.
	LPPO2572	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed developments around Offmore and Comberton for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of good quality agricultural land which is in constant production • This land is teeming in wild life including badgers, bats, foxes, common newts and Great Crested Newts, frogs and bees. A full survey should be done to identify all of the species which will be destroyed. • The land is used by local residents for health walks and other leisure activities. • There are plenty of brown field sites such as Lea Castle which would make a better alternative and fulfil the needs of Kidderminster. The housing need figures seem excessive and are not in line with historical growth. • Insufficient services: Doctors, Schools, Hospitals. • There are no jobs for the local population how will the plan provide jobs for additional people? • Where is the money to come from? Is the local community going to be lumbered with unsustainable debt? • Such a large development will increase pollution, road congestion flooding issues for existing and new development with the amount of water run off down to Blakeway stream. • Loss of privacy to residents. The top fields are substantially higher than the existing estate. The lower field is much lower and also takes our soak away water which could affect the stability of the ground. • Concentrating too many houses on the east of Kidderminster, overwhelming the existing communities which could cause social problems.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The schools and Doctors to the east of Kidderminster are already at capacity.
	LPPO2586	Object	<p>Concerned regarding the proposed development of the fields at Offmore and appalled at the proposal. My concerns are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> When purchasing our property the local search did not reveal anything. I asked the planners regarding any future or possible development with regard to the surrounding fields. The planner advised me that there were numerous other sites that would be used before the fields surrounding my property and he also stated “it won’t be in my life time that development happens in your location”. I have since contacted the farmer who currently owns the land and he stated that he had been in conversation with the Council and Developers for over 12months, I would like an explanation why we have been lied to both in a verbal enquiry and in a legal criterion. The land is raised by a considerable degree and development will cause the water run-off that will to the adjacent property gardens. The height of properties built in this location, ‘houses would tower over the current barns and would cause a reduction in property values. There is a Gentleman’s agreement with the farmer for use of a track that surrounds all the properties in the courtyard as there is no rear access to the properties and this has been in place since the barns were converted. What will happen when the land is sold? The development will have a severe impact on the surrounding roads and infrastructure, the council do not have the finances to maintain roads in the area as it is so how do you expect to build new roads and maintain them? I was always led to believe that Greenfield sites and brownfield sites would be used before any Green Belt. Why are the proposals all on Green Belt land. There are numerous sites of brownfield and greenfield sites unused and located around Wyre Forest. All the development is in one area and one side of Kidderminster when if the developments were located around the area there would be less impact on everything? I also understand there has been a challenge raised as to the percentage of houses required and the percentage that Wyre Forest District council have requested which according to figures is far in excess of

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>actual requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Kidderminster Hospital was downgraded yet Worcester Royal is unable to cope with the extra workload to the extent it is in special measures. How can an authority allow more influx of residents when the current ones have to use sub standard services. The Doctors surgeries will not cope neither will the schools. With all increases of population, there is a rise in crime, how will West Mercia Police cope, they do not have the resources to attend all incidents so they are prioritised and only the major incidents are attended. 5. The impact on the surrounding nature will be devastating. There is an established badgers set at this site. There are common and great crested newts in and around the properties, my understanding is the newts and their environment are of great importance and both are protected. I would be very interested to see a copy of an ecological report on the areas nature population and the impact a development will have. Nature cannot cope with constant depletion of its natural resources from badgers, birds, bats, amphibians, butterflies and the bees that are constantly in the media regarding loss of habitat and if they disappear then the human race will suffer untold consequences. 6. The increase in traffic fumes and noise will have detrimental effects to health for all, the picture is a very bleak one. 7. The developers at a recent drop in meeting said that not only were the houses needed as a requirement by central government but for people working in and wishing to move to Kidderminster for employment, this I feel is a very weak and unjustifiable reason as what few jobs there are in Kidderminster are either low paid, zero hours contracts or voluntary work, there are no large volume employers now the carpet works have closed. The centre of the town is appalling with shops either closed, charity shops or low quality merchandise. The Horsefair is a total eyesore yet there is no regeneration for this area, people are not going to travel to Kidderminster when they can go to Merry Hill, park for free, shop in an environment that is both pleasant and not subject to weather conditions. 8. It is a well documented fact that when local authorities have introduced green areas for residents to walk along hedgerows, on grass, by running water and where trees grow, their health and well being has risen in some instances that depression has been reduced considerably and health issues have dramatically

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>reduced.</p> <p>There is currently very strong feelings regarding the decimation of the Green Belt in the local area for housing and I hope you will take the time to read and digest not only my thoughts but all of the local residents whose lives will be blighted by such a carbuncle in such a beautiful part of the Wyre Forest.</p>
	LPP02589	Object	<p>The burden of new housing developments in the WFDC area should be shared across the area and not almost entirely along the eastern boundary of Kidderminster which is essentially Green Belt land and is arable land growing essential food crops. Whilst I understand the need for development and understand that this land will be eventually developed as an inevitable expansion of Kidderminster, the immediate development should take account of the current brownfield areas including Lea Castle and the Sion Hill and Sladen former school sites. Offmore Court was completed in the mid 1990s and is surrounded on three sides by Grade A agricultural farmland. The fields surrounding the development have been used on a continuous basis, to grow cash crops (originally sugar beet, until the closure of the Kidderminster sugar beet processing factory, and latterly wheat, potatoes, carrots etc). As and when the development of the fields adjoining Offmore Court takes place we would like to suggest the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That consideration is given to the effect of flooding of the stream which flows from the eastern direction and along the edge of the Offmore estate towards Spennells. Currently any rainfall is adsorbed by the land and there is little or no problem with flooding of the stream. When this land is developed there will be significant run-off as the land available for natural drainage will be greatly reduced. • That the unique nature of the Offmore Court development is respected and an area of undeveloped land should be allowed to remain around the development to enable its unique character to be retained and not submerged.
	LPP02599	Object	<p>Comments and concerns regarding the propose development to the East of Kidderminster. (OC/6 East of Offmore Farm area & OC/13 Stone Hill North). These areas are designated as Green Belt. The Green Belt policy needs to be</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>strictly adhered to, and much emphasis placed on the following quote:</p> <p><i>"The essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence, and their protection must be maintained as far as can be seen ahead"</i></p> <p>Once a decision is made to change the Green Belt boundary it will not be possible to put it back. That is why it is so important to respect this policy. The Core housing plan to the East of Kidderminster is on Green Belt, which includes grade 1 & 2 agricultural land also used for shooting sports. Rare species are present, especially to the stream south of Offmore Farm and surrounding Prior Close. There is important wooded wetland area, allowed to go to wild bog adjacent to the stream, between OC/13 & OC/6 that is a haven to rare wildlife and ancient yet un-registered trees. This area from the stream to the field boundary allows natural flood control. Which would be compromised by any development that would create excess run-off and drainage problems. Along with mature trees and plant life, wildlife is present in the area including Barn Owls, Woodpeckers & other important birdlife, Deer, Hares, foxes, badgers, bats and reptiles, toads, frogs & newts. It would be extremely irresponsible to develop this land.</p> <p>The land to the rear of Prior Close is classified as Grade 1 & Grade 2 agricultural land. According to Policy 28D and paragraphs 28.13-28.15 'Only Lower grade agricultural land should be considered for development and not permitted on higher grade land...'</p> <p>'The latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP 2009) reaffirm that winters are likely to get wetter and that we are also likely to experience more extreme weather conditions such as intense rainfall events. Existing surface water drainage systems are not designed to cope with these extreme conditions. Extensive flooding in the UK in the summer of 2007 was mostly due to surface water overwhelming traditional piped surface water drainage systems. Therefore, it is considered prudent to ensure that new SUDS schemes are developed taking into account climate change.'</p> <p>'The attractiveness of the District's natural environment is identified as being a particular asset within the Sustainable Community Strategy. Safeguarding the District's Green Belt will help to maintain the appeal of the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>District to residents and visitors and will also maintain the opportunities that the Green Belt offers for recreation.'</p> <p>All of these exerts of the current plan that are also reinforced the past (2006-2026) plan, and should be seriously considered when considering any development on prime Green Belt land. I must re-iterate when the Green Belt is dissolved it can't ever be undone.</p> <p>The proposed development would lead to other issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are not enough jobs in the area to sustain such an increase in the population of the East of Kidderminster. • A linear development in this area would not be a sustainable community in any sense of the word.
	LPP02656	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First and Foremost it is Prime, High Grade Arable / Agriculture Land. - Offmore and Comberton schools are at capacity, anymore intake would be very detrimental. - At certain times of the day there is a large volume of traffic in and out of the estate , which will increase. - Why on earth ruin something that is already a very attractive gateway to the town? - We would support an alternative extended Lea Castle site, which would make it a desirable, practical sustainable community, with all the necessary services. <p>The bottom line, this country cannot afford a large increase in the population, we do not produce enough of what we consume, you only have to look at our balance of payments deficit. This is why we should not be using farm land for housing.</p>
	LPP02706	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Green Belt plays a vital role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. 2. Without a by pass, all the roads around Hurcott Road will be used as rat runs.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. It would impact on wildlife habitats in the buffer zones for Hurcott & Podmore SSIs.</p> <p>4. Birmingham Road is often already congested; this would be much worse.</p> <p>5. The proposed linear development would have no community heart.</p> <p>6. Offmore primary school is already full and cannot be extended.</p> <p>7. Additional building at a higher level will add to flood risk</p>
	LPPO2711	Object	<p>The Green Belt policy needs to be strictly adhered to, and much emphasis placed on the following quote:</p> <p><i>"The essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence, and their protection must be maintained as far as can be seen ahead"</i></p> <p>Once a decision is made to change the Green Belt boundary it will not be possible to put it back. That is why it is so important to respect this policy. The Core housing plan to the East of Kidderminster is on Green Belt, which includes Grade 1 & 2 agricultural land also used for shooting sports. With a rare species present, especially to the stream South of Offmore Farm and surrounding Prior Close. There is important wooded wetland area including a set-aside area that is allowed to go to wild bog adjacent to the stream, between OC/13 & OC/6 that is a haven to rare wildlife and ancient yet un-registered trees. This area from the stream to the field boundary allows natural flood control. This would be compromised by any development that would create excess run-off and drainage problems. Much along with mature tree and plant life, wildlife is present in the area and we have personally seen Barn Owls, Woodpeckers & other important birdlife. Deer, Hares, foxes, badgers, bats and reptiles including toads, frogs & newts. Any development that is allowed to take place on Green Belt should at least conform to the Rural development policy (Section 28) rather than come under urban planning laws.</p> <p>Agricultural land Classification: Classifies the proposed development land to the rear of Prior Close to be Grade 1</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>& Grade 2 agricultural land. According to Policy 28D and paragraphs 28.13-28.15 - Only Lower grade agricultural land should be considered for development and not permitted on higher grade land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of the best and most versatile agricultural land as defined by the NPPF will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that it can not be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land. 2. Proposals for development on agricultural land should not prejudice the viability of farming operations on any remaining agricultural land. 3. Applications for development on agricultural land of higher quality will be resisted where the site has not been allocated in the Local Plan and is considered worthy of protection. <p>Climate Change: The latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP 2009) reaffirm that winters are likely to get wetter and that we are also likely to experience more extreme weather conditions such as intense rainfall events. Existing surface water drainage systems are not designed to cope with these extreme conditions. Extensive flooding in the UK in the summer of 2007 was mostly due to surface water overwhelming traditional piped surface water drainage systems. Therefore, it is considered prudent to ensure that new SUDS schemes are developed taking into account</p> <p>7.1 The attractiveness of the District's natural environment is identified as being a particular asset within the Sustainable Community Strategy. Safeguarding the District's Green Belt will help to maintain the appeal of the District to residents and visitors and will also maintain the opportunities that the Green Belt offers for recreation.</p> <p>All of these exerts of the current plan that are also reinforced the past (2006-2026) plan, and should be seriously considered when considering any development on prime Green Belt land. I must reiterate when the Green Belt is dissolved it can't ever be undone.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The proposed development would lead to other issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are not enough jobs in the area to sustain such an increase in the population of the East of Kidderminster. • A linear development in this area would not be a sustainable community in any sense of the word • Kidderminster has been naturally in decline since the loss of the carpet industry and other businesses, there is no way such a large population increase with planned housing projects would be sustainable. • The proposed development on Green Belt goes against so many existing and past governmental & District council policies & guidelines. <p>As a local resident I am appalled at the lack of communication by the local Council who are supposed to work for not against the people.</p>
	LPP02745	Object	<p>The Green Belt is a vital part in separating Kidderminster from the advance of the West Midlands Conurbation, the public footpaths are used by many walkers both with and without dogs. This would cause massive congestion at peak times. Husum Way already carries a large amount of school traffic to and from Offmore and Comberton schools and is used as a cut through. Speeding traffic already causes concerns for the children who walk to school. The very dangerous junction between Husum Way and the A456 cannot cope with any additional traffic. Both Offmore and Comberton primary schools are full. The lower end of the field behind the existing houses in Prior Close is boggy as the water from all the higher ground surrounding it collects at this low point.</p>
	LPP02773	Object	<p>I would have serious concerns about the proposed housing developments for Baldwin Road and Offmore surrounding areas. This area of Kidderminster is already congested with school issues, traffic issues, etc., The wildlife habitat in Hurcott Wood and the Green Belt areas of Offmore Farm would be severely affected.</p>
	LPP02774	Object	<p>I am writing regarding my concerns about the local plans proposed on both your options A and B for the Offmore and Comberton areas. Offmore is currently on the edge of the town and the Green Belt plays a vital part in the separation from the West Midlands conurbation. It seems totally inappropriate to be building on Green Belt sites when there are far better options that I feel should be considered. Green Belt is vital not only for the purpose of</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			local wildlife but for the local area to. I chose to live in the Offmore area as it is now, on the edge of town and surrounded by aesthetically pleasing green areas not further housing sites that will create a feel of being in a built up area. Whilst I totally understand the need for providing more housing I do not see how expansion to Offmore and surrounding areas is viable.
	LPPO2789	Object	I object to the proposal to build to the rear of Offmore, Comberton, Baldwin Rd and also Spennells.
	LPPO2811	Object	Support the OCAG-LP objections to local plan proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton area.
	LPPO2839	Object	We prefer more dispersed strategy where although construction costs are inevitably higher, there can be more architectural diversity, e.g. Lea Castle which would allow a development to include a Primary school/medical amenities. Our home in Green Belt fields on a small estate lies on the Eastern boundary of Kidderminster so we had no notification of these plans which could result in us being located between an industrial park and a large traffic island.
	LPPO2859	Object	Object to development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm & Comberton and would like to include Franche and Ferndale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended. - GP surgeries are struggling to cope now - The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built - The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation - Loss of wildlife/arable land
	LPPO2860	Object	Object to development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm & Comberton and would like to include

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Franche and Ferndale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended. - GP surgeries are struggling to cope now - The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built - The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation - Loss of wildlife/arable land
	LPPO2970	Object	<p>I believe you should take careful note and consideration of the alternatives drawn up by 'The Offmore Comberton Action Group'. Theirs seems to be a reasoned argument in favour of the alternative proposals. I have objections to placing industrial land close to Hodge Hill nursery, right in the middle of countryside when so many alternatives are open to you; the Old court house, the new court house, the Frank Stone building in Green Street (empty as long as I have lived in Kiddy,)), the old labour exchange, Sion Hill school, the area alongside Louise Hewitt's that burnt down. Why use Green Belt for Industry? Please reconsider your plans.</p>
	LPPO3055	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gateway to Kidderminster from the Birmingham side would be totally spoiled. • The volume of traffic would increase dramatically, on what is already an extremely busy section of road/dual carriageway(near to Husum Way). • The junction of Husum Way & Birmingham Road is already an accident blackspot , & surely building near to this will only increase the chance of even more accidents. • At regular times throughout the year, especially Bank Holidays the "through traffic" going to the Safari Park creates a traffic jam from the Land Oak to Husum Way , & further. Once again , building near this stretch of road would only add to the problem. • Why can't sites that have already had buildings there be used i.e. Lea Castle former hospital or where schools have been closed etc. Thereby saving Green Belt land.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from the aforesaid , do we in Kidderminster really need such a large volume of new housing
	LPPO3086	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Rd. This road is already used as a rat run from people using Crossley Retail Park and or wishing to avoid the traffic lights at the Land Oak pub. Husum Way and Borrington Road/Tennyson Road similarly act as an unofficial bypass and development in both these areas will only intensify the increasing use of roads in and around this area. Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Road are just single tracks and cannot accommodate increased volumes of traffic and so this will push more traffic along Baldwin Road. The speeds that some motorists go at in this road are frightening. From a visual perspective, the land behind Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. The Green Belt land around Baldwin Road and Hurcott supports much wildlife and is a beautiful gateway to Hurcott Woods and Pool an area enjoyed by many locals. Offmore is similarly high in places and will have a potent visual impact on the local surroundings. The land behind Baldwin Road and to the east of Offmore/Husum Way contributes strongly to reducing the impact of urban sprawl from Kidderminster through to Blakedown and then Hagley and the wider West Midlands. As a gateway into our town and district, our rural/semi rural heritage should be retained. Offmore Primary School is on a restricted site and cannot be extended. A further school would contribute to additional traffic issues at peak drop off and pick up times. Development of land to the east of Offmore would create a linear estate which would not be a sustainable community, it would have no community “heart” . Apart from the school the only community facilities on the estate are The Cavalier PH and Offmore Evangelical Church. The shopping precinct contains only a NISA Supermarket, a fish and chip shop and a hairdressers; there is no pharmacy or post office and no room to develop them. Proposed employment development adjacent to Hodge Hill would cause traffic and potentially noise problems and have a huge visual impact on this “rural” landscape.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for an eastern bypass would require a new railway bridge – how would this be funded and again there is a huge visual impact. The proposed eastern bypass would also create much traffic noise which would then impact upon the proposed newly built housing “estate” to the east of Offmore and existing residential roads. Further, any eastern by pass which started at Birmingham Rd would exacerbate traffic problems on Baldwin Rd which would be used as an access to that bypass. The only way a satisfactory eastern bypass can be provided is for it to run, at the very least, from the Stourbridge Rd round to The Mare and Colt on the Worcester Rd.
	LPP03089	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Rd. This road is already used as a rat run from people using Crossley Retail Park and or wishing to avoid the traffic lights at the Land Oak pub. Husum Way and Borrington Road/Tennyson Road similarly act as an unofficial bypass and development in both these areas will only intensify the increasing use of roads in and around this area. Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Road are just single tracks and cannot accommodate increased volumes of traffic and so this will push more traffic along Baldwin Road. The speeds that some motorists go at in this road are frightening. From a visual perspective, the land behind Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. The Green Belt land around Baldwin Road and Hurcott supports much wildlife and is a beautiful gateway to Hurcott Woods and Pool an area enjoyed by many locals. Offmore is similarly high in places and will have a potent visual impact on the local surroundings. The land behind Baldwin Road and to the east of Offmore/Husum Way contributes strongly to reducing the impact of urban sprawl from Kidderminster through to Blakedown and then Hagley and the wider West Midlands. As a gateway into our town and district, our rural/semi rural heritage should be retained. Offmore Primary School is on a restricted site and cannot be extended. A further school would contribute to additional traffic issues at peak drop off and pick up times. Development of land to the east of Offmore would create a linear estate which would not be a

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>sustainable community, it would have no community “heart”. Apart from the school the only community facilities on the estate are The Cavalier PH and Offmore Evangelical Church. The shopping precinct contains only a NISA Supermarket, a fish and chip shop and a hairdressers; there is no pharmacy or post office and no room to develop them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed employment development adjacent to Hodge Hill would cause traffic and potentially noise problems and have a huge visual impact on this “rural” landscape. • Proposals for an eastern bypass would require a new railway bridge – how would this be funded and again there is a huge visual impact. • The proposed eastern bypass would also create much traffic noise which would then impact upon the proposed newly built housing “estate” to the east of Offmore and existing residential roads. Further, any eastern by pass which started at Birmingham Rd would exacerbate traffic problems on Baldwin Rd which would be used as an access to that bypass. The only way a satisfactory eastern bypass can be provided is for it to run, at the very least, from the Stourbridge Rd round to The Mare and Colt on the Worcester Rd.
	LPPO3102	Object	<p>Any development would be a serious visual incursion on the Green Belt land and would impact on the wildlife habitats herein. Much of the land to the rear of Offmore is considerably higher than the existing housing so any development would be very visible. The whole area seems to be a series of 'rat-runs' at many times of the day. Hurcott Road, Hurcott Lane, Husum Way and Tennyson Way are all very busy roads some with difficult junctions. Any development on this side of town would need a substantial By-Pass from the Wolverhampton Road to the Worcester Road with possibly two very expensive railway crossings. Hurcott Lane really needs widening to make it safer (not a single track road with passing places) The busy junctions at The Park Gate and Husum Way/Birmingham Road need significant improvements to make them safer. Whichever options are chosen the road network needs significant improvements to maintain safety and minimise congestion.</p>
	LPPO3118	Object	<p>I am emailing to oppose the planning for building to take place on Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster. I cannot see why these proposals would be made when there is perfectly good land to be built on at Lea Castle, especially as this site could be used as a sustainable village. There is also land to be used on the existing Ferndale estate that seems perfectly reasonable to me for at least 200 houses. To build on the proposed Green Belt land</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			would be an intrusion on the beautiful wildlife that inhabit there and a visual intrusion to the stunning land also. There are many endangered bird species that would be affected and I personally think it would be a crime to damage that. I truly hope you take Lea Castle and the Ferndale estate into consideration before destroying our lovely countryside.
	LPPO3124	Object	I am emailing to oppose the planning for building to take place on the Green Belt land east of Kidderminster (Offmore estate). I'm not sure why this area is being considered when it would be much easier to build a sustainable village at Lea Castle as there is already planned building works for this area. The schools in the Comberton area are already to there limit and this would also add more pressure to the schools. Another area which could be developed on would be the Ferndale area which could easily house 200 more new builds.
	LPPO3157	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't agree that the east Kidderminster Green Belt land should be built on. - An eastern by pass would need at least one new railway bridge. - Offmore Primary School is full. - Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to avoid congestion.
	LPPO3172	Object	We understand, that all brown belt sites have already been allocated for development and that additional land needs to be made available in order to support the ever growing population and the local housing needs, we believe this does not have to be the land on Baldwin and Offmore. We want to protect the Green Belt land and the beauty of the countryside and all the wildlife within it. We have Bat's, Muntjac, Snakes and a variety of rare birds living in the area. We feel that noise and light pollution would have a major impact on the wildlife. We worry that Kidderminster's boundary would be moving nearer to Blakedown and that the visual approach to the town from the Birmingham Road would change the existing landscape dramatically. The local Schools have no capacity to take on additional pupils, the doctor's surgery just about copes . The infrastructure of the bridge at Offmore could not withstand additional traffic, the local roads are already used as "rat runs".
	LPPO3193	Object	Against proposal:

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster separates Worcestershire from the west midlands. • The Eastern By Pass would have to be built from the Wolverhampton road to the Worcester road to be of any use as anything shorter would cause roads around the Hurcott area to become heavily congested/rat runs/dangerous. • There are endangered bird species along the bypass route. • As a bypass road would be needed before land to the east of Offmore could be developed this means this development should not go ahead • the eastern bypass would need an expensive railway bridge which no developer sound be willing to fund • The elevated position of the western bypass would need at least a 30m tree screen to buffer against traffic noise. • development of Green Belt site will lead to increase in localised flooding as the water course will be disrupted • Development of the land behind Baldwin road would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on protected wildlife habitats and incursion onto the buffer zones for hurt and Podgier SSIs. • A linear development impact on community spirit and would not include local amenities/increase in anti-social behaviour and crime. • Offmore primary school already full. • Would not support a new bus route.
	LPPO3245	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An Eastern Bypass would have to be built from the Wolverhampton road to the Worcester road and would require one new railway bridge (very expensive)! - The elevated position of this bypass would need a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. - Offmore Primary school is full, is on a restricted site & can't be extended. - There are endangered bird species along the route the by pass would have to take from the A456 to the A449

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>- Development behind Baldwin road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Why not increase the building proposal for land around the Lee Castle area?</p>
	LPPO3246	Object	<p>Concerns re implementation of the use of brown sites, with the effect that Green Belt land is taking prominence in pursuit of housing. Acknowledge the requirement for housing, especially social housing, but must challenge the bulldozing of Green Belt in ill-conceived plans, when brown sites continue to be allowed to lie dormant. We should address the imbalance that empowers developers and disadvantages the public requirement for housing, by legislation if necessary. Transparency of interest by developers should be mandatory as the current system is not acceptable. Need to find a solution to all the disused properties before embarking on new build. I totally oppose the use of Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster, for the following reasons:</p> <p>Husum Way/Tennyson Way has already become an overburdened and dangerous thoroughfare, with accidents being a regular occurrence at the Birmingham Road junction. The intersection itself is misused and hazardous. Any additional housing would necessitate an Eastern By Pass, which would be a major cost, particularly when a new railway bridge would be inevitable. Would a developer cover such an exorbitant cost or would it be a further burden to the taxpayer? Common sense dictates that a By Pass would need to stretch from Stourbridge Road to Worcester Road, otherwise increased traffic would exacerbate the "rat-run" imposition already being endured.</p> <p>Environmentally, this proposal is outrageous. For over 40 years we have enjoyed the countryside, breathing in good fresh air. There is no doubt that health will be compromised by the noise and traffic pollution that will ensue from such a massive change to the neighbourhood. The surrounding district is renowned for its beauty and abounding wildlife with easy access to walkers and ornithologists. I am confident the Worcester Wildlife Trust will have an input in any suggestion to sabotage the well established wildlife habitat, from Hurcott, east Offmore, and Spennells. No doubt some endangered species would be identified.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to ensuring any large development is first and foremost a sustainable community. The linear plan, with or without a by pass, would be "heartless". Surely we have learned from the past that</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>vast housing schemes lacking community spirit and amenities quickly deteriorate into slums. To my knowledge there is no opportunity of extending Offmore Primary School, neither is there easy access to overcrowded surgeries and our sadly downgraded hospital.</p> <p>The Kidderminster community has already suffered from a short-term strategy in downgrading our hospital and from loss of industry. It is good to have a forecast of redevelopment and growth - let's get it right this time.</p>
	LPPO3298	Object	I strongly object to houses being built at Baldwin Road/Offmore, purely on a traffic issue. Adding more houses creating even more traffic using Hurcott Road as a rat run is just not on.
	LPPO3309	Object	<p>Infrastructure to areas WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any substantial increase in housing. The A456 would require substantial capacity development to deal with the increase in traffic, if this was achieved Husum Way will not cope. An additional road and a bridge over the railway would be required. This is unlikely to happen due to the high development costs and therefore the affordability of the housing scheme. There is currently a high level of wildlife within this area including badgers, foxes, deer and a large variety of birds, including endangered species. This development would have a significant impact on them and should not go ahead. Currently the A456 is a single lane carriageway and would not be able to cope with the proposed industrial development near Hodge Hill Farm. This proposal does not support a sustainable community, does not accommodate a neighbourhood centre and will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. The Offmore primary school is currently at full capacity and cannot be developed as it is on a restricted site.</p>
	LPPO3378	Object	Proposals do not encourage a sustainable community, as a parent of an Offmore pupil we know the school is full and unable to extend and as a Practice Nurse in a local GP surgery, how would a development of this size be served?
	LPPO3567	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission was refused 6 years ago to build a semi built onto house. • Were told no new houses were to be built in the area.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fought for the public footpath to stay at the land behind Baldwin Road. • Accidents on Husum Way, Birmingham Road junctions will only increase - already have many. • Have a lovely view of fields - don't want to look at new builds. • Where will the birds go? • Lack of schools, doctors etc. • Lea Castle would be a better option.
	LPP03589	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees with everything on the Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans sheet. • Has watched the surrounding countryside disappear. • The council will not be satisfied until Kidderminster is sat side-by-side with neighbouring towns/villages.
	LPP03607	Object	<p>Residents are surrounded by open countryside which is good for both quality of life, health and well-being as well as helping to maintain good mental health. To make such a change to our environment would have a serious impact on our health and well-being. Anything built at the rear of the properties would tower over them and would completely overpower the properties. This would have a significant impact on the value of the properties. The wildlife that exists around Spennells is very precious and we are losing vital habitat for species that are struggling to adapt to the changing environment. Around the barns there is a very healthy bird population, foxes, a badgers set, bats and great crested newts which are a European Protected Species. There are many brown field sites available where new housing can be developed without taking Green Belt that is vital to our towns and communities. This land is good quality agricultural land which has good crop production year on year. The current road network will not sustain a development of such a scale. There will be a much higher traffic flow for those people working on the other side of town. There are little to no employment opportunities on this side of town and it would be better to build high density homes in the town where people do not need to take car journeys to work. The increase in pollution through additional exhaust fumes increases the health risks to everyone in the community. This along with the increase in volume of traffic and traffic noise makes for a dismal picture for the future. Our current infrastructure will not cope with the increased population. It will only serve to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			further impact on a hospital service that is already struggling to cope. I have the same concerns about the rest of the infrastructure in terms of Schools, GP surgeries, dentists, etc. Regeneration should be concentrated on brownfield sites within Kidderminster to help regenerate the centre of Kidderminster and bring some life back into the town.
	LPPO3799	Object	I object to planned building to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore. I believe this would have a negative impact on wildlife and pose increased pressure on local schools (Offmore is already full). As a local resident I have seen many road traffic collisions on the Birmingham / Offmore turn, therefore with increased traffic this could see more collisions. I believe that the site at Lea Castle would prove a more viable option and have less negative impact on local services and wildlife. The site is on an easily accessible main road and is ready to be developed. There are also 3 local schools within that catchment.
	LPPO3867	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not suitable for the development proposed. • Green Belt will be destroyed - most of it agricultural land. • Would need to build a by-pass and rail bridge - costly (time and money). • Other sites are better.
	LPPO3921	Object	Objects to plans for the Green Belt land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore/Comberton area.
	LPPO3951	Object	<p>I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/Traffic emissions - Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools. - Affect tourism/wildlife/possible flooding. <p>Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings before Green Belt.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3954	Object	<p>Ref: Development behind Baldwin Road and Offmore proposals</p> <p>‘The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’..... I strongly oppose this particular proposed development on our Green Belt for several reasons. Offmore and Comberton is already a ‘large’ housing estate, many people and families live here and need the open spaces of the Green Belt. Furthermore we already have problems, over subscribed schools and small estate roads used as main commuter routes to highlight just two ... any further development around this area will only compound these major concerns. I also believe in this day and age WFDC have an obligation before embarking on any new development to safe guard, improve the environment and social care of the people already living there and in this particular proposal a huge housing estate on the Green Belt which surrounds Offmore would be very detrimental for all.</p> <p>I am sure like many other residents fully understand the need for housing and the compromises which will be needed ... I urge the Council to look for smaller sustainable sites and make certain that the basic NEW infrastructure is in place before the development starts, it is not acceptable for the Council just to accept that the present facilities are adequate.</p>
	LPPO3959	Object	<p>I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure — Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Since the opening of the Stourport link road the traffic on Husum Way has increased considerably and has become a rat run. How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular.</p> <p>Offmore School is full and cannot be extended.</p> <p>GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals.</p> <p>The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is arable land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.</p>
	LPP03975	Object	<p>I would like to object to the urban extension to the East of Kidderminster core site proposed for allocation in table 31.01.1 of the Plan.</p> <p>The land is Green Belt and plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. Many endangered bird species such as corn buntings, yellowhammers & skylarks also live in this area. The Plan clearly states in Policy 6B that locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt. The Plan even agrees at paragraph 2.10 that many local residents raised the importance of protecting the Green Belt, so it must be agreed that all must be done possible to avoid building in this area.</p> <p>It also needs to be considered if building on this land will cause drainage problems. Paragraph 31.5 touches on this need for it to be considered but provides no answer as to whether it is known if problems will occur. Obviously flooding to the area would definitely not be wanted and so maybe a proper investigation into this should've taken place before the area was allocated.</p> <p>The proposed development in the Offmore & Comberton area would be a large site of 1,735 dwellings (table 31.01.1) so a bypass road would be needed in order to access these new houses properly. This would mean that the site should be part of Option A as opposed to just simply core housing. However, to build an eastern bypass as Option A proposes would equally cause problems. Not only are you building on Green Belt land but it would be an incredibly expensive project as it would need to be built over the railway line and it is unlikely that any developer would want to pay for this. Also it is doubtful that it will really provide relief to the congestion on the A449 Chester Road (as argued in paragraph 31.5). This is because a large amount of traffic that travels down the A449 Chester Road comes from the Wolverhampton Road. The relief road would only start from the A456 Birmingham Road and so would not take away the bulk of the traffic. To be truly effective the relief road would need to begin from the Wolverhampton Road.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>In terms of the local community, Offmore & Comberton would not be able to cope with these extra people — for example Offmore Primary School is already full and on a restricted site so cannot be extended. The proposed development would not be sustainable and due to its linear nature not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. I understand that these new houses do have to be built somewhere but I would also ask whether the NHS can cope with the influx of extra people to the area. Kidderminster & Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand. Maybe money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services.</p>
	LPP03977	Object	<p>I would like to object to the urban extension to the East of Kidderminster core site proposed for allocation in table 31.01.1 of the Plan.</p> <p>The land is Green Belt and plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. Many endangered bird species such as corn buntings, yellowhammers & skylarks also live in this area. The Plan clearly states in Policy 6B that locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt. The Plan even agrees at paragraph 2.10 that many local residents raised the importance of protecting the Green Belt, so it must be agreed that all must be done possible to avoid building in this area.</p> <p>It also needs to be considered if building on this land will cause drainage problems. Paragraph 31.5 touches on this need for it to be considered but provides no answer as to whether it is known if problems will occur. Obviously flooding to the area would definitely not be wanted and so maybe a proper investigation into this should've taken place before the area was allocated.</p> <p>The proposed development in the Offmore & Comberton area would be a large site of 1,735 dwellings (table 31.01.1) so a bypass road would be needed in order to access these new houses properly. This would mean that the site should be part of Option A as opposed to just simply core housing. However, to build an eastern bypass as Option A proposes would equally cause problems. Not only are you building on Green Belt land but it would be an incredibly expensive project as it would need to be built over the railway line and it is unlikely that any developer would want to pay for this. Also it is doubtful that it will really provide relief to the congestion on the A449 Chester Road (as argued in paragraph 31.5). This is because a large amount of traffic that travels down the A449</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Chester Road comes from the Wolverhampton Road. The relief road would only start from the A456 Birmingham Road and so would not take away the bulk of the traffic. To be truly effective the relief road would need to begin from the Wolverhampton Road.</p> <p>In terms of the local community, Offmore & Comberton would not be able to cope with these extra people — for example Offmore Primary School is already full and on a restricted site so cannot be extended. The proposed development would not be sustainable and due to its linear nature not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. I understand that these new houses do have to be built somewhere but I would also ask whether the NHS can cope with the influx of extra people to the area. Kidderminster & Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand. Maybe money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services.</p>
	LPPO3980	Object	Object to development East of Kidderminster North.
	LPPO3989	Object	<p>I object to the local plan proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The land is Green Belt and should remain so. 2. As a bypass road would be necessary for the development of land to the east of Offmore it should NOT be developed. 3. A by-pass would need to be linked to the Birmingham Road over the railway. Bridges are very expensive and private developers would not build one which means that Husum Way road bridge would be used more resulting in more traffic/accidents at the Birmingham Road/Husum Way junction. 4. Offmore primary school is full and has no room for expansion.
	LPPO4006	Object	I strongly object to the proposed development to the land the rear of Baldwin Road, and the Offmore, Comberton

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			area and I agree with all the disadvantages given by the OCAQ-PL.
	LPP04013	Object	<p>Objects to new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase in volume of traffic - a bridge will be required - the impact of A2 very good agricultural land that is valuable land - schooling - the present is at full capacity - Concerned about the industrial development at Hodge Hill and the impact it will have on noise and pollution. <p>Supports development of the Lea Castle site and the ADR site between Hurcott Village and Stourbridge Rd. Overall supports 'B' sites as more sustainable with minimum impact on the community and road structure, doctors, schools, shops and welfare.</p>
	LPP04020	Object	The impact of building behind Baldwin Road and the Offmore and Comberton areas would start a potential chain of development into Blakedown and other areas. Leave Green Belt alone.
	LPP04076	Object	<p>We would like to take this opportunity to express our most extreme concerns with regards to the proposed building plans in the Kidderminster area. The affect on the countryside and wildlife would be tragic. Why is it felt necessary to look at Green Belt sites when there are a number of abandoned buildings, some of which have been empty for over 20 years. Why not develop these sites? Other examples of land which should be considered in the first instance are Sion Hill School and the site of Sladen School, land ripe for being used for new properties. The infrastructure of Kidderminster is not adequate to cope the development of these sites.</p> <p>We are at a loss to understand the reason for building more business units on the Worcester Road when after some 8 years or so the units that are already in existence have not been occupied.</p>
	LPP04123	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to proposal. • Kidderminster town centre could be made into affordable housing as it's a dying down for employment.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure needed would be huge – schools, roads, shops, amenities. • Hurcott would have more pollution - air pollution is high. • Lorries already whizz past making houses shake - this will get worse. • Hurcott Road is already used as a rat run. • The land below the area designated along the Alma Lodge Road runs into lakes and ponds - home to many species.
	LPP04127	Object	Whilst we appreciate the pressure to build more homes in the Kidderminster area, we feel that such a hastily conceived 'top of the head' scheme at the behest of a developer, who's first criteria is profit, may not be the best solution for the town.
	LPP04201	Object	The Green Belt plays a vital role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. Without a by pass, all the roads around Hurcott Road will be used as rat runs to an even greater extent than they already are. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt. This would impact on wildlife habitats in the buffer zones. Birmingham Road is often already congested. The proposed linear development would have no community heart. Offmore primary school is already full and cannot be extended. Additional building will add to flood risk.
	LPP04242	Object	<p>Objects to development of the Green Belt around Offmore / Husum Way because: it separates Kidderminster from West Midlands.</p> <p>Roads already congested – by-pass would cause roads around Hurcott to be used as rat runs.</p> <p>More houses – more schools!! (Offmore already full). A new railway bridge would be needed (very expensive).</p> <p>Shakespeare Drive and Husum Way already flood (more housing less drainage).</p> <p>Wildlife and endangered bird species would suffer.</p> <p>Suggest that Lea Castle would be much more appropriate for development – maybe linking with the Sion Hill Middle School site.</p>
	LPP04246	Object	I wish to raise my objection to the proposed development for Offmore/ Comberton area and Baldwin Road. There

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>are frequent accidents at Husum Way/ Birmingham Road junction as well as traffic jams in and out of Kidderminster through the Land Oak. So many additional houses are going to increase the amount of traffic dramatically and pollution will increase. Bank holidays will be horrendous, particularly with the development of the Safari Park and the people this will bring to the area. This in turn could actually put people off visiting the area rather than increase tourism in the area. Access to any houses behind Baldwin Road would have to be from the Birmingham Road and where this is positioned is on a blind bend which would be highly dangerous. In addition, the amount of houses will put pressure on the local primary schools which are already at capacity and for King Charles High School which is near capacity and unable to extend further. There are endangered species living in the land which has been put forward to be removed from the Green Belt which must be protected. I question why all proposals for development are to the east side of Kidderminster and nothing proposed for the other parts of town. Development of industrial units by Hodge Hill also bring additional traffic to what is an already extremely busy road. The cost of a new bypass which requires two railway bridges would be extortionate and while so many existing roads are desperately in need of resurfacing, is not justifiable.</p>
	<p>LPP04252</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in traffic already congested at peak times = impact on air quality/noise - There is no objective assessment of future trends - Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape - Loss of wildlife, should sustain biodiversity. - Impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage in - Detrimental visual impact forever. - The proposal to build next to one of the already largest housing estates in the area is poorly considered. <p>Regenerate brownfield areas to attract new businesses. Implement plan B is implemented - more dispersed strategy across the district</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP04253	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in traffic already congested at peak times = impact on air quality/noise - There is no objective assessment of future trends - Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape - Loss of wildlife, should sustain biodiversity. - Impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage in - Detrimental visual impact forever. - The proposal to build next to one of the already largest housing estates in the area is poorly considered. <p>Regenerate brownfield areas to attract new businesses. Implement plan B is implemented - more dispersed strategy across the district</p>
	LPP04255	Object	<p>I object to all of the Core Sites and Option B in the Green Belt to the north and east of Kidderminster on the basis of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill; 2) noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters; 3) pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc); 4) Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access by walking.
	LPP04291	Object	<p>I wish to object to the development of the whole area of Option A as shown by the blue and red shading on the maps provided. The new development will lead to:</p> <p>Removal of fields which could diminish the mental health and physical well-being of the people who use them for</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>walking, jogging and exercising dogs Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to health. Alternatively building higher density homes in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution. Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing Rights of way Loss of wildlife habitat of birds nesting in the fields.</p> <p>Rather than encroach upon our countryside I urge the Council to build on Brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town. I urge you not to make use of Green Belt land for the reasons given above.</p>
	LPP04323	Object	<p>I object to the local plan proposal for land rear of Baldwin Rd and the land East of Offmore/Comberton area. The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster is vital in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. The proposed eastern by-pass would cause additional traffic to the area and the A456 is already an extremely busy road. The development would have a serious visual impact on the area and impact the eco system of Hurcott village and Hodge hill area. The development would not be a sustainable community. Offmore primary school is ready full. The school cannot be developed further and in addition King Charles school is also full. The area at the end of Shakespeare Drive/Husum Way is prone to heavy flooding and additional housing will only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>My preferred option would be an extension to Option A & B for the land at Lea Castle. This area could easily accommodate the required development and could be made into a sustainable village. A 2 form entry Primary school could be built and then feed the under subscribed Wolverley high school. It would be capable of sustaining a bus service which could also benefit Cookley residents. The transport links are already in place for such a development.</p>
	LPP04324	Object	<p>I am objecting to this for reasons stated below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is Green Belt land and plays a vital part in our community.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife - we have endangered birds in this area and buzzards, hawks etc. • The schools are already full to the max and there is no room to expand. • Husum way is already a rat run for the A449 without adding a bypass which will come out on Husum Way before the bridge as there will be no funding and it will cause chaos to the rail as they cannot build another bridge it's too expensive. • Contact the local police and find that there are far too many deaths and accidents on the A449 Husum way/Hurcott road area due to planning of the junction. • There is always extreme flooding by Husum Way Bridge and in Shakespeare drive and the development areas are higher than Offmore and Comberton so flooding risk will be massive.
	LPP04328	Object	Object to the local plan proposals for the land at the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area. I agree with all the disadvantages of these proposals as stated below from the Offmore Comberton Action Group. I'm particularly concerned with the amount of extra traffic plans to build would create as there is already a long queue of traffic down the Birmingham Road each day in the rush hour am & pm traffic, surely the roads will be gridlocked with considerably more traffic from the proposed amount of homes.
	LPP04391	Object	I don't believe we need to use the land at Offmore.
	LPP04444	Object	The size of development planned for the north east side of town is massive – 1100+ houses in a tranche will completely alter the character of the town and destroy Hurcott Village, spoiling a historic area forever. Urban sprawl on the scale proposed is not in keeping with Kidderminster's semi-rural character. The roads around the Park Gate public house, Hurcott Lane and Birmingham Road are already dangerous with numerous accidents occurring. The massive increase in traffic which would result from these plans would worsen the accident rate and cause gridlock. The Clensmore development has made the Horsefair congestion much worse as no change to the road system was included. Further development on this side of town will only add to this.
	LPP04528	Object	I would like to object and comment on the proposed building rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES EAST OF KIDDERMINSTER NORTH - OC/5 (HUSUM WAY), OC/6 (OFFMORE), OC/12 (COMBERTON LODGE), OC/13N (STONE HILL (N)), WFR/CB/7 (BIRMINGHAM ROAD)

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			The land you propose to build on is much higher than the existing Offmore Estate, overlooking nearby properties. The extra traffic would mean more noise and congestion. I appreciate that more houses are needed but more consideration should be given to Lea Castle being the better choice over the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area.
	LPP04790	Object	Concern at development on east side of Kidderminster. Lea Castle is big enough to include services, i.e. shops, schools, surgery and would negate need to develop other sites. Issues of traffic/pedestrian safety/impact on local infrastructure, schools and Hurcott nature reserve, a SSSI. Preserve Green Belt as a buffer zone between Kidderminster/Blakedown.
	LPP04798	Object	The existing land immediately adjacent to the rear of Prior Close on the east of Offmore is already elevated at about 1.5 metres at the point it abuts existing gardens. The field then rises in both an easterly and northerly direction. Development in this area will have a significant impact upon the quality and wellbeing of the existing residents because any new housing will be at a much higher level and result in severe overlook from the new properties. The proposal for small pockets of development would result in an unsustainable community. It will be separate from the existing community because it will require totally separate access/egress, leaving its residents isolated from a community that is on their own doorstep. In order to access the existing community facilities the new residents will need to travel by car for the simplest of things such as popping out to the local shop. Walkways might be incorporated into the design but the simple fact is that human nature will result in traffic movements rather than walking. The local Offmore Primary School is full and does not have any spare land within it's boundary for extending the building. In fact this school was completely rebuilt in recent years and has made maximum use of the land on which it stands.
	LPP04406	Support	Just an idea, please build on housing estates like Comberton or Spennells. As they have been designed for and could just be extended.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP0463	Object	Infrastructure to areas WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any substantial increase in housing. The A456 would require substantial capacity development to deal with the increase in traffic, if this was achieved Husum Way will not cope. An additional road and a bridge over the railway would be required. This is unlikely to happen due to the high development costs and therefore the affordability of the housing scheme. There is currently a high level of wildlife within this area including badgers, foxes, deer and a large variety of birds, including endangered species. This development would have a significant impact on them and should not go ahead. Currently the A456 is a single lane carriageway and would not be able to cope with the proposed industrial development near Hodge Hill Farm. This proposal does not support a sustainable community, does not accommodate a neighbourhood centre and will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. The Offmore primary school is currently at full capacity and cannot be developed as it is on a restricted site.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP01000	Object	WFR/CB/6-7 Land in front of Hurcott Hall and land opposite at Hodgehill. The development of this site would be a case of gross sprawl. It is bad enough that moving the edge of Kidderminster town out to Hurcott Lane should be proposed. The land on either side of A456 here is open countryside and should remain so. Its transport links to the motorways involve trucks using the already overloaded A456 though Hagley.
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	LPP01023	Object	<u>Hodge Hill Employment Site</u> - Core Strategy Policy DS04: Rural Regeneration is quoted which stated that development proposals will not be permitted where they would be likely to have an adverse impact on the District's best and most versatile agricultural land. The proposals at Hodge Hill are in conflict with Policy CB16 of the Neighbourhood Plan which provides for the use of existing rather than new buildings. This is Green Belt land and the Parish Council would oppose this, especially if proposal for relief road is implemented. Hodge Hill Farm is locally listed and access to the site is dangerous.
	LPP01602	Object	Objects to site being allocated for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on highways • impact on wildlife • loss of good agricultural land • loss of and impact on Green Belt • loss of amenity

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> noise and air pollution
	LPPO2033	Object	Land for Employment. Land for employment opportunities such as Land off Birmingham Road (WFR/CB/7) appears to be misplaced on a green field site. Surely there are plenty of sites in a town with declining traditional industry rather than set a precedent on a green site. The Easter Park site for instance has failed to fill some of its units in the time since it was built.
	LPPO4380	Object	Employment on 'Land off Birmingham Rd'. All industrial/trade units should be kept within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Zone.
	LPPO4611	Object	We agree with all 10 "Disadvantages listed on the circular known as "OCAG-LP (Offmore Comberton Action Group-Local Plans). In addition, the idea of industrial units between Hodge Hill Farm on the A456 and the farm house near corner of Husum Way simply goes right into the face of current road restrictions made a few years ago to keep traffic in single file and generally slow it down as it approaches Husum Way, a 40 mph limit and the urban development straddling the A456 (Birmingham Road). WE cannot imagine the problem of INCURSION that the need for commercial vehicles coming in and out needing to go west and east of such a development would cause. The Lea Castle development seems far more workable than say extending Kidderminster development eastwards from its current edge. We have informed the RSPB as members, the danger of such units and a proposed Eastern bypass via the outskirts of Kidderminster to particular bird life. (See one of the 10 disadvantages above-mentioned). "Ah, but it's only one incursion." Travelling the country as we do and witnessing new housing and industrial unit development, more traffic congestion. Means we are seeing land taken up from nature on a frightening scale! Similarly the possible future development of fields behind Stanklyn Lane running to the current boundaries of Spennells Estate will remove another current wildlife eco-system, which numerous species of birds rely on let alone other wildlife. The "material drive" of those in power will eventually attack us all, if not destroyed by its own very nature in "Nature's scheme of things." The human race has this problem they always believe they'll get by or round. The people who drive this may not be affected yet, but their descendants will. We will in future be unable to create the space required to keep catering for more traffic and population. We have the dilemma of its future approach, and ultimate reality.
	LPPO5118	Object	I also object to the proposal of allowing Industrial development at Hodge Hill as again without the road

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			infrastructure this would not be tenable. The reason that people move to and visit Kidderminster and the surrounding areas is that it gives a feel of a rural location when travelling into Kidderminster along the Birmingham Road.
	LPPO5150	Object	The suggestion that land between Husum Way and Hodge Hill Nurseries should be used for industrial development is beyond outrageous. It represents inappropriate ribbon development of the worse kind in one of the more attractive approaches to Kidderminster!! At this stage it seems appropriate to say there are empty units on nearly every industrial site in town.
Moor Park Trustees	LPPO3127	Support	<p>We write to support the sites OC/5 and WFR/CB/7 and note that these sites are discussed collectively in table 13.0.1 as East of Kidderminster (N) for a mixed use of housing and employment collectively providing circa 1,735 dwellings and 9.66ha of employment land.</p> <p>There are few other options, of this scale, on the outskirts of Kidderminster. The site in question is currently allocated as Green Belt but it is noted that the site, upon allocation, would be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC, since the 1970s and WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district.</p> <p>The site off Husum Way (OC/5) is self-contained with little constraint. Bound to the North by the A456, the East by Hodgehill, the South by the railway line and Husum way to the West. Removal of this site from the Green Belt will not create risk of further sprawl into the Green Belt at a later date and due to its boundary constraints it will work well as a standalone residential development or as part of a larger scheme. The site is an agricultural field which will have limited ecological value due to the processes which currently take place as part of conventional farming practice. Topographically the site is relatively level.</p> <p>We have had approaches from developers, and promoters, and in that regard the land (OC/5) is under option to a local developer (subject to the relevant planning consents) the site is deliverable within the required timescales for the local plan.</p> <p>Site WFR/CB/7 was initially identified by WFDC themselves and in that regard was not put forward by the landowner in the original call for sites. Similarly to the site of Husum Way — the site is self-contained/self-governing. It is bound by the Birmingham Road to the North, the railway to the South, Hodgehill Farm to the West and Hodgehill Farm shop/Deli/Cafe to the East.</p> <p>Since its potential for employment use was identified the landowner made contact with County Highways to discuss access in light of such proposals. Subject to further confirmation as to the LPA's aspirations for the site, and</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>an allocation, we would need to undertake a transport assessment and potentially a strategic transport model run. These would all benefit from being undertaken upon allocation of the sites to the East of Kidderminster. Birmingham Road itself, however, has space for upgrade to accommodate upgraded access depending on the employment uses proposed and its location on the outskirts would assist in keeping traffic off the more limited road network within Kidderminster itself. Comments were made regarding the sustainability of the site, however, as noted below — a development of this scale will ensure effective provision of infrastructure to support new development.</p> <p>There are regular bus services along the Birmingham Road and this route itself is a strategically important route, is a lorry route network and also a cycle route network. There are good footpath links back into Kidderminster. The site already has sustainable transport links which are able to be vastly improved by a development of this size and nature through increased users.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP0969	Comment	OC/5 Husum Way. This is a relatively small site enclosed by A456, the railway, farm buildings and developed land. If Kidderminster is to extend out to Hurcott Lane, it may be appropriate for it to extend out as far on the other side of A456, but that should not mean that there should be similar extensions south of the railway.
	LPP01603	Object	<p>Objects to site being allocated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on highways • impact on wildlife • loss of good agricultural land • loss of and impact on Green Belt • loss of amenity • noise and air pollution
	LPP02055	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing here would remove all the habitats which wildlife, that have been identified as at risk, depend on. • This land is considerably higher than the surrounding so development would be very visible. The views as you drive into Kidderminster currently help lift the appearance of the area. Building vast amounts of property here is likely to have a further detrimental effect on Kidderminster’s reputation and appeal as a place to visit. • The junction on the Birmingham Road onto Husum Way is already very dangerous and proposing to add to the traffic and congestion in that area would be catastrophic. • People would use the Hurcott Road as a ‘rat run’ even more then they do now, it is already a dangerous road which has seen many an accident. • To overcome the congestion issue a by pass would need to be built and no development should take place until this has been done. The by pass would need at least one railway bridge, which would be incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for it. • The houses could also prove difficult for a private developer to sell due to the traffic noise from the Birmingham Road and the traffic congestion your proposals will cause. • The community would have no heart and could not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. There would also be no local schools children could walk to as Offmore is already full and cannot be extended.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I appreciate houses needs to be built but they should not all be piled on one area which is what you are proposing.
	LPPO4332	Object	<p><u>Local Plan proposals for land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore / Comberton Areas - Option OC/5.</u> <u>Objections:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster currently plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. Before any building work commences the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to be constructed along with the required and very expensive railway crossing / bridge, which would need funding by the proposed developers (unlikely to happen). For this plan to work the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to extend from the A449 Wolverhampton Road all the way to the A449 Worcester Road to be effectual, if not the side roads & lanes in the Hurcott / Offmore / Spennells areas would end up being used as rat runs. The proposed housing at the rear of Baldwin Road & Offmore together with the By-Pass itself would be in an elevated position making them very visible and obtrusive. The developments at the rear of Baldwin Road & along Hurcott Lane would impact on the buffer zones for the Hurcott & Podmore SSI's and endangered bird species. The hundreds of houses planned in this area would have a dramatic effect on the recently built New Offmore Primary School which is at full capacity and can't be extended any further. In summary this ribbon development LP is a not sustainable or a community and an alternative proposal needs to be considered.
	LPPO5136	Object	The options of plan 'A' and 'B' would cause a considerable volume and build up of traffic congestion not to say the loss of agricultural land would be a bad idea.
Churchill and Blakedown	LPPO3115	Object	Concerned that Parish will become even more of a 'through route' if sites east of Kidderminster are developed. Character will be badly affected if Eastern Relief Road is built. County proposals already mean likelihood of

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Parish Council			increased commuter traffic for station and school has been expanded. We would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. Kidderminster-Blakedown section narrowed to single carriageway for safety reasons and alterations at Hagley junction mean traffic often backs up to Blakedown. Proposals at Baldwin Road and Offmore would add to traffic levels. Employment proposal at Hodge Hill would add traffic at an accident blackspot. Proposed relief road would bring more traffic onto A456 from A448 and A449. Why is this needed when A450 meets A456 at Hagley? Blakedown village centre - concerns re air quality and pedestrian safety. Suggest traffic lights for junction of Belbroughton Road and moving pedestrian crossing to near Station Drive. Proposed eastern relief road would add further pressure to A456 in village. If A448/A450 junction was improved it would divert traffic from centre of Kidderminster and relieve pressure on A456.
Moor Park Trustees	LPP01046	Support	<p>We write to support the sites OC/5 and WFR/CB/7 and note that these sites are discussed collectively in table 13.0.1 as East of Kidderminster (N) for a mixed use of housing and employment collectively providing circa 1,735 dwellings and 9.66ha of employment land.</p> <p>There are few other options, of this scale, on the outskirts of Kidderminster. The site in question is currently allocated as Green Belt but it is noted that the site, upon allocation, would be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC, since the 1970s and WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district.</p> <p>The site off Husum Way (OC/5) is self-contained with little constraint. Bound to the North by the A456, the East by Hodgehill, the South by the railway line and Husum way to the West. Removal of this site from the Green Belt will not create risk of further sprawl into the Green Belt at a later date and due to its boundary constraints it will work well as a standalone residential development or as part of a larger scheme. The site is an agricultural field which will have limited ecological value due to the processes which currently take place as part of conventional farming practice. Topographically the site is relatively level.</p> <p>We have had approaches from developers, and promoters, and in that regard the land (OC/5) is under option to a local developer (subject to the relevant planning consents) the site is deliverable within the required timescales for the local plan.</p> <p>Site WFR/CB/7 was initially identified by WFDC themselves and in that regard was not put forward by the landowner in the original call for sites. Similarly to the site of Husum Way — the site is self-contained/self-governing. It is bound by the Birmingham Road to the North, the railway to the South, Hodgehill Farm to the West and Hodgehill Farm shop/Deli/Cafe to the East.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Since its potential for employment use was identified the landowner made contact with County Highways to discuss access in light of such proposals. Subject to further confirmation as to the LPA’s aspirations for the site, and an allocation, we would need to undertake a transport assessment and potentially a strategic transport model run. These would all benefit from being undertaken upon allocation of the sites to the East of Kidderminster. Birmingham Road itself, however, has space for upgrade to accommodate upgraded access depending on the employment uses proposed and its location on the outskirts would assist in keeping traffic off the more limited road network within Kidderminster itself. Comments were made regarding the sustainability of the site, however, as noted below — a development of this scale will ensure effective provision of infrastructure to support new development.</p> <p>There are regular bus services along the Birmingham Road and this route itself is a strategically important route, is a lorry route network and also a cycle route network. There are good footpath links back into Kidderminster. The site already has sustainable transport links which are able to be vastly improved by a development of this size and nature through increased users.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	LPP04921	Comment	<p>The land at Comberton Road currently lies within the West Midlands Green Belt. The site is included within the Green Belt Review as a number of smaller parcels which were assessed as follows:</p> <p>Land to the north of the A448 – CONTRIBUTION. The site overall makes a contribution to Green Belt purposes by virtue of its role as open countryside containing the built edge of Kidderminster. In the absence of clear, significant boundaries, development would represent encroachment and sprawl into open countryside which could only be overcome through master planning which considered the development in a wider context which attended to the south-eastern edge of the town more generally. Whilst there are few visual receptors in this locality and the site is generally well screened from the A448, development would create a fundamentally new relationship between town and country.</p> <p>Land to the south of the A448, north of Captain’s Pool and Stanklyn Pool - CONTRIBUTION</p> <p>The site overall makes a contribution to Green Belt purposes by virtue of its role as open countryside containing the built edge of Kidderminster. Whilst the site is largely contained by substantial boundaries and the overall effect on Green Belt in this location (in combination with wider development) would not be significant, the absence of an eastern boundary is problematic. Whilst an external boundary could be created, it is suggested that it would be more sympathetic to halt development at the access road which bisects the site, using the topography to contain development rather than the arbitrary line of the high voltage power line.</p> <p>Land to the north of Stanklyn Lane, south of Captain’s Pool and west of Stanklyn Pool – CONTRIBUTION. The relatively well bounded nature of the site means that development means that development is readily contained, although the scale and topography of the site means that a new relationship between town and country would be created, extending development into visually exposed land where thus far development has used the topography to limit such exposure. This is particularly the case for land extending towards Stanklyn Lane, in combination with proposed land immediately to the southwest, although further work on long and medium distance visual receptors would be needed.</p> <p>Captains and the Lodge - LIMITED CONTRIBUTION. The site makes only a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes, being well bounded with limited visual connection. Development would extend the current built edge of Kidderminster along the A448 but this would not be substantial and would visually contained by substantial boundary vegetation.</p> <p>In light of the above and with particular regard to land to the north and south of the A448, the Development</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Framework Plan includes significant reinforcement of the western boundary of the site, including the provision of significant amounts of public open space and landscaping, in order to contain the site in visual terms and limit the impact of the development upon the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>However, Taylor Wimpey has considered the release of the site from the Green Belt in the context of the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF and assert that the makes a ‘limited contribution’ to the purposes of the Green Belt, as explored below.</p> <p>1) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. The site has intermittently strong, defensible boundaries, which would be reinforced by a proposed approximately 30 metre planting buffer along the length of the development. The site would accordingly have a significant landscape buffer, serving to ‘round-off’ the town of Kidderminster on its eastern boundary. This would represent a strengthening of the existing urban edge, which simply terminates to the east of Kidderminster. To the north, the site is bounded by a railway line, adjacent to Husum Way. Similarly, the site is bounded by a railway line to the south-west, adjacent to Stanklyn Lane. Stanklyn Lane itself also forms part of the site boundary to the south-east. The site would therefore be well contained and not encourage sprawl beyond the period of the Local Plan Review. Accordingly, the release of the site from the Green Belt will not result in the unrestricted sprawl of Kidderminster; it will instead serve to ‘round-off’ the town’s eastern boundary.</p> <p>2) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. There is a considerable green gap of over 10km between Kidderminster, Catshill and Bromsgrove to the east/south-east. The entirety of this gap is contained within the Green Belt, preventing coalescence. The site at Comberton Road is located immediately adjacent to the existing built-up area of Kidderminster and is clearly separated from nearby settlements by extensive agricultural land. Therefore, the release of this site will not result in the merging of any neighbouring towns, as a significant Green Belt gap will remain.</p> <p>3) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The creation of strong, defensible boundaries is important in protecting the countryside from encroachment. While it is acknowledged that, in theory, the release of any land from the Green Belt could result in encroachment, it is considered that the site offers the opportunity to provide strong and defensible boundaries which will protect the countryside and maintain the visual and physical separation between Kidderminster and surrounding settlements. This is evidenced by the significant planting of a landscape buffer on the eastern boundary of the site, as shown on the Development Framework Plan. The release of this site from the Green Belt will not compromise the purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>4) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Whilst Kidderminster is a historic canal town which contains four conservation areas and associated listed buildings, these are not located within close proximity of the site and, as such, the site does not make a significant contribution to fulfilling this purpose of the Green Belt. Several listed buildings exist to the east of the site, in and around the village of Stone, including St Mary’s Church. The sensitivity of these buildings will be considered as part of any development of the site. Nevertheless, these buildings are relatively isolated and therefore have a limited contribution towards the setting and special character of historic towns. As such, the release of this site from the Green Belt will not compromise the setting or special character of any historic towns.</p> <p>5) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The release of this land from the Green Belt would not prevent the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The previous Core Strategy and Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan allocated a significant amount of brownfield land for redevelopment. However, the supply of suitable brownfield land is now reducing. Therefore, a Green Belt review is to be undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review, in order to meet its housing needs. The development of the site can be appropriately phased within the housing trajectory to take account of the availability and deliverability of brownfield sites across the District. The release of the site from the Green Belt will therefore not prejudice the recycling of derelict and other urban land. A Preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal prepared by Pegasus Environment provides further consideration.</p> <p>Green Belt Summary It has been demonstrated that the release of the site from the Green Belt would not compromise the five purposes of Green Belt land as set out within the NPPF and is entirely in accordance with national policy regarding the release of land from the Green Belt. The site therefore makes a ‘limited contribution’ to the purposes of the Green Belt in the context of the Local Plan Green Belt Review. The site is capable of being well contained within strong, defensible boundaries and will, as a result, minimise encroachment into the countryside while maintaining the clear visual separation between Kidderminster and neighbouring settlements. It would not compromise the setting of the town and would not prejudice the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Therefore, it is considered that the site represents appropriate Green Belt release to deliver residential development in a sustainable location.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP0116	Object	<p>My concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The value of properties will be significantly decreased. • There are soak away's to take rain water away which goes directly onto the proposed development. • The land is so much higher than the lower field that some kind of supporting structure will have to be built to prevent our access road from collapsing. • The lower field encompasses the Blakeway stream which regularly floods. • If the new development is built the run off water will cause flooding in Offmore and Borrington. • The fields have a badger set and also bats which are active. • Access to the rear of properties are via an agreement with the farmer. If the land is developed we will have no access other than through the house. • Road access in this area is limited, with this development we will have gridlock on the existing roads. • Hospital is not capable of covering the new population. • Insufficient GP's. • " Dental infrastructure. • " Schools. • We have regular power cuts hence the future demand would be excessive on the existing electricity supply. <p>An area around the barns to access the rear of buildings for maintenance would be required. Planners continually refuse extensions at the barns as they could be seen a mile away from the A456 and all permitted development rights have been removed.</p>
	LPP0282	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would like to raise serious concerns about developing land to the east of Offmore. We note that there is no satisfactory access to the fields behind Offmore farm (Old People's Home) in this area at all. Residential roads from Munro Close and Rossetti Close in the north to Silver Birch Drive in the south are not big enough or wide enough to support extra traffic. Even if new roads could be constructed and new

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>routes found, the increase in traffic flow would cause major concerns on the estate with increased congestion, safety and pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on wildlife would be significant. We currently have at least two different species of woodpecker, frogs and toads, bats, foxes, pheasants and many other bird varieties in these fields as well as other wildlife. Diminishing their territory would mean diminishing their numbers - something we cannot afford to do. • An eastern housing build would be "ribbon development" of its own kind, accessed only from some distant spot north and south of the town, with no "soul" or shops and school attached to it. There would be no easy connection to get to Offmore shops and no room at the already over-subscribed Offmore Primary school. • Like many other people on Offmore we think that an eastwards extension of the town would be patchy, haphazard development at best and a blight on the Green Belt land for generations to come. Any further intrusion in to the Green Belt risks connecting Kidderminster to Blakedown to Hagley to Halesowen and eventually to the outer suburbs of Birmingham. It is a proposal we strongly disagree with. • The alternative proposals for an outer suburb at Lea Castle, with school, shops and transport links would be much more sensible than the retrograde, straggling "sticking plaster" estate stuck on to two established residential areas (Offmore and Comberton) that work well now and are perfectly self-contained already.
	<p>LPPO390</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic in these areas is already at unacceptable levels and any development would add to the already heavily used rat runs in these areas. • Loss of views and amenity / recreation space for local residents • Any bypass/link road to the east of Offmore would take away current breathing spaces and take up a nature resource and visual beauty • Visual impact of residential development at Baldwin Road (the land is much higher at the rear of Baldwin Road)

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			What benefits this proposed development would bring to the area? Surely what is required is employment opportunities. If you build hundreds of houses on Green Belt land it will only attract those who will not work in the area but simply commute out of the area.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP0970	Object	OC/6 Offmore Farm. Some of this is grade 2 agricultural land; and there is grade 1 land nearby. Such land should be retained for agriculture. In including this as a preferred site the Preferred Option is guilty of not applying its own principles in Policy 28D.C. The best and most versatile agricultural land should only be developed if there is no other realistic option
	LPP01894	Object	I wish to object to the planned building of homes and an Eastern By Pass, across the Green Belt behind Offmore. I see no benefit of putting a road through these fields and building houses. There is no room at Offmore Primary and it has been extended to maximum . The cost to put a railway bridge to accommodate the road would be substantial and we are already on a high band of council tax. The eastern by pass would not only obliterate the landscape due to its height, it would be visible and noisy. It would also cause harm to local wildlife including endangered birds such as yellow hammers and sky larks. Tennyson way and Husum way are already used rat runs.
	LPP01991	Object	<p>Objects to any development on Greenfield land, except for sites that have been too badly contaminated, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not believe that any meaningful communities will be created by developing to the east of Offmore and to the rear of Baldwin Rd. 2. Additional pressure on Offmore Primary School which is on a restricted site. 3. Concerned that development on land to the east of Kidderminster should not occur until the by-pass has been constructed. 4. Suggests the by-pass should start at the Stourbridge Road because Hurcott Road and Baldwin Road are already used as a 'rat run' and would only become much worse. 5. The area to the rear of Baldwin Road down to Hurcott Lane is well used and much loved by walkers, dog owners and anyone interested in the countryside. It would be an eyesore if built on due to its elevation.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2082	Object	<p>Object to the proposed development. Just building houses doesn't solve problems it creates problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where would all the traffic go? A proposed bypass would cost millions and create traffic problems whilst it was being created and after. Also creating rat runs around local roads. • There are endangered species of birds along the route that is proposed for the bypass • Noise and air pollution would increase substantially • Increase in noise and air/dust pollution during the construction • The land is Green Belt and is used to farm • Loss of views • Devaluation of property prices. <p>Please reconsider your plans, consider the long term impact/damage to local communities, wildlife habitats.</p>
	LPPO2093	Object	<p>Objections - east of Offmore.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of wildlife. 2. Pressure on local schools/GPs 3. Side roads misused as rat runs. 4. Traffic congestion 5. Sustainable community on Lea Castle better
	LPPO2134	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By-pass necessary. • Lack school places/Loss of trees in Husum Way . • Other sites more suitable e.g. Lea Castle with good access to main roads/bus routes –already built on! Catchment area for Wolverley High School. Use land to rear of Ferndale.
	LPPO2160	Object	<p>I object to the proposal for building houses to the rear of Baldwin Rd and the Offmore Comberton area. There is perfectly good land going to waste in the old Lea Castle site, why can't that be used instead? The roads</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>surrounding that area are more robust than the smaller roads surrounding Baldwin Road. The effect on the surrounding wildlife in Hurcott village would be devastating, and while I understand we need more housing surely that shouldn't be at the expense of our beautiful countryside and wildlife? Baldwin Rd is already used as a cut through and the majority of cars do not respect the speed limit and use it as a race track. More housing in this area would just increase this and put the families at risk along this road.</p> <p>What are the plans to support the increased infrastructure that would be needed if we suddenly have hundreds of extra families in the area? Kidderminster Hospital is already at breaking point and where would the children go to school? To cope with the increase of traffic, there would be more roads built, more traffic, more noise pollution and no-one policing the speed limits or behaviour of the motorists.</p> <p>It has already been established that the site at Lea Castle has enough space to accommodate a new school, bus services and plenty of houses. So surely this can be considered as a logical area for development?</p>
	<p>LPPO2248</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The local plan presents us with a series of options for development - all of which involve building on areas of what is currently rural or semi-rural land. We are expected to accept that one of these options is inevitable.</p> <p>Green Belt/greenfield land plays an essential role in sustaining the structure of any urban community. Improving air quality, sustaining wildlife, or simply creating the balance of environment for the physical and mental well-being of the population are all basic requirements for any modern town - it is not something that can just be pushed further out on demand. The fact that councils are being given the green light to remove the protected status of such areas is wrong in principle.</p> <p>The plans describe the proposed developments as land to the rear of Baldwin Road (OC/4). These are fields stretching across to Hurcott which is well known locally as a semi-rural community. It also has important historical significance with its paper-making tradition reaching back to the Middle Ages.</p> <p>This is far more than just another piece of real estate in waiting; for thousands of local residents it is their piece of countryside, for many it is why they chose to live there and why (at the moment) they want to stay there.</p> <p>The area in question is high land – any development here would be seen from a great distance across to the East where the land falls away considerably. The current vista forms part of the rural gateway to Kidderminster– an intrinsic part of the town's character. Planners and councillors should not underestimate the role of these aspects in separating Worcestershire communities from the West Midlands conurbation and in attracting visitors and consumers from the Black Country and beyond.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The prospect of new housing will create stagnation in the local housing market. Buyers will be unlikely to invest in properties knowing that the character of the vicinity is about to change dramatically. The value of these houses will fall so that owners will not be able to get the price they need in order to sell. Contrary to the wording used within the plan – extending the town will make Kidderminster a LESS desirable place to live.</p> <p>Another area earmarked as “Core housing” is the land to the East of Offmore Farm (OC/6). This farmed land is a key aspect of the local environment and any attempts to develop it will not only add to the strain on infrastructure described elsewhere in this letter, it would dramatically reduce the quality of life of the thousands of families on the estate – as well as adversely affecting the value of their homes. Changing the use of this land would be wrong on historical, political and environmental levels – it should not even be considered.</p> <p>Looking at the maps in the Local Plan document, it is clear that the core housing sites will result in the greatest depletion in Green Belt land and are the most serious threat to the rural buffer that is essential to the character of the town.</p> <p>Building on this landscape would be an affront to the people who live in the community. It would be damaging the lives of existing inhabitants in order to meet an expected quota. Real life quality sacrificed for theoretical need.</p> <p>The local authority’s budget is straining to manage the needs of the existing town population on issues ranging from road maintenance to healthcare. Extending the town on this scale will only worsen the problem.</p> <p>Furthermore we do NOT want an Eastern relief road with the resulting disruption, noise, pollution, corrosion of local character and damage to the environment, it would bring.</p> <p>If an increasing population is the cause of the perceived shortfall in house building more and more houses on Green Belt is not addressing that problem. Neither is it sustainable, for band after band of new developments will eventually deplete the rural spaces between towns to an extent that they are no longer effective as green spaces. Developing the Eastern side of the town will adversely affect the lives of thousands. Surely it would be to the council’s advantage to minimise the number directly affected and therefore the level of opposition that will be directed at them.</p> <p>If there has to be large scale development around Kidderminster, dispersal is preferable to extending an already busy town. This allows new “settlements” to develop their own infrastructure, maintains an element of separation between communities, reducing inevitable problems caused an increased concentration of traffic and population and spreading demand for services (for employment, retail, education, healthcare, transport links etc) across a wider range of towns and communities. It also allows new developments to be designed in a way that</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>has less of an impact visually and environmentally. The council asks if we prefer Option A or Option B. The problem is that, as long as both options include the areas designated as Core housing sites on the Eastern edge of the town neither is going to be acceptable to the majority of people that the proposals affect. Option B is offered as the dispersal option but the swathe of heavy development to the East of Kidderminster makes it anything but. If the council wants to achieve any kind of acquiescence it will need to re-draft these proposals without the core housing sites that appear in the current plans.</p>
	LPPO2448	Object	<p>We recently moved from London to escape the crowded, doctors surgeries, crowded shops, crowded roads, and would be really unhappy if this proposal for the Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster, would go ahead, as it would seem so does every local person, the disadvantages outweigh the advantages, I hope you agree.</p>
	LPPO2470	Object	<p>As a resident that will be negatively affected by the plans to erase a significant amount of the Green Belt land surrounding my home in order to build thousands of new houses that will undoubtedly remain empty for years (£210,000 is NOT affordable, not even close. Maybe in London, but certainly not in the Wyre Forest). I felt it necessary to express my severe displacement with the planned proposal for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton Area for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The houses being built are presumably meant for young families? But where will their children go to school? The local schools are already overflowing. 2. The Green Belt area to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. 3. An eastern bypass would need to be built between the Wolverhampton and Worcester roads, otherwise the roads around Hurcott would be utter chaos. 4. This bypass would require at least one new railway bridge, which would be incredibly expensive. No private developers would pay for it. 5. The visual concern would be an obvious issue, not to mention the impact on local wildlife. 6. The development would create a significant amount of water run-off that could turn Broadwaters into a swamp. I have friends who live in that area who are understandably concerned.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2647	Object	<p>Object to the housing proposals east of Offmore for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offmore Primary School is currently full • There are anti social behaviour issues that need sorting on Offmore. Adding more houses is likely to worsen the issue. • The local hospitals can't support the residents that are already in the area • The local bus service doesn't properly serve the existing community. • There are many speeding cars on Tennyson Way during the evenings, this will only become busier with more housing and cars.
	LPPO2762	Object	<p>We are writing to express our concerns and disappointment at the proposed development of Green Belt land to the east of the Offmore Estate.</p> <p>We moved to get away from all the building of houses in every little nook and cranny around our home and surrounding areas. This now seems to be happening here in Kidderminster at the cost of other areas that need to be completely renovated, as they are in such a state of disrepair, like the Comberton Estate. Many of the houses and streets are completely in need of rejuvenation.</p> <p>You are proposing to build more houses that we don't seem to need, as there are so many houses still up for sale round and about, instead of maybe helping those areas that need to be updated and are being overlooked.</p> <p>It does seem strange that all the new development has to be on the eastern side of Kidderminster, drawing us ever closer to Blakedown, shrinking the area that separates us from them. If this buffer zone is something that the local government wants to protect then extending towards Bridgnorth or Hartlebury, as another option to consider, wouldn't quite have the same repercussions.</p> <p>While we are not totally opposed to more housing, if needed, we feel that to centralise all the current development plans to one area of the town seems very unfair.</p>
	LPPO2902	Object	<p>We are opposed to any development of this Green Belt land and firmly believe that there are far more suitable and sustainable options for future development in the area.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><i>Disadvantages of the WFDC proposals to develop east of Offmore Farm:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land to the east of Offmore is designated Green Belt • This land is prime agricultural land which is farmed productively every year contributing to UK food and grain production and is important for wildlife. The Skylark breeding population has increased there. • The land to the east of Offmore is significantly higher than the rest of the estate so any development would be very visible and imposing upon the rest of the area. • It would have no neighbourhood centre. • Offmore Primary School is full to capacity and is on a restricted site so not suitable for extending. • The proposed Eastern bypass would not be funded by housing developers and would be extremely expensive to construct • The existing roads through Offmore Farm estate are already over used and the proposed development would significantly increase traffic
	<p>LPPO2952</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Withdrawal from Europe may mean a requirement for more home grown food therefore productive agricultural land should not be used. 2. The Green Belt area to the east of Kidderminster separates the town from the nearby village of Blakedown. 3. Would impact on the already full Primary School. The Offmore Primary School has no room for further development. 4. A new railway bridge would have to be built at considerable expense. 5. An Eastern Bypass from the A456 to the A448 would not relieve the terrible traffic at the Horsefair and would cause more noise pollution. 6. The land to the east of Offmore is home to protected and increasingly scarce wildlife. 7. This land also has a habit of flooding and water run-off would be increased with building on these fields.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3110	Object	I object to the proposals as per the disadvantages provided by Offmore & Comberton Action Group. I currently reside on Baldwin Road and believe the proposals will have an impact on the area in which we live.
	LPPO3134	Object	Objecting to building on Baldwin Road/Offmore/Comberton sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools and infrastructure inadequate. • Greenfield sites. • Brownfield sites should be used - especially in the town centre. • Will ruin the countryside.
	LPPO3163	Object	The proposed benefits of easier school provision and an Eastern Relief Road do not outweigh the disadvantages of large scale expansion to the east of Kidderminster. Offmore School has further capacity. The Eastern Relief Road would require the construction of an additional railway bridge at a cost prohibitive to any developer. The height of any such road/housing would be considerably higher than current housing making it very visible. Why should the lion's share be taken by the East. It is a misconception that industries and businesses will flock to the town to support this increase in numbers, with the traditional carpet industry declining where will these people be employed? Some units have remained empty for years and the old shopping streets are deserted. We will be no more than a commuter town The existence of Green Belt Land between the current eastern household boundary and Blakedown is crucial in the separation of Kidderminster and the West Midlands conurbation
	LPPO3294	Object	There is a small development of 7 homes, that are converted former farm buildings situated at the rear of the Offmore Farm Care Home in an area, known as Offmore Court. This development was completed in the mid 1990's and is surrounded on three sides by Grade A agricultural farmland. The fields surrounding the development have been used on a continuous basis, to grow crops (originally sugar beet, until the Kidderminster sugar beet factory closed down) and latterly wheat, potatoes, carrots etc). As and when the development of the fields adjoining Offmore Court takes place we would like to suggest the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That consideration is given to the effect of flooding of the stream which flows from the eastern direction

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and along the edge of the Offmore estate towards Spennells. Currently any rainfall is absorbed by the land but when this land is developed there will be significant run-off as the land available for natural drainage will be greatly reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There have been occasions during heavy rainfalls that there has been flooding from the field into Offmore Farm Close. • That the unique nature of the Offmore Court development is respected and an area of undeveloped land should be allowed to remain around the development to enable its unique character to be retained as the buildings have a certain 'group value' and that their setting as former farm buildings should be treated sympathetically in any future Master Plan.
	LPPO3299	Object	There is only one doctors practice in this area, it is difficult enough to get appointments as it stands. Adding yet more patients to the ever growing list is unsustainable.
	LPPO3419	Object	I object to the proposal for re-development of Green Belt land adjoining the Offmore & Comberton area. I am appalled that WFDC are considering housing on this site when there are more suitable areas yet to be developed. Lea Castle could be used to its full capacity and is much more able to support a sustainable village community and a new primary which could then feed and sustain the nearby Wolverley High School. Offmore school is full and can not be extended. An Eastern bypass would cause additional noise and pollution for Offmore residents. Listen to the concerns of local residents before considering any future development of the Offmore Comberton areas and destroying our local wildlife and green fields
	LPPO3431	Object	If these plans go ahead this will affect me as there will be more traffic up and down Hurcott Road. This will affect many things i.e. doctors, more pressure on hospitals, dentists, schools too. So I strongly disagree with this plan.
	LPPO3470	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to any proposed development to the rear of Prior Close. • There are many species of birds in this area and a number on the BTO/RSPB red list. There's also plenty of other wildlife around including great crested newts. • There is no immediate road access to the rear of Prior Close. • The relief road envisaged is merely an estate road – surely a relief road should be at least three lanes, preferably four – we must look to the next hundred years and the country's continuing increase in

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>population and traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another concern is where the relief road begins and ends. We believe it should include the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge Roads – maybe widening existing roads/lanes but the exit point on the Worcester Road, as currently envisaged, meets an already known accident blacks spot from Easter Park through to and past the Torton traffic lights. • There is already added congestion along the Worcester Road with the new traffic lights. • We do not wish to become the Wyre Forest District of Birmingham or the West Midlands. • Also, with an increasing population why are you agreeable to land, being farmed each year in year to produce food, to be built on? • Prior Close Green Belt area is entirely secluded except for access by the land owners, farmer and farm workers.
	LPPO4010	Object	Object to OC/6.
	LPPO4011	Object	<p>I object to the local plan core housing proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I'm concerned about any development on the east of the Green Belt - this helps to separate the town from the West Midlands Conurbation • An eastern By Pass would need to be built from Wolverhampton Rd to Worcester Road to be of use. This is already an accident black spot. • There are endangered bird species along the route the by pass would have to take from A456 to the A449 • A bypass would need to be developed before the land to the east of Offmore could be developed • A new railway bridge would be required to help realise this development, which would be incredibly expensive • The bypass would need at least a 30m tree screen to buffer the noise • I would question whether the linear development would create any degree of community and social cohesion

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offmore school is at capacity with no scope for expansion • Development would be very visible due to the elevation of the land • 10. Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to help avoid congestion
	LPPO5137	Object	The options of plan 'A' and 'B' would cause a considerable volume and build up of traffic congestion not to say the loss of agricultural land would be a bad idea.
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	LPPO3116	Object	Concerned that Parish will become even more of a 'through route' if sites east of Kidderminster are developed. Character will be badly affected if Eastern Relief Road is built. County proposals already mean likelihood of increased commuter traffic for station and school has been expanded. We would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. Kidderminster-Blakedown section narrowed to single carriageway for safety reasons and alterations at Hagley junction mean traffic often backs up to Blakedown. Proposals at Baldwin Road and Offmore would add to traffic levels. Employment proposal at Hodge Hill would add traffic at an accident blackspot. Proposed relief road would bring more traffic onto A456 from A448 and A449. Why is this needed when A450 meets A456 at Hagley? Blakedown village centre - concerns re air quality and pedestrian safety. Suggest traffic lights for junction of Belbroughton Road and moving pedestrian crossing to near Station Drive. Proposed eastern relief road would add further pressure to A456 in village. If A448/A450 junction was improved it would divert traffic from centre of Kidderminster and relieve pressure on A456.
	LPPO2037	Support	Lea Castle Hospital /Sladen School ideal sites
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	LPPO4086	Support	LAND AT COMBERTON ROAD, KIDDERMINSTER. Taylor Wimpey is currently in control of the land to the north of Comberton Road and to the south of the Birmingham to Worcester railway line (sites OC/6 and OC/13N), and a further area of land to the south of Comberton Road (OC/13S), as shown on the Site Location Plan (Appendix 1). The northern area is promoted as an infrastructure led residential development with significant green infrastructure, plus land for a primary school and other community facilities. It also provides opportunity for strategic relief road around eastern Kidderminster. The land south of Comberton Road is likely to be delivered much later and completion is likely beyond the plan period. Land will need to be secured for the relief road which is not in control of Taylor Wimpey. Development Vision document shows initial concept masterplan for site. (see

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Appendix 2). Northern parcel - 1,050-1,300 homes; provision of land and proportionate contribution to delivery of road linking A456 and A448; provision of new pedestrian/cycle links to Tennyson Way and Borrington Road; provision of land for new community facilities including primary school; provision of significant area of green infrastructure; provision of SuDS; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by route of relief road. Southern parcel - longer term provision of 400-500 dwellings; opportunity to help with delivery of new road link between A448 and A449; provision of Green Infrastructure for use by existing residents of Spennells; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by new road. Analysis of evidence base and technical information shows that urban extension is soundly based.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/12 –COMBERTON LODGE NURSERY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2038	Object	Its got a high flood risk. Building here blocks off the wild life access into / out of the Spennells Valley nature reserves.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/13(N) – STONE HILL NORTH

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP04245	Comment	Green Belt and other places are available. Birchen Coppice, golf course.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPP0971	Object	Different considerations apply to different parts of site. Ridge between Stanklyn and Bell Brooks should be kept open as green wedge. Grade 2 areas should not be developed. Some of northern part is marsh. Irrigation system dating from 17th century. Area to south of Spennells is part of former Stone Common and Hoo Farm. This is grade 2 and should not be used for housing.
	LPP02039	Object	You will be building on parts of the flood plain. Building here will disrupt the east west flow of wild life along Hoo Brook.
	LPP02187	Object	I object to the proposal for re-development of Green Belt land adjoining the Offmore & Comberton area. I am appalled that WFDC are considering housing on this site when there are more suitable areas yet to be developed. Lea Castle could be used to its full capacity and is much more able to support a sustainable village community and a new primary which could then feed and sustain the nearby Wolverley High School. Offmore school is full and can not be extended. An Eastern bypass would cause additional noise and pollution for Offmore residents. Listen to the concerns of local residents before considering any future development of the Offmore Comberton areas and destroying our local wildlife and green fields
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	LPP02219	Support	LAND AT COMBERTON ROAD, KIDDERMINSTER. Taylor Wimpey is currently in control of the land to the north of Comberton Road and to the south of the Birmingham to Worcester railway line (sites OC/6 and OC/13N), and a further area of land to the south of Comberton Road (OC/13S), as shown on the Site Location Plan (Appendix 1). The northern area is promoted as an infrastructure led residential development with significant green infrastructure, plus land for a primary school and other community facilities. It also provides opportunity for strategic relief road around eastern Kidderminster. The land south of Comberton Road is likely to be delivered much later and completion is likely beyond the plan period. Land will need to be secured for the relief road which is not in control of Taylor Wimpey. Development Vision document shows initial concept masterplan for site. (see Appendix 2). Northern parcel - 1,050-1,300 homes; provision of land and proportionate contribution to delivery of road linking A456 and A448; provision of new pedestrian/cycle links to Tennyson Way and Borrington Road; provision of land for new community facilities including primary school; provision of significant area of green infrastructure; provision of SuDS; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by route of relief road.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/13(N) – STONE HILL NORTH

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Southern parcel - longer term provision of 400-500 dwellings; opportunity to help with delivery of new road link between A448 and A449; provision of Green Infrastructure for use by existing residents of Spennells; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by new road. Analysis of evidence base and technical information shows that urban extension is soundly based.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO2298	Comment	<p>I am clear in my understanding of the purposes of designating land as Green Belt as defined in paragraph 80 of the government's publication 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF), these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas; • to prevent neighbouring towns from merging; • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; • To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>I would like to offer support to one particular site, that being the land known as Captains and The Lodge, designated WFR/ST/1 and located on the east side of Kidderminster to the south of the A448. The Green Belt Review prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler, which has informed the Local Plan Review, has given a brief analysis of the site and concluded that it offers only a limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt and I would concur. Looking at the five purposes of inclusion of land within Green Belt in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of the site from Green Belt in isolation would still check the unrestricted sprawl of Kidderminster as the relatively small scale of the site will create new limits to development along the outer edge where it will abut the residual and far greater area expanse of Green Belt; rather than being unrestricted, the re-designation of the site will therefore allow controlled expansion of the urban periphery in a location which is predominantly out of general sight. The shape of the site and relationship of it to the existing boundary of the Spennells estate show that it naturally fills a gap between the more intrusive part of the estate to the south and the A448 to the north, again giving natural limits and control to the increased built up area. 2. With the exception of villages such as Stone and Chaddesley Corbett, the nearest town on this side of Kidderminster is Bromsgrove, some 8 miles distant. There will be no danger of the adjacent towns merging with the reallocation of this site and even Stone, a good mile distant, remains safe from being subsumed as a result. 3. The safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment is effectively the same as checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Whilst Green Belt, a not insignificant proportion of the site can be

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>deemed to be previously developed land; part of the land has extant and exercised permission for the storage of caravans, which in itself already constitutes an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt, and then there is the footprint and residential amenity space associated with the two existing dwellings. Whilst admittedly paragraph 53 of NPPF seeks to restrict development of residential gardens, I rely on the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in the glossary in Annex 2 to the rear of the NPPF which excludes, amongst other things, 'land in built up areas such as private residential gardens'. As the site is currently Green Belt, it cannot be classified as being in a 'built up' area, and therefore the residential amenity spaces associated with the two houses are, by definition of lack of exclusion, previously developed land. Despite this, paragraph 89 of NPPF instructs local authorities to regard the construction of new buildings within Green Belt as inappropriate development with few exceptions amongst which is limited affordable housing to meet local community needs; a need clearly demonstrable in the greater Kidderminster area. The fact that part of the land could already potentially be developed for affordable housing whilst remaining within the Green Belt therefore significantly reduces the potential additional impact of the site being removed from Green Belt designation to allow more general development.</p> <p>4. The edge of the urban environment here is quite abrupt; the relatively high density of the Spennells estate gives a hard edge to the town that the two dwellings on the site currently softens to an extent, albeit there is little visibility into the site save for a public right of way that separates the site from the edge of Spennells. Spennells is also a relatively recent development itself and presents a contemporary urbanism to the arriving visitor as they approach along the A448. Whilst Kidderminster does have an historic core, it is located some distance from this gateway site with a natural chronology of development increasing in age and associated characteristic as you travel more. A new development, of contemporary idiom on this site would therefore be wholly appropriate, and would not detract from the setting and special character of the historic parts of the town centre which are quite remote from the site.</p> <p>5. In recent history, Wyre Forest District Council has had robust policy in respect to town centre regeneration, particularly in Kidderminster, and not without success. Wyre Forest as a district is however disadvantaged in having only three relatively small centres with a high proportion of Green Belt around them creating a natural limit to development that is close to being reached. In my own local authority area, I have seen adherence to the last item of the above list in particular, significantly diminish existing redundant employment land in order to satisfy the needs for anticipated housing provision which policy</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>has dictated 95% needs to be on previously developed land; worse still, I have seen employment land vacated due to the significantly higher land values that subsequent housing designations brings. Clearly, a balanced view needs to be taken to ensure that all demands on available land are able to be catered for, else all we will create are dormitory towns where the residents live, but do not, because they can not , work; a wholly unsustainable approach and contrary to paragraphs 6-16 of NPPF. Whilst development of available and deliverable non Green Belt sites should obviously take precedence, keeping this particular site in Green Belt will contribute little additional influence to urban regeneration within the centre of town given the sterling efforts of the local planning authority to date.</p> <p>Notwithstanding all of the above, it is an invidious task to determine where sacrifices need to be made, as they have to be those with the least worst cumulative impact.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe the site to be amongst the least worst, if not the least worst, of all the current Green Belt sites and would wholeheartedly support its reallocation for residential development. I understand the land owners of the majority of the site are amenable to the use of the land for residential purposes, so not only is the site ideal for purpose, it also represents a deliverable opportunity. I can understand that the current exercise has aroused emotions amongst those hostile to development and that you may receive several objections to this site being included. However, as it has been demonstrated that additional housing needs to be procured over the next plan period, the exercise of deciding where it should be located needs to be undertaken on a positive 'least worst' principle, rather than the alternative of a negative 'anti-development' attitude.</p>
	LPPO2461	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has Captain’s and the Lodge been selected as a “core site”? Why was it selected over other proposed sites? • What will happen to the current right of way which runs from the A448 east to west, crossing Kittiwake Drive adjacent to number 35 and running down past Captain’s Pool? • Will the current approx. 4 metre width be maintained? • What is the current ruling on minimum distance of any proposed new dwellings to the existing right of way? How many metres away would new dwellings be so that I can judge how intrusive they may be from my property. • Could you give an assurance that any planned development of the Captain’s section of WFR/ST/1 would

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>not give vehicular access onto Kittiwake Drive?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kittiwake Drive is narrow with adverse cambers and I believe is unsuitable to higher vehicular use. 2. Adjacent to a children’s park and increased traffic movements would increase risk to children crossing the road to get to the park. 3. The foul drainage system would not have been designed to accommodate outflow from an additional housing estate. 4. Under Preferred Options A or B what would be the final disposition of Captain’s Pool and its fishing rights? Under current arrangements with the current owners Phoenix Angling members have key access to the pool via the right of way and therefore park their vehicles adjacent to the pool in a designated area.
	LPP0103	Object	<p>I put a strong objection to the plans that have been put forward for core housing sites referred to as WFR/ST/1 the area referred to as captains and the lodge as it will affect where I am living. At the moment I am looking out at fields which was what attracted me to the property in the first place. It would also reduce the price and privacy of my house. The area is quiet and full of nature and wildlife as there are plenty of habitat for them, this would all be destroyed. There would be lots of constant noise and traffic especially entering onto the Bromsgrove road from the area to which I live.</p>
	LPP0104	Object	<p>Object to the development ref no WFR/ST/1, the plan is FAR from clear so in this case both options A or B I would object too.</p>
	LPP0761	Object	<p>Object to Option A - fields adjacent to Spennells. Object to plan A and B (core housing) particularly with respect to Captains and the Lodge. Plans are a terrible option with respect to the Green Belt which will be smothered with houses and will destroy wildlife habitats including Skylarks, Green Woodpeckers, and numerous wildflowers. An adverse effect on everyone’s quality of life particularly people who walk through the fields with their dogs, jog or simply walk in the countryside for their physical and mental wellbeing. They will also place more pressure on infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sewers in Spennells can barely cope already

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There will be insufficient school places and doctors 3. Traffic on Spennells is already a nightmare at peak times- this will make it even worse! <p>We are going to be directly affected by noise, traffic fumes (increasing risk to health) and access.</p>
Spennells Against Further Expansion	LPPO1718	Object	In addition we oppose development upon the area described as ‘Captain’s and the Lodge WFR/ST/1’ which has been included in the Draft Plan as a ‘Core’ area.
	LPPO1956	Object	I strongly oppose new houses at Captains and the Lodge. Do not believe that Wyre forest is expanding by such an amount and question the need for so many houses, other than for the council to receive a government payout for each dwelling built. It would put huge pressure on existing roads, schools, shops, doctors and dentists, the police and hospitals. I do not think that the infrastructure is there to support such a huge growth in population. The fields, which are part of the Green Belt for a reason, are enjoyed by huge numbers of people each day of the year. It inhabits a wealth of wildlife which would be disrupted. I believe that affordable housing could be built in other areas of Kidderminster and that enough land lies derelict on brownfield sites to cater for the population growth
	LPPO2085	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More traffic onto A448, an already busy road 2. Development by Captains Pool would have adverse environmental effects and increase unwanted public access. 3. Loss of wildlife 4. Please amend status of WFR/ST/1 to greenfield not brownfield.
	LPPO2090	Object	<p>Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of wildlife habitats and nesting sites on Captains Pool and surrounding areas. Too many houses will destroy the nesting places for the wildfowl which live and visit the pool. Currently there are coot, moorhens, ducks, geese and a visiting pair of great crested grebe. • Effect on visual amenity that is Captain's Pool. Small mammals and also ducks and other birds and bats

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>have been seen in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area used by walkers • Pollution to the pool by way of litter which is harmful to the wildlife.
	<p>LPPO2267</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We oppose the adoption of the Local Plan, both Options A & B including the Core Areas of The Captains and the Lodge because :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There should be no erosion of the productive Green Belt land as there will be an increased need for the UK to provide more food production rather than import food once we have left the EU. 2. Loss of Green Belt will further endanger wild life, both flora and fauna. 3. Loss of Green Belt will also reduce the natural area for people to exercise, as the current areas have many public paths. 4. Proposed building on areas designated as natural flood plans seems fool hardy, as there is plenty of local evidence showing the damaging effects this can have on other areas. I.e. Bewdley, Upton on Severn, Tewksbury etc; 5. Loss of Green Belt will add to the global warming effects that are projected. 6. The increase in population predicted in the new plan will not be able to be employed within Wyre Forest and will thus need to commute to Birmingham and West Midlands, and Worcester. The Wyre Forest has seen a reduction in manufacturing over the last 5 to 10 years in trades that rely on large numbers of workers. Any new businesses are more likely to be high tech and requiring less personnel. 7. Due to item 6 above, roads will become more heavily congested, causing more health problems due to greater levels of engine exhaust emissions. 8. The existing trunk road system in and around the Wyre Forest area is currently running at full capacity with no real plans evident to address the situation. 9. Increased population will need more health facilities both at GP level and Hospital. Wyre Forest has seen Kidderminster Hospital services progressively reduced and this would need to be reversed. Likewise more GP surgeries would be required and the concern there seems to be a national shortfall in GPs. Whilst the Government states that more will be trained, the Royal College of GPs has revealed that some 20% are

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>likely to leave. It is not clear in the Proposed Local plan if the areas required for additional medical facilities are included in the plan or would be additional to it.</p> <p>10. Current public transport is very poor and needs substantial investment to serve the current population levels let alone increased population.</p>
	<p>LPPO2339</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We are against part of the development of the site labelled Captains and The Lodge (WFR/ST/1) for reasons explained later.</p> <p>1 Population Growth - In the decade following 1991 the population remained static with an increase of 1.1% in the following decade and a further increase of 1.1% 2013 – 2015. Overall there has been an increase of 2.2% in 26 years or less than 0.1% per annum. It is now widely accepted that population growth in the UK is now reducing as an effect of the referendum. (2.2) Currently the Options submitted outline a requirement of 5400 units (becoming 6000) or 300 units p.a. of which just 90 units p.a. will be affordable. There is no evidence whatsoever that there is a need for this number of units which appears to be based upon a population growth in the period concerned well in excess of 7% or considerably greater than has been the case in recent years. Indeed planning dept. officers at the recent Heronswood School presentation accept that currently the population of Wyre Forest is falling.</p> <p>2 There Is No Significant Natural Interest in Spennells Fields - Rather than meet the required objective of enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation, Option A will destroy an area which the report incorrectly states has no natural interest. As an owner and breeders of award winning show dogs, in recent years we have walked in Spennells Fields more than 200 times each year. The fields are teeming with wildlife with over 90 species of birds being identified on Captains Pool and a further 20 species in and around Spennells Fields. Many of the birds listed in these records are Red and Amber listed (Birds Of Conservation Concern 4) including on the Red List Lapwing, Merlin, Skylark, Starling, Ring ouzel, Fieldfare, Song thrush, Redwing, Mistle thrush, House sparrow, Yellow wagtail, Grey wagtail, Linnet, Yellowhammer and the Corn bunting. In addition to the bird life there are badgers and foxes present (the boundary to the south of Captains WFR/ST/1) comes within 2m of a very large fox earth. Foxes are protected under a series of wildlife protection laws against poisoning, gassing, asphyxiating, maiming, stabbing, impaling, drowning, clubbing and most forms of snaring, with anyone convicted of carrying out such acts liable to 6 months imprisonment and/or a £5,000 fine per animal. The fields and hedgerows of this area are where the animals forage. Grass snakes are widely distributed in the area of Spennells fields and in 2016</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>there was signage warning walkers that adders were in the area. Four species of bats are identified in and around Stone Hill South (OC13). These include Long Eared Bats, Pippistrelles, Soprano Bat and Daubentons Bat. A large number of moths and butterflies have also been noted in the area widely now known as Spennells Fields.</p> <p>3 The Infrastructure Demands Are Inadequately Addressed. If all the development takes place as in Option A, there would not be the pupil numbers required to build a new primary school for a number of years. Heronswood Primary does not have the capacity to expand exponentially during this time. Secondary schools in Wyre Forest are underperforming BUT if option A is adopted the secondary school in the Wyre Forest with the least opportunity to expand is King Charles, where the upper school site is landlocked. Other schools have greater possibilities for quality expansion of resources and so it would be sensible to distribute the new units around the area as in Option B. Hospitals throughout Worcestershire are in Special Measures. This issue should be addressed before either Option is adopted. It is also becoming increasingly difficult to obtain a doctor’s appointment. This matter also requires rectification if and when Wyre Forest expands further. Open Space and PRoW’s do not as such feature in our community facilities plans in the detail we would expect, and yet this is the reason that the area of Spennells Fields is so admired. It is a natural community asset which must not be lost as would be the case in Option A. If Spennells doubles in size how could traffic enter and exit the estate? The results of the complete adoption of Option A will be unbearable for current residents of the area. Policing costs also appear greater in Option A and it is also probable that doubling the size of Spennells Estate would promote anti-social behaviour. With a modified Option B development (making greater use of Blakedown and Wolverley) across the Wyre Forest will maximise the use of current resources and as a consequence reduce demands on the infrastructure of one area.</p> <p>4 There is a failure to take a holistic view of the housing need alongside that of the Southern/ Eastern bypass and the development of the Railway Station. The Plan states ‘The recent completion of the Hoobrook Link Road (opened Sept 2016) will help ease delays along the A451 Stourport Road corridor’ Has this been a planning failure? The opening of the link road despite assurances to the contrary has led to dreadful traffic backing up that at times creates gridlock on the A449 roundabout at its junction with Wilden Lane. Similarly the Southern Eastern Bypass does not receive the attention it merits in the Plan. The planning officers present at Heronswood Primary were unable to shed any light on the route but whatever route is selected it would still further deplete the Green Belt to the south of the Spennells Estate with each kilometre of road requiring a minimum of 5 acres of land. Is this route necessary? Most traffic travelling via Hagley to Bromsgrove, Droitwich or Worcester will take the A450 to Mustow Green. This route could be upgraded but the issue of Birmingham traffic westward bound via Bewdley</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is not resolved by a southern/eastern bypass. The Plan states ‘The opportunities to increase car parking provision at Kidderminster Rail Station are limited and so improving parking provision at the alternative stations (Blakedown) will be valuable as an alternative means of providing for anticipated rail growth in the Wyre Forest’ Why then has Blakedown been omitted from the proposed developments? It is a total nonsense to improve Kidderminster Station to the tune of £5 million+ when the car park is landlocked and cannot be extended. It is also illogical to call upon a percentage of Kidderminster commuters in the next 15 years to drive to Blakedown to park when there could be a development in Blakedown in order to prevent the additional traffic on the A456. This has a detrimental impact upon the green issues the plan seeks to resolve. It is illogical to require residents to travel to a station outside the town when some housing in that area would reduce miles travelled and therefore reduce pollution.</p> <p>5 Option A will not address the need for affordable homes. WF Council require 30% of new homes to be affordable. Yet the Local Plan Review suggests that WF is an area with a household income that is below average. The percentage of affordable homes therefore needs to be greater in order to attract a greater proportion of younger families to Wyre Forest and to allow these families to purchase a property and to make Wyre Forest a desirable place to live. The Campaign for Rural England has produced a report stating that dwellings built on green land often do not meet such criteria. Based upon planning consultant Glenigan data shows demonstrates that just 16% of houses built on Green Belt land since 2009 outside local plans were classed as ‘affordable’. A point which applies to all development is the capacity of large companies to avoid even a 30% target as they have greater resources to call upon than local planning officers who are working with small teams on limited budgets.</p> <p>6 There will be a major and significant loss of amenity to the residents of Spennells should Option A be adopted, and no details are given relating to the compensatory amenity that residents will enjoy. Proposals within, or conspicuous from the Green Belt, must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, by virtue of their siting, materials or design. The openness of the Green Belt is its most important attribute. By placing a very large proportion in this one area as detailed in Option A this openness will be lost. It would be further compounded if the bypass were also to go ahead as this would require a large buffer on both sides of such a route in addition to the area required for four carriageways and a central reservation. The removal of these open spaces in largely one area will have a detrimental effect upon active lifestyles of Spennells residents and damage the biodiversity of an area it seeks to enhance. The visual amenity and unique landscapes of Spennells Fields will be lost forever’ and the southern and eastern routes into Kidderminster damaged.</p> <p>7 Employment Opportunities. There is no evidence that the suggested enhanced employment opportunities will</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>be delivered. This is a worthy aspirational goal but currently the opposite appears to be the case in the Wyre Forest, with yet more closures being announced in the traditional industry. The Population Growth Figures which are excessive can only be achieved should this aspirational target be achieved. The closure of many units in Worcester St. following the building of Weavers Wharf appears has created a void in the town centre. The consideration of urban living spaces in this now abandoned area could aid the regeneration of Kidderminster town. The siting of a cinema in this area could also be beneficial leaving the former site of WF Glades available for living space. The distribution of housing growth around the area will in turn make Kidderminster a more desirable location in which to reside. My wife and I moved to Spennells as there is good access onto the A448 and we do not have to travel through the town centre to reach it. A spread of development around the town will be more appealing to potential incomers as a variety of development produces better access to other areas.</p> <p>8 Watercourses. Whilst the major watercourses of the Severn, Stour and Canal are detailed in the report, the series of pools leading to Stanklyn Pool and onto Captains Pool receive little attention. This area in the early 1990's was classified as a site of ecological interest forming part of the linear landscape leading to Spennells nature reserve. We have addressed this issue further in our consideration of developing site OC/12.</p> <p>9 Loss of Green Belt and Arable Land and Hedgerows. Although both Options appear to use roughly the same amount of Green Belt land, the amount used of around 2% is double that which the Government recommends. With Option A this is compounded should the southern/eastern bypass go ahead as this will consume considerably more of the Green Belt to the south of Wyre Forest. The rural nature of Stone Parish will be destroyed. Spennells Fields also provide a green space enjoyed by many of the residents of the current Spennells estate. This space is essential for the well-being, air quality and health of the population. There are also numerous PRow in the Fields the character of which would be destroyed should Option A proceed. These assets have for decades been used and enjoyed by residents. Furthermore it is not only the development of the fields themselves to consider but also the accompanying destruction of the hedgerows which are an environment for many forms of natural life. Spennells Fields are also used intensively for the production of both cereal and vegetable crops. A stated objective in the plan is to prohibit the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Development will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it cannot be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land. The case to develop this land has not been made.</p> <p>Captains Issues (OC/12). In June 2004 following an unpermitted attempt to develop the southern side of Captains</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Pool an application was made by the landowner to obtain retrospective planning permission (Ref 676 2004 29 June 2004). At this time the land used for caravan storage was, I believe, increased and the southern boundary built in the ancient woodland. Substantial damage was done to the woodland and although this was subject to a repair order no rectification ever took place. The damaged part of the woodland as a result is now overgrown with Himalayan Balsam. The stream running from what is known locally as Fishermans Pond (the pond between Stanklyn Pool and Captains Pool), that is the supply stream for Captains Pool, has been compromised. During an appeal on 9/3/2010 (APP/R1845/A/09/2118087) Alan Wood on behalf of The Planning Inspectorate refused an appeal to develop the site of Captains on the grounds of Inappropriate Development, Openness, Visual Amenity, Highway Safety and a number of lesser considerations. All these considerations remain appropriate and it would require very substantial investment to overcome some but not all of these factors. Woodlands are addressed within Policy 10D. The ancient woodland to the south of Captains was badly damaged when there was an attempt to develop the area before any permission had been approved. As the subsequent retrospective appeal was dismissed the woodland should have been returned to its previous form. This was never done. Para 15.2 The need to maintain and replenish ground water supplies, reduce flooding and increase the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems and in line with the NPPF and NPPG the Council will steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. It must be noted here that the southern area of Captains site has been infilled and hard packed to provide for caravan storage. As a result the feeder stream for Captains Pool has turned the area to the immediate east of the three existing barns into swampland. The algae on this stagnant water can be clearly seen on Google earth as a light green between the barns and the copse around the stream between the Fishermans Pond and Captains Pool. This land appears to be at greater risk of flood than other areas in the town where it is suggested building cannot take place due to flood risk. The southern boundary of the site has been developed and pushed into the ancient wood which existed there, and a large fence around 2m high erected. The fence is within 2m of perhaps one of the largest fox earths in the Wyre Forest area. The stream from Fishermans Pond to Captains Pool in this area has hard standing on both sides in preparation for the new caravan storage area. This area was classified in the 1990's as a sight of ecological interest that formed part of the linear landscape of local importance joining Stanklyn Pool to Spennells Nature Reserve. The site has been compromised and should be returned to its previous state in order to preserve the linear landscape as it appears on the both Option A and B of the proposed developments. Summary. Councillor Hart has expressed a wish that no Green Belt should be lost if at all possible. Councillor Hardiman opines that all brownfield sites should be the primary route to address the initial need. These are most sensible opinions which if carried forward would ensure that any</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>inadequacies in the PG figures or failures to meet the employment targets would not see Green Belt used unnecessarily and would minimise the need for any incursion into the Green Belt and thus prevent urban sprawl. The use of all the fields suggested in Option A is not a stand-alone decision as the development of a southern/eastern bypass would have a compounding effect in this one area. The demise of Worcester Street following the building of Weavers Wharf should be addressed and with imagination can create both opportunities for affordable housing units and aid the regeneration of the town centre. The building of a cinema on the site of Wyre Forest Glades needs to be further considered as the site could be suitable for apartments. The doubling in size of Spennells estate will place an unacceptable proportion of the new housing in the Wyre Forest, an area which does not have the infrastructure which can be developed, whereas an amended Option B including both Blakedown, and Wolverley and a development of Lea Castle are better served by the existing infrastructure in terms of transport and schools than is the case in Option A. The doubling in size of Spennells may well increase anti-social behaviour in the area. Unless planning conditions are enforced with vigour the plan would not develop the required number of affordable homes. It is widely accepted that many large building companies often do not deliver the infrastructure promised in their original plans. Therefore whatever plan goes forward it must contain watertight conditions that ensure development companies do not renege on any undertakings made.</p>
	LPPO2408	Object	<p>As AS/10, WFR/ST/2, OC/13 and WFR/ST1 all of which lie at the rear of Spennells estate. My reasons are that the land is greenfield and should remain so. Also the extra traffic on the already congested A449 from Hoo Brook would become intolerable. Added to the extra number of new inhabitants the already struggling schools in the catchment area would not cope, Heronswood Primary school has no scope for expansion and is already having to use portacabins. The local infrastructure is sufficient but would not be able to handle an influx of the number expected.</p>
	LPPO2439	Object	<p>I wish to object to the council plan to possibly build up to 2000 new houses in the Spennells area, this includes Captains Lodge and opposite side of A448 Bromsgrove Road. Objection is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spennells estate is already big enough you will have to provide more schools as Spennells, Comberton and King Charles Schools would not be able to cope with possibly 2000 extra families, not forgetting shops etc also. • The roads on this side of town are choked at peak times of the day already, you can't say that you will build an eastern bypass because this has already been turned down by Ministry of Transport. On this side

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of town at 8.00am there are queues at Comberton Hill, Low Hill, oldness Corner (Black Bridge) and Mustow Green.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you relieve this situation? • Kidderminster is not a growing town, a lot of businesses are closing, especially carpet related companies or moving to other areas in the country. I would suggest you wouldn't require anything like 2000 new houses over the next 15 years i.e. 2019-2034. <p>Please don't pile more misery on the residents of Spennells. I hope common sense will prevail. The council should use common sense and don't do anything at the moment.</p>
	<p>LPPO2510</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to state my objection to plans to release land at the rear of Spennells, Captains Pool and The Lodge, from the Green Belt for housing development (Option A). The Green Belt was set up explicitly to prevent urban sprawl and protect rural or agricultural land. If we allow land to be released from the Green Belt rather than look at alternative options, eventually Kidderminster will link with Summerfield, then Hartlebury, Ombersley and then eventually Worcester. Where do we draw the line? Housing developers are so certain land will be released from the Green Belt they are purchasing it for vast sums of money prior to consultations, and decisions by Planning Departments. The message to developers must be clear – Green Belt is protected for a reason, and will stay that way. Developers must look to build on brownfield sites and previously developed sites, rather than build on Green Belt land because it is a cheaper option for them and generates more income for the Local Council. The massive environmental impact in the face of climate change needs to be considered. Rural areas provide a means of generating oxygen and reducing carbon dioxide, prevent flooding and provide food resources. Indeed, the fields at the rear of Spennells have been regularly planted with crops year after year in the twenty-one years I have lived here. Loss of this agricultural land means a loss of this food resource, resulting in a larger carbon footprint to bring in food from elsewhere. It also means a loss of employment to the workers whose jobs it is to maintain this arable land. Wildlife of many species live in the hedgerows around this land which will be forever destroyed if it is allowed to be developed. Public rights of way across the land provide safe leisure facilities for the people of Spennells and it rare not to see families of cyclists or walkers, enjoying outdoor family time on any given day of the week. In addition to this there is the added pollution that extra cars alongside the extra homes will undoubtedly bring, causing increased traffic congestion to an already poorly designed road network on the Estate. Any traffic incident which causes local delays on the A449 or A448, results in the residents of Spennells</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			becoming trapped on the Estate, as traffic cannot flow onto Spennells Valley Road from the only two exits on the Estate. More homes will only increase this problem. Given the Government’s commitment to protect the Green Belt, and reduce the impact of climate change I urge you not to allow Wyre Forest Green Belt to be depleted for short term gain. We must look for alternative more environmentally sustainable solutions.
	LPP02550	Object	Development here will automatically mean more traffic on the Bromsgrove Road. People who choose to live here are more likely to use the A448 as their local road and to commute to work via Bromsgrove and out to the Motorways. This poor quality, narrow and speed restricted A448 is already over loaded and congested, the Mustow Green roundabout in the evening is a nightmare regularly adding between 10 and 15 minutes to the evening commute. One of the attractions in living on the Spennells estate is that it borders on open country and affords easy access to country footpath through green fields, especially for joggers and those who own dogs and need to walk them. These footpaths encourage healthy outdoor exercise in all age groups. If they are lost then the option of pounding the pavement outside yet more houses is not nearly as appealing. There are plenty of sites in and around the town centre which could be restored into high quality housing. Also there are brownfield sites which should be considered first before taking the easy option of building on the Green Belt and taking yet more valuable agricultural land out of production. Do we really want to encourage more people to live in Kidderminster with the town centre the way it is at the moment? The town centre is a disgrace, it is depressed and an embarrassing place to take friends and family around when they visit. There are no decent shops, family run shops are driven out and the place is full of charity shops, empty shops and banks. There seems to only be one direction the town centre is going and that is down.
	LPP02569	Object	I OBJECT to the planning of Spennells fields and Captains Pool. This will have such a negative impact on the surrounding area where residents use the fields as a community facility to walk dogs etc. There are plenty of other sites within Kidderminster that are derelict that can be used for this and wouldn’t have an impact on people’s life. It will destroy the approach into Kidderminster if you develop near Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive and also the area close to Captains Pool, a beautiful part of Kidderminster where an ugly housing estate will be placed, I feel this will want to make most residents move on and out of Kidderminster.
	LPP02653	Object	I object strongly to the proposed development on existing Green Belt land in Spennells, Captains and the Lodge, and surrounding areas. The premise we need 600+ houses is entirely flawed and based entirely on erroneous data. We simply do not need that many houses as the population of Kidderminster has been largely static for

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>several years and those that we do can be accommodated in existing Brown Field sites without laying waste to valuable Green Belt. This is without even mentioning the impact on traffic volumes of all these houses in one place plus the extra demands on local infrastructure. Once gone these valuable green areas are gone forever, therefore every effort should be made to utilise land that is lying derelict and unused first. Many of which are an eyesore and attract criminal behaviour. Hundreds of people use the fields to the south of Spennells and adjacent to Stanklyn Lane every week for recreational purposes, if this land is built it will be a monumental disaster to all those walkers, joggers, cyclists and dog walkers and many children who get their first taste of real countryside and even more so to the loss of habitat for all the wildlife that live in and feed in these fields. Having access to green areas is vital to peoples well being as has been well established in various studies. At the moment we have a large flock of swifts visiting the fields to feed on the abundant insect life, plus the ever present skylarks. There are several large well established badger setts in this area, not to mention bats, rabbits, foxes and myriad native bird life, all of which would lose this valuable green area. It is just wrong to look at a large green field site and say lets build on here because it's convenient for the building company and ignore all the brown field sites because they are a bit more inconveniently spread out over a wider area of Wyre Forest. Therefore I strongly suggest that the existing Housing Plan should be scrapped and a better environmental solution considered.</p>
	<p>LPP02716</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I am opposed to both of the options that Wyre Forest District council have proposed for the following reason: Removal of the fields will greatly reduce the spaces local people can go walking, jogging cycling, walking dogs etc. There has been no thought to the immense increase there will be in traffic. There is already severe congestion around Heronswood Road, adding 1700 extra properties is going to greatly add to this, not to mention the extra noise and fuel emission pollution that will be created.</p> <p>Where are all the extra schools going to be built, along with the extra dentists, doctors and other facilities that will be needed? Is there a plan to incorporate these into either of the options? I believe there are around 1200 empty houses in Kidderminster. Why are these not being utilised along with the empty buildings that there are in the Kidderminster town centre? I would have thought some of these empty buildings would be ripe for conversion into flats. This would cut down on people needing to use cars and thereby reduce pollution. There are already around 300 houses being built on the new Silverwoods development (ex British Sugar Factory). Does this not take off the pressure for the need of another 1700 homes?</p> <p>This area on the map, is referred to as Captains & the Lodge WFR/ST/1 and is described as a core housing site. At present we have been advised this area will have 135 houses built on it.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I am most dismayed to hear this and would like to list a few of the birds and other wildlife that can be found in this area. – Please see separate page –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First of all the Leylandii hedge: If the land is used I would like to keep the hedge and existing fence. At present this hedge houses many types of birds and other wildlife. I am not just referring to the Spring/Summer breeding season. This has been home to all manner of wildlife for many years now and to lose this hedge would be a disaster environmentally. • Secondly, Captains Pool itself. I presume the lake itself is being sold. Currently Phoenix Fishing Club tell us that they have a lease on this pool/pond for another 3 years. Under the terms of their lease they have to maintain this area and also maintain the water to a high standard, which is I believe inspected every 12 months. Please advise how this is going to be maintained and who will be responsible for it? • Amongst the mammals listed on the other page are badgers. There is currently a Badgers Sett on the far side of the lake. How is this going to be looked after? • We also have a few types of bats that are often seen flying around on many evenings. I hope the site will be carefully checked to make sure their nesting areas are protected and not disturbed. • There is a boat shed on this site. There is a lot of wildlife that goes in and out of this boat shed despite doors on the front. Will this be checked to make sure this is not a nesting area? <p>The construction of any new housing on the Spennells area anywhere near the lake will be catastrophic to the environment from which it will be difficult to recover and these lovely creatures will never return. Where does the urban sprawl end and how much more of the countryside do we need to lose before the damage caused is irreversible?</p> <p><u>BIRDS OF CAPTAINS POOL AND AREA WFR/ST/1</u> <u>Breeding Residents:</u> Coot, Mallard, Moorhen, Canada Goose, Great Crested Grebe, Finches, Tits, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Treecreeper, Nuthatch, Starlings, Song Thrush, Mistlethrush, Blackbird, Yellowhammer, Sparrow Hawk, House Sparrow, Hedge Sparrow, Pigeons, Doves & Corvids. <u>Winter Visitors (Oct-April):</u> Goosander, Siskin, Redpoll, Blackcap, European Starlings, Fieldfare, Redwing, Brambling, Goldcrest, Teal. Other birds seen are Grey Heron, Gulls, Shoveler, Pochard, Kingfisher, Tufted Duck, Mute Swan, Wagtails- Pied &</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Grey, Little Egret, Tawny Owl and Buzzards.</p> <p><u>MAMMALS</u></p> <p>Hedgehogs, Moles, Common Shrew, Water Shrew, Field Vole, Yellow Necked Mouse, Wood Mouse, House Mouse, Brown Rat, Grey Squirrel, Rabbit, Fox, Badger, Pipistrelle Bats, Soprano Bats & Daubenton’s Bats.</p> <p>There are around 20 butterfly species and around 75-85 species of bird resident, breeding and passing through that can be seen at Captains Pool. The above list is just a few.</p>
	LPPQ2750	Object	<p>I am objecting to the Draft Local Plan A concerning the fields adjacent to Spennells and Plan A and B concerning the Core Housing Site on the area referred to as Captains and the Lodge. It would be wicked to see the peaceful surrounding countryside smothered with houses. The fields adjacent to the Spennells are used not only by dog walkers but people who walk or jog for their health and mental wellbeing. We really appreciate having the opportunity to stroll along the fields and watch the variety of birds that flit about, some nesting in the fields, and listen to the skylarks as they swoop in the sky. What a shame it would be for them to lose their habitats along with other wildlife that lives here. We’ve also had a wonderful field of poppies here, photographed by hundreds of people, which would never be seen again. Building more houses would mean pressure on hospitals, doctors, schools, transport and so on. How would the schools cope and where would the extra resources come from? Add on to this the overload on drainage and sewers. There is enough traffic on the estate already with congestion on the roads in and around the Spennells being especially bad in the mornings. We do not want increased traffic with more traffic noise and exhaust fumes which are a risk to health. With reference to the Core Housing site this backs on to a peaceful cul-de-sac and residents are very concerned about access to the houses and the noise problems.</p>
	LPPQ2757	Object	<p>Objection to Plan A plus area described as Captains and the Lodge i.e. WFR/ST/2, WFR/ST1, AS/10, OC/13. I wish to object based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The effect of the planned development would create loss of Green Belt which should protect our countryside from Urban Sprawl and even though existing Rights of Way are supposedly protected there is a great danger that these areas will be eradicated by housing development. The benefits to mental health and physical well being are at serious risk as the development will eradicate the fields used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle etc. This on top of the effect on the wild life habitat which is continually being eroded.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planned development which will nearly double the size of Spennells would have a dramatic effect on the ability of local schools and medical centres to cater for the increased requirements of the increased population which cannot even cope with the existing residents. <p>The Council must re-evaluate their plans and concentrate on building on brownfield sites which will have the added benefit on regenerating the existing Town Centre.</p>
	LPPO3129	Object	<p>Object to site being included in the Core Housing Area, at most should be included under Option A Housing sites. Should not create a huge area of housing onto Spennells. A token open space such as a park would not be sufficient to sustain the population. Sustainable development should meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. More housing may meet some needs, without sufficient open space and demarcation between areas an urban sprawl is created with all the problems associated with it. Even with Section 106 funding it would be insufficient to provide suitable amenities or recreational open areas for such a large vicinity of housing.</p>
	LPPO3170	Object	<p>I am very much against the loss of Green Belt in the Kidderminster area, particularly in areas adjacent to large housing estates. It provides areas for healthy exercise, particularly walking and jogging, which, given the rise of obesity in Wyre Forest, is essential for the health of the citizens. Also the Green Belt is a haven for a variety of wildlife both in the fields and hedgerows and it is wrong to destroy their habitat. Nowhere is this more evident than the fields at the top of Spennells and it would be a tragedy to see them built on. I am concerned over the proposed development of Captains and the Lodge, Bromsgrove Road. I understand that it is proposed to access this development from the A448. That's fine providing there is no vehicular access from the development into the existing Spennells estate. If there were it would create a linkage from the A448 into a quiet residential area posing a very real danger to children who play on the streets as well as unacceptable levels of noise and pollution. I was assured at the drop in meeting that this will not happen, but I would strongly recommend that if this proposal goes ahead that this is explicitly stated and guaranteed. I am concerned that the proposed plans that we are being consulted on do not specify the type of housing proposed on any of the sites. At the drop in meeting I asked about this and was told it would be dependent on proposals made by developers. I firmly believe that the council should take the lead in this, rather than be reactive to the developers' plans. In your planning documents you correctly point to an ageing population. However if you look at all the new builds in the areas surrounding Kidderminster there are very few, if any, bungalows being built, mainly because they are less profitable for the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			developers. This is where the council could and should specify a significant quantity of good quality bungalows which would provide an incentive to senior citizens to vacate larger family homes for young families.
	LPP03487	Object	<p>I wish to object strongly to both options A & B. Although these schemes are being presented as an either or choice, each includes development in the area referred to as WFR/ST/1 designated as a “Core Housing Site”. The main reasons for my opposition which can equally apply to both plans are a follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Loss of Green Belt status:</u> DCLG states that “this Government is committed to protect the Green Belt” and “only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter Green Belt boundaries”. Are projected local expansion needs really exceptional enough to warrant this land grab and won’t the infringement of these guidelines make it easier to commandeer more land in the future? The awareness that 98% will somehow be preserved seems unlikely to happen when tempting offers are made by developers. • <u>Increased pressure on Local Services:</u> Both options A and B will impose extra strain on hospitals, doctors, dentists and schools, in addition to the water, gas, electricity and sewerage provision required. Some of these services are struggling to cope already and GPs may even vote soon to stop registering new patients. The local plan review leaflet says only that new facilities may come forward, but even if they do, it will take considerable time and upheaval to install them. Shopping has become poor, the bus service to and from Spennells is substandard and any new residents will no doubt have at least one or two cars. An Eastern Relief Road may be built, but is this really something to welcome? More countryside destroyed, more noise and traffic fumes and soon yet another road will be needed as traffic expands to fill the space allocated to it. • <u>Increased risk to health:</u> Whichever option is adopted it is certain that the atmosphere will become even more unclean with more noise and congestion affecting both pedestrians and cyclists. • <u>Loss of use of fields & footpaths:</u> Captains and The Lodge (WFR/ST/1), Farmers Fields 1 (AS/10), 1 (WFR/ST /2), And 3 (OC/13). Being unable to use and enjoy these fields and the footpaths bordering them, full of trees and flowers and home to birds and other wildlife, will diminish the health and well-being of residents and other visitors. It is a safe area to walk. <p>I object to both Options A & B for these reasons.</p>
	LPP03619	Object	I want to draw issues to the environmental damage that will be caused when building core housing by Captain’s

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Pool. The fields are home to many species of RSPB red listed birds. Birds nesting there such as Skylarks, and Corn Buntings to name only a few of many are depleting in numbers and need to be protected. The RSPB recommends a 200 Hectare exclusion zone around these nests so they can continue to breed safely and increase their numbers. With all the houses that the LP recommends building on core sites and option A, this will see the demise of these birds in the Wyre Forest district which is why the LP needs to be revisited and reworked. As the LP states around 6000 houses need building by 2034, how does the WFDC plan to offset the carbon footprint created by building these houses and the extra cars (10000 approx) which will be on our roads? Air pollution is a rapidly growing problem as seen around the world as well as in the UK. This is caused by over population and the need for cars to get around. So why over estimate by far in the LP, the amount of housing needed thus creating more air pollution? The Spennells is a designated nature reserve and more housing, cars and people would affect the area severely. Tree Protection Orders are in force over the Spennells and its surrounding areas. What will become of these? Are they going to be ignored and the building companies pay a nominal fine for cutting them down? Once again as in its title, it's "Wyre Forest District Council" with a TREE as its emblem. Should that not now change to a HOUSE if the LP goes ahead? This is why the LP needs to be reviewed and reworked to help the environment. It states on the WFDC website that the council is committed to providing well maintained parks and facilities for all to enjoy! If we encourage the building on Green Belt land then there will be no more well maintained facilities for anyone to enjoy!</p>
	LPPO3738	Object	<p>I would respectfully request that other sites are considered before destroying this particularly quiet, leafy area of Kidderminster. The area around the Captains Pool is particularly beautiful and is a great resource for dog walkers, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Surely a development of this area would also be detrimental to the Spennells Nature Reserve? This would be a real shame and something we would never be able to replace.</p>
	LPPO4039	Object	<p>I would like to submit objections to <u>WFR/ST/1 Core Housing Site</u></p> <p>Please note my strong objection to the building on this site known as "Captains and the Lodge", I have lived very close by for nearly 29 years. The following points must be considered in relation to this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TPOs on the woodland - mentioned and detailed above • there are at least 3 types of bats roosting in the woodland and in the boathouse • there are herons nesting on Captains Pool at the far end to the footpath, they have been there for over

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>30 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • many types of water birds grazing on the grassland from Captains house down to the pool. There are 92 recorded different types of birds in this area across to Stone • the only current access onto the A448 will be hazardous as this main road is 50 mph speed limit. One planning application on this site has already been rejected for this reason • there is no footpath on the Captains and The Lodge side of the A448 for children to walk safely to Comberton or King Charles schools • there is swamp land at the easterly corner of Captains Pool (as viewed from the footpath along the pool) that contains newts, frogs and toads • skylarks are nesting on this site in the fields adjacent to Bromsgrove Road • development will be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt • there are badgers setts on this site • there are dormice in the fields where skylarks are • the development will home in the region of 400 extra people and there are not sufficient local amenities, doctors, schools, hospital, shops etc. • both Captains and The Lodge contain restrictive agriculture related covenants, these need to be considered • development on this site would conflict with Policy GB.6 of the LP which states that proposals within the Green Belt must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt. I attribute significant weight to this factor <p>I object strongly to this Core Housing development WFR/ST/1. If you don't accept a reduction in the housing demand numbers, then I still object to Captains & The Lodge being in the draft Local Plan, for the reasons stated above</p>
	LPP04295	Object	<p>I am whole heartedly objecting to Option A and also to any core housing around the Captains and the Lodge. Nothing better than to walk the fields or take them for a long bike ride. The tranquil surroundings, nature and friendly people we pass all add to amazing, safe and stress free well being. We love to see the amazing variety of breeds of birds In the fields as well as the ones that visit our own garden, also bats we have frequently seen at dusk. We love the skyline through the fields, watching sunsets and on clear nights the star constellations. All of</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this will be marred with obscene buildings and light pollution. Not what I want my children to then be deprived of. The traffic would be another issue. The volume of traffic would be disruptive. Imagine an average of 2 vehicles per household on top of the vast amount already. The pollution, build up and safety of us and our children would all be jeopardised. The thought of extra housing on top of the sheer size of Spennells estate is mind blowing. The local schools, doctors and dentists can not deal with this. The waiting lists to sign up for any of these are already problematic let alone then trying for an appointment. It seems as though figures have been miscalculated and are in fact less required than estimated so I don't see why all of the brown belt land can't be used for maisonettes or apartments before hitting this beautiful countryside. There are appalling buildings empty and making Kidderminster look a disgrace like crown house and the majority of Worcester street. This could provide so much more to the town itself if these are converted and updated. If the town is left the way it is any longer I'm sure there will be plenty of property as people would move anyway, there is nothing here for people. It can't possibly just be for the growing population of Kidderminster, it's the overspill from surrounding cities. Where does it end? How much land is going to be eaten up? There were promises of protecting the Green Belt areas and I'm sure as you have seen from the amount of objections and the amount of time and effort gone into objecting to this you can see how much this means. Please please reconsider and re plan. Let us keep these fields for all our sakes and especially children to have the freedom of this natural playground.</p>
	LPP04432	Object	Oppose development at Captain's and the Lodge WFR/ST/1.
	LPP04439	Object	I wish to object to build housing on the Green Belt area known as Captain's Pool and The Lodge.
	LPP04553	Object	<p>I object most strongly to the development of the area identified as WFR/ST/1 Captains & the Lodge on the Kidderminster East map in Appendix A. The map in Appendix A clearly shows the development of WFR/ST/1 Captains & the Lodge as being a Core Housing Site and therefore to be developed in both Option A and Option B, which is in direct contradiction of the statement in para 31.1 that "under Option B the built development would not extend south of the Bromsgrove Road". Development of this area of land would have a severe negative impact on the environment and wildlife around Captains Pool pond and impair the views of St Mary's church, Stone. An important concern is that if developed without the adjacent area of OC/13 Stone Hill South the only feasible access to this area for construction traffic and residents would be through either Kittiwake Drive or on to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the A448 Bromsgrove Road significantly increasing the hazards on either road. It should be noted that access on to the A448 from the adjacent area of the existing Spennells estate is explicitly prohibited in the deeds of the Spennells properties precisely because of the hazardous nature of this stretch of road. This land should only be considered for development as part Option A.</p>
	<p>LPP04585</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Captains Issues (OC/12). In June 2004 following an unpermitted attempt to develop the southern side of Captains Pool an application was made by the landowner to obtain retrospective planning permission (Ref 676 2004 29 June 2004). At this time the land used for caravan storage was, I believe, increased and the southern boundary built in the ancient woodland. Substantial damage was done to the woodland and although this was subject to a repair order no rectification ever took place. The damaged part of the woodland as a result is now overgrown with Himalayan Balsam. The stream running from what is known locally as Fishermans Pond (the pond between Stanklyn Pool and Captains Pool), that is the supply stream for Captains Pool, has been compromised. During an appeal on 9/3/2010 (APP/R1845/A/09/2118087) Alan Wood on behalf of The Planning Inspectorate refused an appeal to develop the site of Captains on the grounds of Inappropriate Development, Openness, Visual Amenity, Highway Safety and a number of lesser considerations. All these considerations remain appropriate and it would require very substantial investment to overcome some but not all of these factors. Woodlands are addressed within Policy 10D. The ancient woodland to the south of Captains was badly damaged when there was an attempt to develop the area before any permission had been approved. As the subsequent retrospective appeal was dismissed the woodland should have been returned to its previous form. This was never done.</p> <p>Para 15.2 The need to maintain and replenish ground water supplies, reduce flooding and increase the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems and in line with the NPPF and NPPG the Council will steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. It must be noted here that the southern area of Captains site has been infilled and hard packed to provide for caravan storage. As a result the feeder stream for Captains Pool has turned the area to the immediate east of the three existing barns into swampland. The algae on this stagnant water can be clearly seen on Google earth as a light green between the barns and the copse around the stream between the Fishermans Pond and Captains Pool. This land appears to be at greater risk of flood than other areas in the town where it is suggested building cannot take place due to flood risk. The southern boundary of the site has been developed and pushed into the ancient wood which existed there, and a large fence around 2m high erected. The fence is within 2m of perhaps one of the largest fox earths in the Wyre Forest area. The stream from Fishermans Pond to Captains Pool in this area has hard standing on both sides in preparation for the new caravan</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			storage area. This area was classified in the 1990's as a sight of ecological interest that formed part of the linear landscape of local importance joining Stanklyn Pool to Spennells Nature Reserve. The site has been compromised and should be returned to its previous state in order to preserve the linear landscape as it appears on both Option A and B of the proposed developments.
	LPP04641	Object	The schools argument is flawed, as despite increased house building the Council have already closed several schools. If there is such a requirement, it would have been easier to keep the existing schools open. To use Green Belt because of wrong decisions in the past is not within the justification requirements of the National Planning Guidelines There have never been any No Doctors surgeries on Spennells. From an environmental view point and to protect the endangered Corn Bunting Option A must not proceed.
	LPP04675	Object	In addition I oppose development in the area 'Captain's and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' which has been included in the Draft Plan as a 'Core' area, the Easter Park business development and the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site at Heath Lane.
	LPP04683	Object	In conclusion, I would like to oppose development at Captains and the Lodge.
	LPP04779	Object	See response 2462.
	LPP04868	Object	Captains Pool should also not be developed.
	LPP05007	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposed development of the Green Belt fields designated 'Rear of Spennells & Easter Park AS/10', 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2', 'Stone Hill South OC/13', and 'Captains and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' (marked Option A and a Core area on the Draft Local Plan).</p> <p>In support of my objection I wish to make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The population of Wyre Forest district has hardly grown in the past 25 years, so the quantity of houses that has been projected as being necessary has been over-estimated or even exaggerated. Brownfield

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>sites and regeneration of Kidderminster town centre could provide sufficient land for new housing without resorting to taking Green Belt. Green Belt should only be taken as a last resort and we have not reached that point yet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure is not in place to support a huge increase in the number of households in the area. Our medical establishments are already at breaking point, our schools almost full. Our road network cannot support more vehicles. • An immense area of wildlife habitat would be lost which currently supports a number of rare species of animals and plants. Currently the fields are in use – they are not left barren. • The Spennells fields area is a valuable natural open space which has a positive effect on people’s physical and mental wellbeing. The public footpaths and bridleways across these fields are used by walkers, dog-walkers, joggers, horse-riders, photographers and birdwatchers and people of all ages and levels of fitness. This is a convenient location for taking exercise without first having to jump in a car. • If these fields were to be given over to housing, tarmac roads and driveways, what would happen during periods of heavy rain? How would drainage be managed to avoid causing flooding in the lower-lying area of Stanklyn/Summerfield? <p>Once our Green Belt has gone we cannot get it back. Once a habitat has been lost we cannot get our flora and fauna back. I urge you to make the right decision – a decision which leaves Spennells fields Green Belt land intact.</p>
	LPPO5125	Object	<p>The Captains Pool is classified as brownfield despite in reality being a field full of plant life, trees, wildlife, etc, when there are real brownfield sites around Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley that are just buildings or former buildings. The plan itself presents the Core build sites as non-negotiable and pressures residents to support Plan A as the "preferred" plan, discouraging anything but picking A or B or objecting to any part of the Core, such as the Captains Pool build behind Spennells. The area including the Green Belt and Captains Pool which would be built on or affected by the build is inhabited by wildlife such as foxes, badgers, bats, buzzards, barn owls, hedgehogs, toads, frogs, grass snakes and others. It is also valuable agricultural land, among the best in Worcestershire, of which there is a shrinking amount in Britain.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	LPPO1002	Support	<p>WFR/ST/1. This might possibly be an appropriate extension to the existing developed area, but we would not like to see development further along Bromsgrove Road, so as to maintain a strategic gap between Kidderminster and Stone.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPPO3829	Support	<p>Aware that the review includes proposals to take certain land out of protected Green Belt designation for the purposes of urban extension, I would like to make the following representation: I am clear in my understanding of the purposes of designating land as Green Belt as defined in paragraph 80 of the government’s publication ‘National Planning Policy Framework’ (NPPF), these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas • to prevent neighbouring towns from merging • to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment • to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns • to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land <p>I would like to offer support to one particular site, that being the land known as Captains and The Lodge, designated WFR/ST/1 and located on the east side of Kidderminster to the south of the A448. The Green Belt Review prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler, which has informed the Local Plan Review, has given a brief analysis of the site and concluded that it offers only a limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt and I would concur. Looking at the five purposes of inclusion of land within Green Belt in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of the site from Green Belt in isolation would still check the unrestricted sprawl of Kidderminster as the relatively small scale of the site will create new limits to development along the outer edge where it will abut the residual and far greater area expanse of Green Belt; rather than being unrestricted, the re-designation of the site will therefore allow controlled expansion of the urban periphery in a location which is predominantly out of general sight. The shape of the site and relationship of it to the existing boundary of the Spennells estate show that it naturally fills a gap between the more intrusive part of the estate to the south and the A448 to the north, again giving natural limits and control to the increased built up area. 2. With the exception of villages such as Stone and Chaddesley Corbett, the nearest town on this side of Kidderminster is Bromsgrove, some 8 miles distant. There will be no danger of the adjacent towns merging with the reallocation of this site and even Stone, a good mile distant, remains safe from being subsumed as a result.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. The safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment is effectively the same as checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Whilst Green Belt, a not insignificant proportion of the site can be deemed to be previously developed land; part of the land has extant and exercised permission for the storage of caravans, which in itself already constitutes an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt, and then there is the footprint and residential amenity space associated with the two existing dwellings. Whilst admittedly paragraph 53 of NPPF seeks to restrict development of residential gardens, I rely on the definition of ‘Previously Developed Land’ in the glossary in Annex 2 to the rear of NPPF which excludes, amongst other things, ‘land in built up areas such as private residential gardens’. As the site is currently Green Belt, it cannot be classified as being in a ‘built up’ area, and therefore the residential amenity spaces associated with the two houses are, by definition of lack of exclusion, previously developed land. Despite this, paragraph 89 of NPPF instructs local authorities to regard the construction of new buildings within Green Belt as inappropriate development with few exceptions amongst which is limited affordable housing to meet local community needs; a need clearly demonstrable in the greater Kidderminster area. The fact that part of the land could already potentially be developed for affordable housing whilst remaining within the Green Belt therefore significantly reduces the potential additional impact of the site being removed from Green Belt designation to allow more general development.</p> <p>4. The edge of the urban environment here is quite abrupt; the relatively high density of the Spennells estate gives a hard edge to the town that the two dwellings on the site currently softens to an extent, albeit there is little visibility into the site save for a public right of way that separates the site from the edge of Spennells. Spennells is also a relatively recent development itself and presents a contemporary urbanism to the arriving visitor as they approach along the A448. Whilst Kidderminster does have an historic core, it is located some distance from this gateway site with a natural chronology of development increasing in age and associated characteristic as you travel toward the historic core reflecting the natural expansion of the town over the last 150 years or more. A new development, of contemporary idiom on this site would therefore be wholly appropriate, and would not detract from the setting and special character of the historic parts of the town centre which are quite remote from the site.</p> <p>5. In recent history, Wyre Forest District Council has had robust policy in respect to town centre regeneration, particularly in Kidderminster, and not without success. Wyre Forest as a district is however disadvantaged in having only three relatively small centres with a high proportion of Green Belt around them creating a natural limit to development that is close to being reached. In my own local authority</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area, I have seen adherence to the last item of the above list in particular, significantly diminish existing redundant employment land in order to satisfy the needs for anticipated housing provision which policy has dictated 95% needs to be on previously developed land; worse still, I have seen employment land vacated due to the significantly higher land values that subsequent housing designation brings. Clearly, a balanced view needs to be taken to ensure that all demands on available land are able to be catered for, else all we will create are dormitory towns where the residents live, but do not, because they can not, work; a wholly unsustainable approach and contrary to paragraphs 6-16 of NPPF. Whilst development of available and deliverable non Green Belt sites should obviously take precedence, keeping this particular site in Green Belt will contribute little additional influence to urban regeneration within the centre of town given the sterling efforts of the local planning authority to date.</p> <p>Notwithstanding all of the above, it is an invidious task to determine where sacrifices need to be made, as they have to be those with the least worst cumulative impact. In conclusion, I believe the site to be amongst the least worst, if not the least worst, of all the current Green Belt sites and would wholeheartedly support its reallocation for residential development. I understand the land owners of the majority of the site are amenable to the use of the land for residential purposes, so not only is the site ideal for purpose, it also represents a deliverable opportunity. I can understand that the current exercise has aroused emotions amongst those hostile to development and that you may receive several objections to this site being included. However, as it has been demonstrated that additional housing needs to be procured over the next plan period, the exercise of deciding where it should be located needs to be undertaken on a positive 'least worst' principle, rather than the alternative of a negative 'anti-development' attitude. I look forward to being able to review all of the consultation responses as the process moves forward to its next stage.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO FPH/27 – ADJACENT EASTER PARK

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	LPP04684	Object	I would like to oppose the business/ industrial Buildings at Easter Park (as those already there have never been fully occupied and are an eye sore).
	LPP04869	Object	I strongly object to the further development of Easter Park Business premises, as they are never fully occupied and stand as empty buildings on a main road into Kidderminster, coupled with the empty VOSA building further creating the impression of a run down and economically poor town.
	LPP05074	Object	In addition I oppose development in the area ‘Captain’s and the Lodge WFR/ST/1’ which has been included in the Draft Plan as a ‘Core’ area, the Easter Park business development and the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site at Heath Lane.
Stone Parochial Charity	LPP01158	Support	We are in full support of the proposal and the land is available at short notice. Land is currently underutilised and is of low agricultural worth and has little attractive merit.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO39	Comment	<p>There are three major problems with this proposal:</p> <p>a. Nesting Skylarks which have been nesting in the fields behind the Spennells estate for as long as we have lived here (36 years).</p> <p>b. Access to the site - Although a new road is proposed, when will it be built before or after the houses? Spennells already becomes gridlocked easily as there is only one way on and off the estate, via Spennells Valley Road, which easily becomes blocked. One morning it took 2 hours to get off the estate.</p> <p>c. Because the Council sold off the land originally allocated to become a middle school near the existing school in the 1980s, there is no spare space to extend the school. Will there be a proposal to build another school?</p>
	LPPO1869	Comment	<p>Proposed development in Spennells fields. I object to “Option A” as it will reduce the Green Belt in Kidderminster.</p>
	LPPO2493	Comment	<p>I do not believe either Option A or Option B listed on the preferred options are acceptable or viable. I also do not believe that the core options for housing around Spennells estate should be utilised either.</p> <p>It was an exciting new estate, one that was bound to grow in time, but a beautiful estate, surrounded by beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Taught my children to ride their bikes on the public footpath on Lapwing field, memories that will last a life-time.</p> <p>The road infrastructure is struggling to support the current residents.</p> <p>The shops on the estate have become busier and busier and the school has large class numbers, which was one of the issues that caused the school to drop into special measures a few years ago.</p> <p>The surrounding countryside is beautiful and should not be allowed to be built on, I’ve lived in urbanised areas, and once that countryside has gone it can’t be bought back. Wildlife destroyed, safe walks gone, clean air no longer able to be breathed, peace and quiet abolished.</p> <p>I cannot see why, with so many empty buildings and land around Kidderminster, they are not utilised before the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>decision to use Green Belt land is made.</p> <p>I don't believe there are enough jobs in the local area to require extra homes.</p>
	<p>LPPO2501</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Green Belt land has special protected status. This special status is being potentially undermined by local authorities all over the UK with what appears to be the support of central government. In this particular case, I am speaking of the proposed development of the Green Belt land on the edge of Spennells Valley, Kidderminster. If this special status is to have any meaning at all, then central government should state that any proposals should not undermine the existing status of Green Belt land. Options that should be included for and prioritised should be new out-of-town and brownfield development. This would encourage the regeneration of our town centre and out-of-town developments that would not compromise Green Belt land and thus retain the integrity of our town boundaries. There may well be additional development costs relating to this type of approach, but the medium/long term benefits would be greater. We cannot just keep allowing development to keep eating into our precious British countryside. Our shared environment is worth a lot more than mere money when it has such a dramatic affect on the quality of people's lives.</p> <p>The Green Belt Land adjoining Spennells is a significant part of life for the many people who enjoy access to this space. Horse riders, cyclists, joggers, walkers etc. enjoy the benefits that this beautiful space provides. The natural wildlife is a joy to see. A sprawling new housing development is going to do absolutely nothing for the quality of people's lives in this area and in turn put massive stress on an infrastructure that is not going to cope with the proposed levels of development.</p> <p>Try to be more imaginative than just looking at the cheaper options. The character of our towns etc is very much defined by our precious Green Belt land and people's best interests are not going to be best served by wiping out this valuable natural resource.</p> <p>We join everyone who voices their strong objections against this proposed development in the strongest of terms. We are fully aware of all of the political and financial influences at work here. Just do the right thing. Looking after our cherished environment is one of the most positive actions that we can all take.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2652	Comment	<p>At no time did I ever think builders would try and build on the beautiful fields with all its wildlife plus the peace and quiet it brings to our estate.</p> <p>The thought that you are considering building on the Green Belt that protects our estate is unthinkable as I always thought I and generations to come would have this beautiful country side to live in.</p> <p>As the estate started to grow in size it was a struggle to get off the estate. The roads around the estate were always gridlocked. This is what Spennells is like NOW so what on earth is going to happen if you build even more houses.</p> <p>There are so many non Green Belt areas you could look at first.</p> <p>Mental illness is so widely spoke about in our lives as the big vote catcher yet when it comes to putting it into practice, like protecting our countryside so people like myself can by just walking and taking in its beauty remove all the stress of the day and help us cope.</p>
	LPPO2675	Comment	<p>Prefer option B as it uses less Green Belt land. There are plenty of unused Brownfield sites in Kidderminster such as the magistrate’s court and the Woolworths site to build additional housing upon.</p> <p>Apartments will serve the needs of affordable housing for the desired residents.</p> <p>I strongly object to any form of additional traffic which will increase congestion around the areas of Stourbridge and Hagley caused by the huge volume of houses.</p> <p>Would place a huge strain on both the local road and train infrastructure. Will considerably increase the amount of commuters on the rail network to Birmingham and as such cause overcrowding and delays impacting along the train line.</p> <p>I strongly object to any proposed bypass that would increase traffic on the A456.</p>
	LPPO2732	Comment	<p>The proposals, particularly Option A, would permit development on large areas of Green Belt land. Urban sprawl</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>would encroach on Hurcott Village, Stone, Summerfield and Torton. Green Belt should stay Green Belt. If Green Belt is developed it is gone forever.</p> <p>Seems somewhat immoral to past applicants who have had applications refused, or have not even applied for approval to carry out their wishes, due to the Green Belt policy.</p> <p>A very low percentage are affordable homes for first time buyers.</p> <p>Fields lying to the South and Southeast of Spennells are arable agricultural land and have been used to produce food crops almost annually for the past 36+ years.</p> <p>It will have a huge impact on road congestion in these areas.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in the town should be used to provide homes.</p>
	LPPO2886	Comment	Kidderminster 'Spennells' area, we know the council wish to build a further ring road, so the preconception is what the building will automatically go ahead regardless of any objections
	LPPO3012	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The area designated core seems already to have been fixed and agreed. We were being asked to give opinions about choices peripheral to this. 2. The brunt of the plans for extensive core building has again been centred on the Spennells area extending the loss of Green Belt on the east side of town for a second time and undoing all the people and nature have done to mend this environment since the Spennells development began. 3. Already this side of town has real traffic problems at commuter times at many junctions. Residents experience this every day, and are now being expected to choose between two options, both of which must lead to greater concerns for road safety, congestion, access to emergency services, and air pollution. 4. Existing small roads will inevitably carry a far greater number of cars, affecting many people's enjoyment of walks

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and precious wildlife.</p> <p>5. Surely firm ideas and financial support for a viable and appropriate road system should be in place to reassure us that such huge new development will not further reduce our quality of life.</p> <p>6. Claims that the development would make Kidderminster into a better place to live, with jobs, new homes, new or improved education facilities and an invigorated economy were mentioned, but I did not hear anything concrete at the drop-in session I attended.</p> <p>7. The marked decline in Kidderminster centre's status as attractive and economically vibrant will also not support such claims.</p> <p>8. Allowing housing to straggle into farmland makes building easier and creates building jobs for the short term, but in the long term could create irrevocable damage and I therefore can only object to <i>both</i> proposals for this area.</p>
	<p>LPPO3036</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>1) The alternative proposal of allowing the Green Belt site by Spennells to be developed is unnecessary and just too drastic to be considered. If the change in status of the land was allowed and given the housing density that would no doubt be used, it would eventually more than double the size of Spennells. Spennells is already a big estate but it was built with many grassy areas and walkways and is surrounded by the nature reserve, Captains Pool and the fields. Consequently, Spennells has become a pleasant place to live with being close to Kidderminster with all its amenities and still feeling out in the beautiful countryside. This satisfaction will change if Spennells is surrounded by a sprawling new development.</p> <p>2.) Watching the areas that are already being developed there seems to be little evidence of sensitive planning; the houses are being thrown up very close together. In five years time the new estates will not be pleasant places to live in or to have near by. The attitude seems to be let's jam as many as we can onto the sites. I suppose for the developer it is more houses equals more money, but as expressed above it seems that we do not need all these houses in this area.</p> <p>3.) The wonderful countryside around Spennells is far too valuable for the environment and as productive farming</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>land. Will future generations thank us if we destroy it?</p> <p>4.) The big developers will only be interested in developing Green Belt sites and no doubt will be employing the best lawyers who will endeavour to exploit any legal loopholes, but what is morally right must win.</p> <p>5.) Surely for Kidderminster to be a happy prosperous town the residents need to want to live here. Permanently replacing the rural aspect of the town with undesirable buildings and the increased pressure on services and infrastructure will not encourage people to want to live here.</p>
	LPPO3346	Comment	<p>I do not however agree to the huge figure with which Wyre Forest District Council have concluded that is needed and especially to the usage of the Green Belt that would be detrimental to the area and one that could never be replaced.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells are a habitat for a large number of wildlife.</p> <p>The suggestion of needing such a vast building of homes sounds to me ludicrous. If that was the worst scenario then we now have an ageing population and more single people than ever residing in homes but this would suggest that smaller homes and housing association new builds are needed and in a more central location, not the four bed type that is suggested.</p> <p>Let's not forget the effect this colossal proposed building expansion will have on the whole infrastructure, amenities and facilities of the Wyre Forest area. Schools, doctors, roads, hospitals, not forgetting the useless bus service are already hugely under pressure.</p>
	LPPO3348	Comment	<p>Option A to the South of Kidderminster. There would be development right up to the district boundary.</p>
	LPPO3497	Comment	<p>The Green Belt behind Spennells provides a rare opportunity for those that live in the area to enjoy the benefits that the outdoors has to offer. The footpaths are easily accessible to all involved, those that enjoy walking and jogging. If this area gets built on, the areas on the southern side of the road is all private land and I am unaware of the area</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>being as accessible to go walking.</p> <p>I would strongly urge brownfield sites within Kidderminster to be considered. For the people of Spennells to lose such a valuable area to go walking, I firmly believe that the cost-benefit return is disproportionate.</p> <p>I would urge consideration for other, non greenfield sites to be considered as a priority.</p>
	<p>LPPO3739</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>The large-scale expansion to the east, and particularly the south-east of Kidderminster raises, quite a lot of concerns.</p> <p>Here are a few points I'd like to raise from my own observations of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are new businesses and enterprises <u>definitely</u> going to be set up in Kidderminster to provide jobs for the new residents? • In as much as there are plans to build new houses there should be matching plans for <u>actual</u> schools and <u>actual</u> doctors' surgeries. <p>o Will these people be able to find doctors?</p> <p>o How do you know that school provision will be delivered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The balance of urban/rural life could be adversely affected by rapid development once it gets going. • It must not be forgotten that Spennells Valley is a nature reserve. Should there be extra houses built we would need to see plans for green spaces being interspersed. I don't see any provision in the plans for those. Doubling the size of Spennells would adversely affect the lives of many people who chose to live there because of access to fields for their own mental welfare, and being able to walk their dogs, etc. • Could the development options be less concentrated and spread around the whole of Kidderminster, not just the south-east? Is this to justify building a relief road? • I have never been convinced that a relief road would help the congestion in Kidderminster. The A450 already allows traffic coming from the north-east to bypass the town on the east and to join the A449 to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>travel onwards towards Worcester, or to access the town on the west side. To create another main road joining the single carriage way A449 at a busy section – on the approach to Hoo Farm Industrial Estate – would encourage even more traffic to join the existing bottle-neck before going on towards West Kidderminster, Stourport or Worcester. I think a lot more thought needs to go into where such a relief road would spill out onto, and going on from there how the total road network around that part of Kidderminster might be improved to accommodate so many extra residents.</p>
	LPPO3847	Comment	<p>Habitats providing life to bats, dormice, crested newts (as well as land providing homes to skylarks - prohibited) aren't allowed to be interfered with and built upon.</p> <p>Disrupting breeding and resting habitats of these species, which is what would happen should you choose to ignore local concerns and plough ahead with Option A regardless, is against the law and can warrant an unlimited fine and up to 6 months in prison. As at least 2 of the species I've provided have been documented living amongst the fields adjacent to Spennells (with evidence of the wildlife should you require it), I urge you to reconsider building sites to avoid breaking EU and wildlife law.</p>
	LPPO3	Object	<p>Spennells fields should not be built on. It should become a SSSI as it is a habitat for nesting Skylarks which are in decline and I understand a protected species. Also home to Linnets, Owls and Sparrow Hawks. Any building would threaten the breeding of these birds and would threaten the existing right of way. It is an area of recreation where many people get back to nature by walking these fields.</p> <p>Development would impact severely on the already overcrowded school, health provision and existing retail car park provision.</p>
	LPPO5	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells Green Belt. Field is used for local crop growth. Questions where money is coming from to support capacity increases at hospital, schools, police, fire etc.</p>
	LPPO8	Object	<p>Objects to development on the Spennells Green Belt land at the end of Turnstone Road. There are ample brownfield sites which can be used within Kidderminster, before looking at ruining Green Belt land.</p> <p>Need to consider the impact on traffic, schools, infrastructure, good quality land, wildlife and the general fitness and</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			wellbeing of the local residents.
	LPPO9	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure in relation to roads, schools, sewerage system and local retail provision. • Development will have adverse impact on local global warming and pollution in general. More carbon dioxide will be produced with a loss of trees and green areas that produce oxygen. • House values on Spennells will decline <p>Hopes new homes can be provided in several areas in the Wyre Forest and not just on the Spennells and particularly the Green Belt.</p> <p>Build more housing on brown field site like the old Glades site.</p>
	LPPO10	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crossing the road for school is already hazardous at Captains Pool Road / Heronswood Road / Turnstone Close. More homes would result in more traffic and a worse situation. • The fields at Spennells are home to wildlife including Skylarks which are a part of the Worcestershire Biodiversity act and require full protection of their habitat under farmland birds.
	LPPO11	Object	<p>Objects to development on Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area is used for recreational walking and this interaction is vital for both building community spirit and offering a lifeline to those who do not normally see anyone to talk to. • Traffic congestion is already bad in rush hour. Adding more dwellings will exacerbate the situation • The fields are home to a multitude of wildlife • Development would join Spennells to Stanklyn Lane. These are two separate communities. • There is no space at the School for additional pupils

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO12	Object	<p>Objects to development on the Spennells fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school is full • Roads on and off the estate, even with extra filter roads, would be congested. • The fields offer a wealth of natural habitat and wildlife. • The fields make Spennells a special place to live <p>There are other areas in the District that should be built on regenerated. Exhaust all other areas first. There are areas of the town that are run down - don't spoil the most beautiful parts.</p> <p>The fields should remain as Green Belt.</p>
	LPPO13	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells. It is an area of natural beauty and enjoyed by many people and dogs. Has lived on the estate since the 70s and it has grown enough. There are a lot of other sites which could be utilised before destroying countryside. The town centre should be redeveloped.</p> <p>I also understand WFDC are amongst the worst council's in England for selling off Green Belt areas. Don't let the ground be developed; it may make you a more popular council with your local people.</p>
	LPPO14	Object	<p>Development would have an adverse effect on wildlife and the local community.</p>
	LPPO16	Object	<p>Objects to Option A - field off Stanklyn Lane and Stone Hill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links between the parish of Stone and the edge of Kidderminster do not need to be made stronger. This would increase traffic and pollution. • Stone is surrounded by beautiful green land. • Land at the rear of Spennells is used by local residents daily for walking and valuable family time outside. • School classes would become larger with more difficulty in getting first choice school. <p>Building between two pools - Captains Pool and Stanklyn Pool is awful.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO17	Object	Objects to change in the status of the Green Belt at Spennells. Uses land to walk everyday and has done for the last five years. It has a beautiful outlook already ruined by Easter Park, which has been mostly vacant since it was built. Green Belt land should stay Green Belt land.
	LPPO19	Object	<p>Objects to proposed housing development plans from Spennells to Stanklyn Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be detrimental to the local community as it will put even more strain on the road network and the overall infrastructure in general. • Traffic is already very congested at many times of the day both into and out of Kidderminster on the Bromsgrove Road as well as the Worcester Road not to mention reaching out beyond onto the A449. The thought of more access to homes driving more traffic is unbelievably short sighted. Is any form of traffic monitoring is undertaken on any of these roads at peak times to assess this clearly? • Have plans considered in any way the additional strain already on the provision of education and public services in the town or can we look forward to the redevelopment of Kidderminster General Hospital? <p>This proposal has to be one of the worst this town (where I have lived all my life) council has yet proposed.</p>
	LPPO21	Object	<p>I write in connection with the planning application for houses to be built on the Green Belt site Spennells. I have looked at the plans and know the site well.</p> <p>I wish to strongly OBJECT to the development of houses and industrial units on this site.</p> <p>Infilling will ruin the character of Spennells and estate development will overwhelm an already large estate.</p> <p>The siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: it's on a Green Belt site used by myself and many hundreds of people/ residents for dog walking, running, cycling, horse riding along the Public footpaths. It would diminish the striking countryside that is on our door step. Many residents who don't drive but have dogs are in walking distance of the fields and can walk their dogs in a beautiful SAFE environment.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There is no need for this kind of development on Spennells, the estate is big enough.</p> <p>There WILL be an issue of extra traffic on the estate, residential streets will bear the brunt of the traffic influx, and this will also cause more of a safety hazard to non car drivers. As Councils are under pressure to increase public transport and reduce the number of cars on the road the proposed site will definitely increase the amount of cars on an already busy estate. There WILL be an issue with the local school - Heronswood becoming over subscribed which will in turn affect our children's education. The local shop which is a nightmare at peak times WILL be affected as more people will try and shop there which WILL cause people to shop elsewhere as the store will no longer be a convenience store and in the long run trade will plummet.</p> <p>The proposed site will NOT increase industry and jobs in the area. The Easter Park industrial site still has empty units and there are empty units on Hoo Farm industrial estate. We have enough industrial sites in the local area including Wilden Lane. There are not enough jobs for the amount of residents in Kidderminster let alone introducing another few thousand houses bringing in new residents from outside the area.</p> <p>There are still residential units being built on the Silverwoods site, surely this is enough for the town. You must consider the adverse effect it will have on preserving the existing NATURAL environment. There is a massive amount of wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area is not WASTED space but valuable OPEN space enjoyed and used by not only residents on Spennells but residents from Offmore, Comberton and surrounding areas.</p> <p>I understand that this will be noted as an OBJECTION to the building on the Green Belt land of Spennells.</p> <p>Additional August 2017:</p> <p>We have a very high obesity population and taking away the Green Belt where people can walk, jog and bike ride in a safe environment is ludicrous.</p> <p>We will have the issue of raised noise pollution, traffic pollution and the destruction of wildlife. There is proof of Skylarks, bats, badgers in the fields behind Spennells all of these animals are endangered it doesn't matter that the builders/ councils say we will accommodate them it's rubbish - the wildlife will disappear, you are destroying their</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>homes.</p> <p>Kidderminster has a fairly low crime/drug rate. Bringing outsiders from Birmingham into Kidderminster will increase the crime rate and this in turn will affect our youth living in Kidderminster.</p> <p>There is evidence that large estates have increased crime/drug levels. Doubling the size of Spennells is outrageous and will in turn put even more pressure on a struggling police force.</p> <p>Building so many houses will in turn affect our schools which are already getting over subscribed. This will put a strain on our children's future and our local children are the future.</p> <p>Doctors / hospitals will not cope and they are not coping now, I do believe that Kidderminster, Worcester and Redditch are in special measures. How are you going to cope with that?</p> <p>I do believe that a report from Michael Gove about Brexit states that we need to produce our own fruit/ vegetables. How will we do that if you take away the thriving fields that we have? The fields at the back of Spennells have been full of barley!!!</p> <p>There are no big industries left in Kidderminster therefore jobs are hard to find, if you bring more people in to the town this will affect our growing youth as the outsiders will try and take the few jobs that there is.</p> <p>You talk about Birmingham residents commuting, I from experience can tell you now that this will not last, they will get fed up with travelling and they will want our jobs.</p> <p>Has the M.O.D site at Summerfield been approached - surely there is an exclusion zone there?</p> <p>Attempts to attract retailers to Kidderminster have failed in the past. We need to spend the money on regenerating the town first. For example the old Littlewoods site, Woolworths the Glades and many more empty buildings need</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>regenerating first.</p> <p>The consultation is flawed no evidence.</p> <p>Bringing H.G.VS near to houses is a danger. Health and safety issues - noise pollution, air pollution.</p> <p>I would like to know why there has been no consultation for Blakedown, Chaddesley or Wolverley.</p> <p>I totally object to both options A and B but prefer option B. Spennells fields should not be built on.</p> <p>I use the fields on Spennells everyday to exercise and walk my dog. It is a safe area for my children to walk, bike ride and get fresh air without having to bike ride on the already busy Spennells estate. I can let my children go out on to the fields knowing they are safe, you take this away you are taking away their freedom.</p> <p>Why are you getting rid of this beautiful Green Belt.</p>
	<p>LPPO22</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I oppose and reject the proposed plans you have outlined to use Green Belt land at the rear of Spennells and Stanklyn to build a further 1700 residential homes.</p> <p>My reasons for this rejection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spennells is built up, and at peak times suffers traffic congestion, almost doubling the size of the estate will create chaos at peak times as the current layout of roads within Spennells will not be changed. A through road will not change the roads that are already congested on a daily basis. Adding to this it will create further congestion and increase air pollution as the amount of green space and trees would have been destroyed. 2. Area is enjoyed by walkers, exercisers, birdwatchers & nature photographers. The area attracts a wide variety of species and wildlife; Rare birds may nest within the area too. Destroying this Green Belt space will have a devastating affect on the community and the natural wildlife. We will never get this wildlife back once it is destroyed.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>3. Green Belt land is in place to stop urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with. Look at using disused derelict buildings like those in park lane (by Matalan), old indoor market, old Woolworths and crown house. These are ripe for regeneration for low cost housing and should be regenerated before destroying Green Belt land.</p> <p>4. I cannot see justification in placing such a large proportion of the new homes required in this area alone and on this Green Belt land. Option B, is more evenly distributed throughout Kidderminster.</p> <p>Think of more than just cost. Think of impact on the environment, existing communities, natural habitats and infrastructures.</p> <p>5. Adding this number of houses in one area will put huge pressures on already overly subscribed services like local schools, Doctors, and hospitals. How will this be addressed if we are adding 1700 new homes in this one area alone?</p> <p>6. We don't seem to be able to fix pot holes properly as the funding is not available, clearly, more homes will equal more cars, more pot holes, pollution and congestion! Kidderminster is congested enough as it is, one through road will not solve this, destroying out Green Belt will not solve this.</p> <p>7. Look at all the empty derelict buildings first, regenerate buildings that are empty and vandalised, do not destroy what bits of beauty we have in this town left to enjoy. You have other options.</p>
	LPPO24	Object	Objects to development at Spennells/Stanklyn Lane:
	LPPO32	Object	Objects to the building development plans over the fields near Stanklyn Lane and Spennells. Fields are used by many dog walkers and people who just want to go out and enjoy the scenery or go on bike rides. Please listen to these objections and do not go ahead with these plans.
	LPPO33	Object	Objects to any planning for housing on Green Belt land at Spennells. Despite the road improvements on Worcester Road there are still extensive traffic jams at peak times, pressure would be placed on School services, and land valuable for drainage would be lost.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			There is no sensible place to build a road to exit the new development.
	LPPO34	Object	<p>Objects to development on land to rear of Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should be protected from development until all other possible sites available have been exhausted. • There would be a detrimental effect on wildlife. • It is a much valued site for local residents who use the footpath for exercise and socialising- much research has shown the positive impact of green open spaces and clean air in terms of physical and mental health and wellbeing. • Poor access at Turnstone Road - already has to accommodate road traffic from around 150 dwellings. Adding another 100 houses would potentially increase the amount of traffic by another 75% causing additional congestion, air and noise pollution. Would also impact on the already congested two roads in/out of the estate. • Concerns re new drainage for storm and sewerage. The field currently acts as a valuable soak away. Replacing this with large areas of hard standing will potentially cause serious problems with regard to flooding for homes adjacent to the area. Also concerned about increase in the amount of light pollution. • Development raises serious questions with regard to local infrastructure and services- schools and nursery provision, healthcare, and leisure services.
	LPPO41	Object	Objects to development at Spennells. The field is good agricultural land. Also used regularly by walkers, joggers, horse riders and child cyclists. Field is also home to wildlife. Use brownfield sites and derelict buildings rather than taking away countryside and agricultural land.
	LPPO42	Object	<p>Concerned about development at Spennells for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of buffer to Easter Park • Effects on wildlife if habitat removed • Field is used for leisure by residents - walking • Development proposed will double the size of the estate

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spennells is a community with a sustainable mix of housing types and the residents are entitled to their share of green land • Infrastructure would be necessary as existing facilities could not cope • It would be better to create a smaller sub estate on the opposite side of Stanklyn Lane <p>Smaller developments around the town of Kidderminster would share the load. This proposal is too much and too radical a change of use of farming land to be justified.</p>
	LPPO46	Object	<p>Object to the development at Spennells. Already enough houses in this area - infrastructure cannot cope. Leisure Centre is not easily accessible and the fields are used for valuable exercise and wellbeing.</p> <p>Once the Green Belt is taken it is gone forever. We are losing more and more farm land - the fields are used for farming purposes and are good quality land.</p> <p>There is a static population - the housing planned far outweighs the need.</p> <p>Land being 'banked' by developers should be used along with empty buildings.</p>
	LPPO52	Object	<p>It is not beneficial to build the majority of all the housing needed in one place, it will put too big a burden on our resources, we already have to get two buses to get to the leisure centre which was put out of town in the other direction, you then closed down the leisure centres in Stourport, now we have a big problem with parking and crowdedness at the new centre, AND YOU WANT TO ADD ANOTHER 5000 PEOPLE TO THIS EQUATION!! in your local review document you have stated that we are facing a health problem with 27.7 % of the adult population being obese and a massive 35.7% of under 6 year olds being obese, we have come in at practically the worse levels in England, and you want to take away the open spaces that these people use and replace with paths</p> <p>I see that Wyre Forest comes in the bottom 10 of the worst councils that land grab Green Belt according to the Campaign to Protect Rural England.</p> <p>Spennells is a really nice place to live and that is BECAUSE it is surrounded by fields and green spaces, I use the fields</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>for my general health and mental well being to take this away from me and everyone else will have a huge detrimental effect on the community.</p> <p>The only people benefiting are the developers and the council as I note that you are getting a £9000 per unit incentive to build from central government.</p> <p>Our local NHS is failing before adding another 5000 people to the area Not to mention diminishing ambulance cover; It is already difficult to get an appointment with your GP now.</p> <p>It has been proved that adding new roads actually does not alter traffic flow and any new road will congest just the same, new by-roads just start to feed off it and then we are living in a spaghetti junction road network.</p> <p>Fast forward 50 years..... All new residents now elderly..... How do we support their ever increasing needs on top of the increasing aging population generally! And that's before we even consider the impact on drainage, resources and local wildlife. What about OUR quality of life!!!</p> <p>The new "affordable housing" will bring in a huge housing benefit bill for you in the future as rented houses attract this element of society.</p> <p>I was under the impression that Wyre Forest has signed up to a carbon emissions programme? This huge development goes way beyond any health foot print we should be trying to make! More cars more fumes. I suffer with asthma so what is the air quality going to be like on Spennells with the MASSIVE build you intend to push on to us ? Does MY quality of life mean nothing?</p>
	LPPO3503	Object	I have grave concerns about the potential loss of Green Belt land behind Spennells estate. There is a lack of infrastructure to cope with the increased population. Corn buntings, a protected species, nest in the fields adjacent to Stanklyn Lane.
	LPPO55	Object	Objects to development at Spennells. Brownfield sites should be used and empty / derelict buildings.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Reasons for opposing Spennells: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much traffic congestion already • Traffic will cause air pollution • Noise pollution • Wildlife will be affected
	LPPO57	Object	I wish to register my strong opposition to using Green Belt land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane for new housing.
	LPPO58	Object	<p>I am writing to fervently oppose option A. My reasons for doing so are as follows;</p> <p>As a resident of Spennells I am aware just how much recreational use the fields provide; joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, bird watchers, cyclists, photographers, elderly people who enjoy the company of people walking there and I feel that the fields have been vital for me to exercise daily. During my time walking the fields I have met an elderly gentleman with an oxygen tank and a woman recovering from a heart attack who uses the field to ease herself back into exercise. I want my child to appreciate how food is grown and be able to go for a walk without the need of a car. If option A goes ahead the South side of Kidderminster will be hit unnecessarily hard it is for this reason I think Option B is preferable.</p> <p>I fail to see how the local infrastructure can sustain the amount of houses proposed! The closure of Glades Leisure centre and a smaller Leisure centre out of the town centre is evidence enough that the town fails to accommodate the existing residents let alone any additional people! Lack of jobs means that new residents of Kidderminster will be commuting to work which not only increases emissions; it fails to boost the local economy. Kidderminster hospital cannot accommodate a birthing suite - with residents of Kidderminster having to travel to Worcester to give birth. Unless plans to re-extend the hospital are in the pipeline I do not see how Kidderminster can sustain any more housing!</p> <p>In order to meet housing targets I appreciate housing needs to be built, I feel that there are plenty of brownfield</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>sites that could be used in preference - for instance in the centre of town! I appreciate this is more costly to the local council but we really do have to protect the Green Belt at all cost, with rising obesity levels, reduction in emissions and reduction in food miles being the governments prerogative I don't see how you can justify building on green and with so many brownfield sites available.</p> <p>In conclusion, I appreciate the local council have targets they need to meet and costs to keep down but this is grade 2 agricultural land, the best quality land Wyre Forest has to offer, the fields are a recreational resource are invaluable means that I strongly oppose option A.</p>
	LPPO60	Object	<p>One of the main reasons we moved to Spennells was due to its beautiful countryside surroundings, as well as the town being close by. We were absolutely horrified when we heard the plans may be brought forward to build houses on the GREEN BELT land directly behind the Spennells which lies at the end of Turnstone and Imber road and other surrounding fields. Not to mention the by-pass!!</p> <p>Spinals, with 2000 homes, is already a very large estate, with only two exits onto Spinals Valley Road, more houses on the beautiful Green Belt fields will put more pressure on our already full schools and nurseries, this will have a major impact on class sizes and our children's education.</p> <p>Extra buses and traffic will cause a safety issue for children in the area; parents are encouraged to let their children play out, how can they when they know their child could be in danger by the ever increasing traffic!!</p> <p>It can already take 30 - 40 mins to leave the estate some mornings, as only two exits onto Spennells Valley Road. Extra traffic and congestion would have a massive impact on everyone; working people would move away and make the area less desirable.</p> <p>The impact on the drainage as the fields are a valuable soak away. Our hospitals are also at breaking point, unable to provide the care for needed.</p> <p>Valuable agricultural land that would be taken away, destroying the beautiful landscape, but most importantly our local wildlife habitats will be destroyed as well... badger sets, skylarks and bats and many more animals live on these</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>fields, what will happen to these animals?</p> <p>I understood that WFDC cared about the Green Belt country side, if you are prepared to rip up our Green Belt, then you have no feelings for the wildlife, people’s welfare, health or feelings.</p> <p>The impact would be unforgivable considering there are other areas in Kidderminster which are not Green Belt, which houses could be built on.</p> <p>Many people use the fields, walk their dogs, social interaction and for exercise. We should encourage people to be living this kind of life style, bearing in mind loneliness; depression/anxiety and obesity are on the increase in Great Britain. What about the increase of air pollution, due to so many houses being built in one area.</p> <p>If I have to choose an option for the proposal, then please choose option B, please do not destroy our areas of natural beauty that our neighbours and residents love so much.</p>
	<p>LPPO62</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the possible removal of Green Belt status to land at the back of Spennells Estate.</p> <p>The fields are a well used community asset with walkers, dog walkers and cyclists, an amenity which can only be a benefit for physical and mental health of all who use it. That includes families, people of all generations and people of varying physical ability.</p> <p>These fields also provide an easily accessible opportunity to get an appreciative sense of nature and wild life. A fantastic amenity particularly for children. From being able to watch the crops grow from seed, to seeing a vast variety of wild flowers, birds, butterflies and insects.</p> <p>Access to Spennells is already at certain times very congested. There is no other viable access to those fields so the congestion and therefore pollution would increase.</p> <p>As I understand it there are options to develop ONLY next to Spennells, or to spread the developments across</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Kidderminster. I urge you NOT to remove such a valuable amenity that is close to so many people, and spread the new housing across the town.
	LPPO63	Object	<p>I would hereby like to register my objections to the above proposed plans. There are numerous reasons why I wish to object.</p> <p>1 The area already lost a lot of wild life habitat in the building of the present Spennells Est. Trees destroyed that were supposed to be protected, replaced by new trees but which take years to mature if they can survive the vandalism. Going ahead with this plan will mean a loss of a lot more wild life including wild flowers which support insects, that support the numerous wild birds that currently nest in the area plus all the birds that regularly visit in the summer. From common Sparrows, Crows and Blackbirds to skylark, pheasant, partridge, flocks of what I am told are corn bunting. Currently there are lots of Swifts/Sand Martins or similar catching insects on the wing. We hear the Cuckoo and every Spring and Autumn the Geese collect to feed on seeds. A Buzzard too. There is a Badger Set, and we have watched a Vixen playing with her litter of cubs. Plus other creatures that live underground like rabbits, voles, field mice and moles. All part of the wild life food chain.</p> <p>2 Then there is the infrastructure.</p> <p>Spennells School which is already struggling to cope with the numbers after closure of several schools. King Charles 1 School which also struggles to cope with the numbers.</p> <p>Hospital which can barely cope with the current number of patients.</p> <p>Doctors which we already have to wait up to a fortnight to see.</p> <p>Roads. Traffic queues off both ways out of Spennells, the Worcester Road, Bromsgrove Road, Wilden Lane. All made even worse by the new Stourport bypass which will be even worse still once all the properties are occupied on the Sugar Beet Site.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Neither Stanklyn Lane nor the Spennells Est. roads are fit to cope with the heavy building site traffic.</p> <p>Bus Service - what can I say?</p> <p>Why take farm land when there are so many derelict and unused places?</p> <p>Where are all these people going to work? The biggest employers, Carpets, Sugar Beet, Cattle Market, Sealine, Ceramaspeed, everything Kidderminster was famous for all gone. I suspect most will have to travel elsewhere to work. More traffic and pollution and longer queues.</p>
	LPPO65	Object	<p>Please register my objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposal for such a huge development will be detrimental to the locality, in terms of loss of Green Belt land, subsequent loss of wildlife habitat and a valuable outdoor amenity to local people.</p> <p>It will create an increase in traffic and pollution, on already congested and damaged roads. It will put further strain on local schools, and especially on local hospitals, already in special measures, and struggling to cope with the present population.</p>
	LPPO67	Object	<p>I wish to express in the strongest possible terms my objections to the proposed/ requested development of the Green Belt land stretching between the A449 and A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an area of significant designated RSPB importance with an abundance of species infrequent elsewhere, including a healthy population of Bramblings and Skylarks, which are rapidly depleting nationwide, and a number of birds of prey. The development will also impact on the wildfowl population on Captain’s Pool which currently includes Kingfisher, Grebe, Heron, Wild Swans and more • These fields also boast a diverse population of mammals including Monk jack deer, badgers, stoats, voles, shrews and wood mice • The area is used to the full by dog walkers, ramblers and lovers of wildlife and birds. It is an area providing physical and mental well being for many people and wildlife alike

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many other Brownfield sites in the Kidderminster/ Stourport area that could be developed instead • To develop for the few would be to deprive the many of this beautiful, precious English countryside. <p>Please DO NOT allow this to go ahead and deprive humans and animals alike of this precious and irreplaceable environment.</p>
	<p>LPPO68</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I formally object to the proposal to build on Green Belt land on the southern edge of Spennells or on any of the Green Belt land in Kidderminster.</p> <p>I moved to Kidderminster purely to live close to fields only to find they might be taken away. By walking my dogs in the fields I now have many friends.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I use the Green Belt areas for regular exercise for me and my dogs - morning and evening around work. This greatly aids my mental health and well being. Where would I be able to walk and exercise two border collies safely if you took this land away? I do not have room in my car for them both and surely we should not be encouraging more people to use cars to drive to places to exercise - this defeats the object of reducing pollution etc? Where would all the Spennells residents drive their dogs and children to do this??? The nature reserve isn't big enough. 2. I often see families and children alone exercising in the Spennells Green Belt area. Taking this away would mean that they would remain indoors. It is fantastic to see groups of children cycling and exploring around the fields - a safe environment. Please do not take this away from them. 3. There are bats and this needs to be explored as they are a protected species - before any decisions are made. http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/planning.html. Residents will need to see evidence that the surveys have taken place. I often walk at night and there are many bats. 4. There are skylarks, yellowhammers and linnets and other red listed birds in the fields. The RSPB certainly need to be consulted in the development plans due to the high number of skylarks in the fields at the moment and the impact on them.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>5. Have the butterfly conservation been informed as http://butterfly-conservation.org/3263-8480/walking-with-butterflies-in-the-wyre.html "A three year project funded by the SITA Trust to reconnect the Wyre has successfully restored areas of coppice to provide habitat for the nationally scarce Pearl-bordered Fritillary butterfly. It has also improved connectivity across the Forest to increase the chances of butterflies and moths colonising new areas in the future." Species have been seen in the fields in the Spennells and this needs to be researched before any decisions are reached. Residents will need to see evidence that the necessary surveys have taken place as species have obviously made their way from the Forest to the Nature Reserve/Spennells.</p> <p>6. There are areas in Kidderminster town centre that are not Green Belt that you could build on notably right near to the train station which would appease everybody. A far more suitable area for new build.</p> <p>If all of these factors are ignored I will certainly be taking these protests to a higher level.</p>
	LPPO69	Object	I would like to file my objection to the Housing development on the back of Spennells. There's so much nature that will be destroyed. The development will have a massive impact on the environment
	LPPO70	Object	I object to the planning of a new housing estate in the fields at the back of the Spennells estate in Kidderminster We have lived on Spennells for 21 years and love the views and enjoy the natural walks the fields offer the estate We strongly object to the plans and would expect to be in the majority I hope the strong feelings felt by all that reside on the estate put a stop to plans that would destroy the obvious benefits the fields have provided residents for many years
	LPPO72	Object	<p>I must fervently object to the council's proposal to build new homes on the Green Belt land to the south of Spennells.</p> <p>The area is naturally beautiful and used by hundreds of people including myself each day as a perfect and safe area to walk our dogs. Destroying this area will damage local habitat and increase noise and pollution.</p> <p>Please do not build on this land!</p>
	LPPO73	Object	Proposed option A building of housing on Green Belt land adjacent to Spennells, I believe would be a disaster for the

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>local community and wildlife.</p> <p>Firstly, the Green Belt land in question produces a variety of good, healthy crops year after year.</p> <p>Secondly, many residents and Kidderminster people use the fields for leisure activities including walking, running and cycling and gives children especially an education of the countryside in different seasons.</p> <p>Thirdly, the impact on wildlife would be terrible as many birds currently nest and feed in the area and would therefore vanish from our skies and gardens forever.</p> <p>I am therefore totally opposed to this option and believe various run down land areas and brown field sites should be built upon as a priority.</p>
	<p>LPPO74</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I have reviewed the draft plan and wish to lodge my objection in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>A brief overview of my objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development will rob residents of the fields and open space which the local community currently enjoy to walk, jog, cycle, dog walk etc and would have detrimental effect to the general health and wellbeing of the community. • This proposal is damaging to the environment • The area doesn't have the infrastructure to support such a development and will lead to traffic congestion and pollution on our already congested roads. • Given the alternative options currently available in the town centre which would reduce traffic/pollution, these other options should be pursued. • This development will put unnecessary pressures on the schools, hospitals, and other facilities which are already under pressure. • The loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl will threaten existing public Rights of Way

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will cause destruction of the wildlife habitat of the area. <p>Please confirm my objections have been lodged with the appropriate body and will be taken into consideration.</p>
	LPPO75	Object	Objects to development on Green Belt at Spennells. The land is used by residents for safe recreational walking. The roads around the estate are congested both in the early morning and in the evening without adding more traffic.
	LPPO76	Object	<p>I oppose the proposed development of Green Belt land on Spennells fields near Stanklyn lane. Any proposals to build on the land would have a detrimental affect on the local area.</p> <p>The roads around Stanklyn lane and Spennells are already congested and unable to cope with the current amount of traffic. Further housing would exacerbate the problem, adding more pressure to Stanklyn lane and its two major junctions. These are already hazardous to turn left from and pose more danger with busier roads.</p> <p>The fields are a valuable asset to the local area with much wildlife living there. There are currently skylarks, linnets and other red-created birds nesting in the vegetations.</p> <p>The fields are a good flood plain for soaking away surface water. In heavy rain our drive and road can flood and this would be made worse by the removal of the field. Local residents use them for walking and dog exercise. They are vital for community spirit. Green Belt is much valued especially around a busy town such as Kidderminster and its housing estate. Loss of Green Belt status protects our countryside from urban sprawl.</p> <p>Local schools are already over subscribed; additional residents would put more pressure on these local services, and increasing pressure on our hospitals, doctors, dentists etc. The bridge at the top end of Stanklyn lane is very narrow and there have already been accidents there. It would not be suitable for HGV vehicles and extra traffic adding more danger to the situation.</p> <p>Stanklyn lane is only 30 mph at the end on which we live and yet we get cars already using it as a cut through to avoid gridlocked roads of the a449 and stone hill. They must be travelling at over 60mph causing a danger to residents as the try to get off drives, cross the road etc. Adding more traffic again would aggregate this problem.</p> <p>There is no need for more housing in the Stanklyn lane area. There are lots of local affordable housing that remains unsold.</p> <p>The fields are currently farmed and well Used. Why use good quality, productive agricultural land? Why use another area of Green Belt when it is unnecessary. Housing would totally spoil the character of the local area and feel of Stanklyn lane. People from all over Kidderminster use these fields to walk dogs, ride and let their children play safely. Please don't remove them.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Please note my objections and do not allow the building of 1,735 new homes of option A of the plan. Instead they could be placed more in the town centre thus reducing commuting and pollution. We urge the government to build on the brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.
	LPPO77	Object	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed development of Green Belt land on Spennells. Any proposals to build on the land would have a detrimental affect on the local area.</p> <p>The roads around Stanklyn lane and Spennells are already congested and unable to cope with the current amount of traffic. Further housing would only exasperate the problem, adding more pressure to Stanklyn lane and its two major junctions. These are already hazardous to turn left from and pose more danger with busier roads.</p> <p>The fields are a valuable asset to the local area with much wildlife living there. There are currently skylarks, linnets and other red-created birds nesting in the vegetations.</p> <p>The fields are also a good flood plain for soaking away surface water. In heavy rain our drive and road can flood and this would be made worse by the removal of the field. Local residents use them for walking and dog exercise. They are vital for community spirit. Green Belt is much valued especially around a busy town such as Kidderminster and its housing estate. Loss of Green Belt status protects our countryside from urban sprawl.</p> <p>Local schools are already over subscribed; additional residents would put more pressure on these local services and increasing pressures on hospitals, doctors, dentists etc.</p> <p>The bridge at the top end of Stanklyn lane is very narrow and there have already been accidents there. It would not be suitable for HGV vehicles and extra traffic adding more danger to the situation.</p> <p>Stanklyn lane is only 30 mph at one end and yet we get cars already using it as a cut through to avoid gridlocked roads of the A449 Stone hill. They must be travelling at over 60mph causing a danger to residents as the try to get off drives, cross the road etc. Adding more traffic again would aggravate this problem.</p> <p>There is no need for more housing in the Stanklyn lane area. There are lots of local affordable housing that remain unsold.</p> <p>The fields are currently farmed and well used. Why use good quality, productive agricultural land? Why use Green Belt when it is unnecessary. Housing would totally spoil the character of the local area and feel of Stanklyn lane. People travel from all over Kidderminster to these fields to walk dogs, ride and let their children play safely. Please</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>don't remove them.</p> <p>Please note my objections and do not allow the building of 1,735 new homes of option A of the plan. Instead they could be placed more in the town centre thus reducing commuting and pollution. We urge the government to build on the brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.</p>
	<p>LPPO78</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object strongly to any further enlargement of Spennells area for further housing for the following reasons:</p> <p>The new road from Stourport Road has caused severe traffic problems at busy times of the day! It has caused even more traffic along Spennells Valley Road and it is almost impossible to get off Spennells Estate in the morning, with people going to work and children being dropped off at school. Sometimes the jam is right back along Heronswood Road as far as the school! There is going to be a bad accident there one day as people take chances to turn right at the T Junction. A set of traffic lights is badly needed here.</p> <p>Secondly, this new road has badly affected the main road from Worcester and also Wilden Lane. Up to four mile traffic jams of an evening can be as far back as Ombersley trying to get round the island at Hoobrook. Further traffic from building more houses off this road will make the situation even worse. This increased traffic will result in even more higher emissions of exhaust fumes from stationary vehicles with resulting increased risk to health.</p> <p>This Green Belt land is greatly valued by local residents and lots of people use this land for walking, jogging, cycling and dog walking. It is a safe environment to walk children without having to cross any roads and is also a haven for local wildlife.</p> <p>This would also put a strain on our local schools that already seem to be underfunded and always asking parents for money. The classroom sizes are already big enough.</p> <p>There are lots of green spaces around Kidderminster where the building of new homes would not be detrimental to present residents. In particular, Lee Castle is a vast green space crying out for something to be done with it. It would require no new road layouts. There is already a road onto this development and easy access via traffic lights onto the main Wolverhampton Road and Stourbridge Road. There is also lots of space around this area for further expansion if needed for a new school, local shops, etc. This side of Kidderminster does not have the same traffic</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>problems as the Worcester/Bromsgrove side.</p> <p>Further housing could be distributed on brownfield sites within Kidderminster that would enable run down areas to be spruced up. The Horsefair particularly springs to mind. This area is a terrible eyesore and an embarrassment. It needs to be flattened and could be used for further housing. The present shops should be encouraged to move to the many empty units in the town centre.</p> <p>Spread housing evenly around the area, taking traffic and the local environment into consideration. Don't bring one particular area to its knees!</p>
	LPPO79	Object	I object to the development of the whole area of Option A. The wildlife will lose their habitat and there will be a negative impact on local schools and roads. Please reconsider this proposal.
	LPPO80	Object	Object to development at Spennells. The fields are used by many for safe recreational walking, jogging and dog walking. Development would mean detrimental effect on wildlife and loss of agricultural farmland. Development should be on brownfield sites not Green Belt.
	LPPO82	Object	<p>There needs to be massive consideration given to the detrimental impact upon the local area that the proposed development of Spennells Field would have.</p> <p>Currently, Spennells is a great place to live, with just the right level of amenities. More homes would stretch these facilities! The car park facilities around Tesco express etc are often full, but manageable. More residents will see this overflow - something that we often experience when the school is used as a polling station... cars overhanging junctions, parked in the bus stop, parked on the main road and most importantly making it difficult for adults and children to cross the road safely.</p> <p>Currently, we have good schools which are full. Where will the new residents sent their children? THERE ARE NOT SURPLUS PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES IN THE AREA! The government cannot afford to build a new school. Equally, no school can afford to expand on its own. Secondary schools will fill locally, not least as Hagley has experienced huge developments too. The Hagley developments will see school children from Kidderminster no longer able to get places at this school.</p> <p>The local roads... where do I start! Access in to Kidderminster is a joke! I queue every evening to get home from work. I often travel excess miles to avoid Mustow Green island or the dreaded A449. This adds to my carbon</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>footprint and given the extra cars that the additional houses will bring will further be detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>Concern for the mental health of locals. I am not sure I'm prepared to put up with the impact of such development on my own doorstep. Disruption and noise whilst the development is completed and then the loss of recreational land.</p> <p>I really do urge you to re-consider this poor proposal!</p>
	LPPO83	Object	<p>May I lodge my objection to the proposed plans to build on the southern side of Spennells although I agree Kidderminster has to expand, as do all UK towns, this development as a whole seems far too ambitious and I hope a more modest proposal can be put forward.</p> <p>The fields bring a lot of enjoyment to the community and to lose them all in one go would be huge loss not to mention the environmental impact.</p> <p>We hope you come to the right conclusion, many thanks for your time.</p>
	LPPO84	Object	<p>As a resident of Spennells I wish to object against further expansion of the estate.</p>
	LPPO85	Object	<p>This is a formal objection to the proposed development to the Green Belt area bordering the existing Spennells Valley housing estate part of option A.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the impact upon existing local amenities servicing this area, including schools and retail facilities as well as residents.</p> <p>Spennells is serviced locally by one primary school and a small complex of convenience outlets. Additional properties will add to the amount of traffic entering the centre of an already busy estate increasing the amount of vehicles and therefore pollution (impacting upon health of local residents) and congestion through the existing estate as well as the demands placed upon valuable services such as schooling. I would be grateful if you would clarify the local authority's stance on children being able to walk to school and whether if insufficient provision of local education facility within realistic walking distance from a family home sits in line with the local authority's core values and</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>principles.</p> <p>I note reference to an additional access point to the proposed development area. I believe that as a desk exercise this would satisfy current legislative requirements, however, I believe in reality that at peak traffic commute times the existing infrastructure of the Spennells Estate would be used as a 'rat run' for commuters wanting a short cut from the Worcester side of Kidderminster looking to access the town centre or Birmingham trunk roads. An expectation that commuters will happily sit in traffic at peak times and not be tempted to cut through a 'quiet' estate is completely unrealistic.</p> <p>This area is a well used and valuable, green natural recreational space which is well used by many local residents including myself and my family in an otherwise urban environment.</p> <p>I am disappointed by the local authorities approach to provision of homes which appears to be to take the easy option of building on valuable green space rather than utilising existing sites of brownfield and ex-commercial premises in order to meet the demand. I would formally request a detailed housing need analysis for the Spennells Valley estate area.</p> <p>I note that the more affluent Stanklyn Lane is proposed to be somewhat distanced and shielded from the proposed development area. I feel this purely creates a further divide between a relatively close lying community and certainly does not promote an ethos of building coherent and sustainable communities.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply to the above raised points.</p>
	LPPO86	Object	Strongly opposes the development of these fields at Spennells
	LPPO87	Object	<p>We would like to protest in the strongest possible terms against the proposed development along the southern edges of Spennells.</p> <p>We object for many reasons , the main one being that there are many brown sites currently available including unused school sites such and Sion Hill and Sladen as well as many unused industrial sites . The proposed</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>development would mean loss of amenity, loss of farmland and the loss of valuable habitats for many creatures including endangered bird species. Local infrastructure would be unable to support such a development creating additional pressure on roads, schools and medical services which are already struggling to cope. Green Belt was created to prevent all these problems - what is the point of having it if it can be disregarded in such a cavalier fashion -it would be much more sensible to look for other sites already within the urban zone first.</p>
	<p>LPPO88</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I am responding to your proposal to expand Spennells Green Belt land in Kidderminster to build 1735 homes and I understand that Persimmon Homes have already purchased the land.</p> <p>I think it is vital that we have new homes in Kidderminster, especially homes that are affordable for young people like my own children. My objection to the proposed Green Belt solution is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kidderminster is already infamous for closed shops and buildings that are eyesores. Much of the old town would benefit from regeneration it seems a waste of naturally beautiful land that surrounds Kidderminster to be used up unnecessarily. Demolished Leisure centre land, old Woolworths, Crown House and many streets that are abandoned and would make excellent modern housing. This is a common dilemma that is easy to solve - regeneration not Green Belt destruction. <p>Other reasons that are pertinent in just this case are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double the traffic at already key bottle neck points by Homebase and junctions off Stanklyn Lane. • Impact on wildlife and widely used public paths and rights of way. • Safety of young children on an already busy estate. • Spaces in schools. • Drainage to existing and new homes. • Local service provision like Kidderminster Hospital. • Loss of productive land. <p>I do hope that this not already a "done deal" and you will genuinely consult and review.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO89	Object	<p>I strongly protest against the expansion in the fields adjacent to Spennells estate.</p> <p>The new bypass road is under used, no real definition between Kidderminster and Stourport. Housing next to the sports centre will make this even worse. I do not want to see the same between Stone and Kidderminster. No need for a bypass from the Worcester road. New road is currently used as a bypass and is not busy even in peak time. Traffic needing to bypass to Stourbridge already goes through Mustow Green, they will not travel nearer to Worcester to use the bypass. Introduction of a bypass will increase air pollution.</p> <p>Council do a very poor job of maintaining the common areas of common land within Spennells. The council seems intent of culturing nettles and even Japanese Knotweed on the estate, with the traffic pollution the air quality here is be significantly reduced.</p> <p>Derelict factory buildings in the town near Morrison’s, near Matalan and Sion Hill School to name a few are embarrassing. The old post office is an eyesore and should be redeveloped.</p> <p>Affect the recession of 2008 the towns of Welshpool and Stafford were hit hard losing industry and started to decline similar to Kidderminster is now. Welshpool seems to have done little and the town is dead. Stafford invested and is a thriving cosmopolitan town busy even on a Sunday with Cafes and coffee shops spilling onto the streets. If you do not invest in the town, it will continue to die.</p> <p>No investment in industry and no jobs will see an increased rise in unemployment. No one will want to come and live in your new houses. People with jobs will leave. Invest in the town, and its jobs.</p> <p>Worry about housing if the population increase does arise and please cut down all the nettles on Spennells.</p>
	LPPO90	Object	<p>I object to option A of your new local plan review.</p> <p>I am 25 years of age and therefore the” next generation”! This is my heritage you are destroying! I very much still enjoy going into the country side which is on my doorstep at present and is GREEN BELT! I need this for my well</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>being and good mental health, being hemmed in the middle of a giant housing estate will depress me.</p> <p>MANY different animals and birds thrive on this piece of land, with evidence of otters on the fields by Captain’s pool, we have three nesting sites for bats in the trees surrounding the fields and also there are many red listed birds such as skylarks, linnets and corn-bunting nesting and feeding on these fields.</p> <p>With the future of fossil fuel uncertain I believe that there will come a time when importing food and travel abroad will become extremely expensive, After all, at current rates of production, oil will run out in 53 years, natural gas in 54, and coal in 110. Getting rid of fields that are used year in and out to grow crops in is nothing short of stupid! There will come a time in England when we will need these fields to grow food for our population , you only have to cast your mind back to the 1940s when people had to use their back gardens and parks to grow food.</p> <p>To put the WHOLE of the build on one side of town is in my opinion unworkable, you are going to put for too much pressure on the schools and the road systems already in place, a relief road will not take away the congestion in traffic on the smaller roads around Spennells, nearly doubling the amount of houses here will cause chaos! With each house comes at least two cars, it doesn’t take a genius to realise how bad the pollution and congestion will be, and all in one area!!</p> <p>To get an appointment with our doctors at present is a nightmare, 1735 houses in one area will push this to extremes.</p> <p>I am aware that a large building company has already purchased one of the fields, how did they know that this was coming! I am aware many people around Spennells have already objected and I hope this will have an impact upon your proposals. Everyone I speak to does not want this build to happen, the very reason the people live on the Spennells estate is that we are not joined to Kidderminster and enjoy the openness of the area.</p>
	LPPO91	Object	<p>Object to the plan of building on the fields. Children walk here & take the dogs. They love the nature what a shame to take that all away from them. You encourage parents to get our kids out into the countryside & now you’re taking that away from them.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO92	Object	<p>Proposed development in Green Belt around Stanklyn Lane and Spennells would destroy the only spot in Kidderminster where Green Belt is available for leisure, exercise, dog walking etc. This is also one of the rare places nowadays where that amenity is available to all via a walk, not by car. What is wrong with brown sites (eyesores) within the Kidderminster area that no longer serve any useful purpose as the employers have now gone. What also of Lea Castle site! What about sites of Schools that you have already shut down. As soon as you start releasing Green Belt, where do you stop, do you want to live in a Brierley Hill lookalike? Where are these people are supposed to work, or visit the dentist, doctor, Hospital (already deemed to be totally inadequate in official survey) Where will the kids go to school, presumably far enough away to bring hundreds more cars on to the already crowded roads around the town, more POLLUTION to live with.</p>
	LPPO93	Object	<p>We moved to Spennells specifically for the enjoyment of the surrounding open spaces, green fields, wild life and tranquillity.</p> <p>We are very concerned to learn of the proposed development / Local Plan Review which is currently out for consultation.</p> <p>We are, in principle, opposed to both Options A and B, but in our opinion Option B would be the preferred option.</p> <p>We summarise below our reasons for this preference and general concerns about the prospect of housing development in Wyre Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current trends indicate that there is little chance of employment development in Kidderminster itself or the surrounding environs. Many jobs are due for imminent loss in the carpet industry and retail opportunities diminish daily with the closures of shops and retail outlets. • This will almost inevitably result in Kidderminster becoming a commuter town. At the moment, most people who live in the town work fairly locally, unlike those in Bromsgrove, Worcester and other significant towns. • The implications for traffic movement are enormous. One has only to see the queues of traffic at Mustow Green to envisage the consequences of additional commuting. Other major routes and junctions are also hideously congested. Measures to improve the infrastructure of roads and traffic flow seem akin to moving the deckchairs on the Titanic - for example, the junction of the new road from Worcester Road through to Stourport Road is controlled by traffic lights. These result in queues back across the island at Hoobrook which cause all manner of problems.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is arguable whether people who commute to work invest a real commitment to the community of a town. Redditch is a soul-less collection of houses; Bromsgrove is rapidly following with the latest overdevelopment. Kidderminster is still quite a busy, thriving town for shopping and there is a real sense of community among its residents. • I am a former Head teacher and I am painfully aware of the impact of the influx of people on the stability and success of schools. Schools become overcrowded and oversubscribed. Schools serving new build areas - even new ones - bear the brunt of mobility and funding issues. • Health provision in the area is currently precarious with the Worcestershire Trust in Special Measures and having an uncertain future. Primary care is of a high quality compared with other areas, but is struggling to maintain its service with the shortage of GPs and the increasing demands. <p>We hope that the above will be taken into serious consideration. This project is not solely about housing. It is about the quality of life, health, well being and education of the current and future residents of Wyre Forest.</p>
	LPPO94	Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the Spennells Expansion plans on the ground that the new development lead to the loss of Green Belt which protects our countryside and have significant consequences on the wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Alternatively, the council can build on the Brownfield sites within Kidderminster.</p>
	LPPO96	Object	<p>The main reason we moved to Kidderminster was the location of the Spennells estate a "rural" setting in a town surrounded by open countryside.</p> <p>The open countryside we overlook from the rear of our house is why we are still in the same house 38 years later. This open countryside at the back of our house is now under severe threat due to proposed building work on Green Belt land along Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>I know that you have been informed of countless reasons why this land should remain as Green Belt land and I wholeheartedly support and agree with every reason put forward.</p> <p>My opposition to the proposed building work is simple; I love where I live because of the proximity of the fields off Stanklyn Lane. Fields that I use for recreation and also fields my 4 year old grandson loves to watch though our</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>bedroom window as the tractors go up and down ploughing and harvesting.</p> <p>Easier to rip up more of our glorious countryside instead of redeveloping disused areas within the existing boundary of the town. Green Belt land is being devoured all too frequently and is being lost forever to wildlife, farming and places of enjoyment for many.</p> <p>We have to preserve our precious countryside and that is why I ask you, the Planning Committee, to seriously consider what you as individuals will be destroying for ever by allowing building to take place on the Green Belt adjacent to Spennells.</p> <p>Please, do the right thing and keep the countryside for everyone.</p>
	<p>LPPO97</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The council should respect that principle without which we would have urban sprawl. Exactly what would be created by the doubling in size of the Spennells estate?</p> <p>The Green Belt is mostly agricultural, the rest wild parts for us to come close to nature important for all but especially the children.</p> <p>Regenerate Kidderminster build homes within the town. Build in as many Brownfield areas as you can to spread the load on the infrastructure roads, hospitals, schools, Doctors which can hardly cope now.</p> <p>Spennells Road, Mustow Green and the viaduct roundabout are already blocked solid at rush hour, 2000 plus extra people making their way onto Kidderminster and Birmingham would do nothing for the problem and create a lot of pollution.</p> <p>The fields in question are important for crops, provide over wintering for birds, skylarks nest there because the grass is not cut until later in the season giving time for the young to fledge this is a species already in trouble around the country. There is something magical standing in the field and hearing the whistle of the train, passengers view is much better looking onto fields and crops and not the rear of people's homes.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Where will all the water go from the roads and houses will someone down the line pay the price and be flooded? Runners, walkers, kids, dogs and their owners all get fresh air, fitness and exercise from the fields, meet and pass the time of day chatting, all good therapy for the stressed, bothered, old and lonely.</p> <p>Plan A is my main concern, Green Belt land was created to stop urban sprawl and protect our countryside and you appear to be ignoring this fact in Plan A by doubling the size of Spennells Estate. Congestion and pollution caused by another 2000 families going to and from work and all emanating from the same area. Brownfield is better but could cause some local problems. More consultation on whichever plan is agreed would be good or a referendum of all residents.</p>
	<p>LPPO98</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Objection to WFDC OPTION A draft plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of the green fields at the rear of Spennells would be an absolute travesty, these fields are a hive of activity for an abundance of wildlife and local people,</p> <p>To add such a huge number of homes to an already busy network of roads and overstretched services has been ill thought out.</p> <p>Increased pressure on local schools, doctors and roads will have an enormous impact. Far better to distribute additional housing evenly to lower the stress in any one particular area. Your own statistics show population growth in Kidderminster is static how do you propose to fill these homes and where are all these additional people going to work?!</p> <p>Dozens of sites all around Kidderminster that should be developed primarily. The land to the rear of Spennells is not sitting idle it lends itself to agricultural usage. To add such a huge number of homes in this area would certainly add to congestion on this side of the town, greater emissions, noise, dust and a greater risk to health all concentrated in one area.</p> <p>I urge the council to consider the future of Kidderminster and have the foresight to protect our valuable green fields,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the town centre has moved leaving large expanses of empty shops that could be cleared for better usage, for example, affordable housing and social housing developments, we have an abysmal bus service provider.</p> <p>The council in its wisdom moved the leisure centre from the town centre to the other side of town so now you really have to have a car if you want to go as it is a task to get from one side of town to the other without changing buses.</p> <p>An excellent bus service and adequate school places, doctors surgeries and local councillors that actually listen to their constituents should all be in place before proposing such a huge development in any one area!</p>
	<p>LPP099</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p><u>Proposal to use Green Belt land to east of Kidderminster (Adjacent to Spennells and Offmore)</u></p> <p>My objection to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Traffic. Traffic leaving and entering Spennells area at peak times is already at capacity. Leaving Heronswood Road onto Spennells Valley Road between 7.30am and 9am any week day morning is very difficult. The tail back from the Bromsgrove Road end often reaches back to Heronswood School, where more congestion is created by parents dropping off children at school and nursery. Since the creation of the new road from Stourport the amount of traffic using Spennells Valley Road, as a short cut to Bromsgrove Road or across Offmore to the Birmingham Road, has increased significantly. The same problem arises at the Hoobrook end of Heronswood Road where traffic joining Chester Road South and then Worcester Road is backed up along Spennells Valley Road. Residents of Spennells often feel trapped at these times and any additional traffic to this area of Kidderminster will not be welcome.</p> <p>The area also becomes gridlocked at evening time particularly if travelling from Worcester, which can take up to 1 hour due to tail backs from Hoobrook as far as Ombersley on occasions and regularly as far back to the Mitre Oak. The major cause of this appears to be the traffic lights on the new road to Stourport, as again the situation has deteriorated since their introduction.</p> <p>Any major housing development in this area, irrespective of where access is, will intensify traffic problems causing increased risk to health caused by higher emissions of exhaust fumes.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Bus and Train Services There needs to be a major change in how bus and train services serve the people of Kidderminster. At present it is not possible to catch a bus from Kidderminster Town centre to Spennells after 6pm, and the last train from Birmingham to Kidderminster is 10.57pm.</p> <p>It may surprise some councillors but a great number of people who live in Wyre Forest actually travel to and work in Birmingham. If their train arrives after 6pm, they either have to arrange for someone to pick them up or take a taxi or leave their car at the station car park. The station car park is now full after 9am during the week leaving the alternative to park on nearby streets, pay expensive all day parking or park on Severn Railway car park, which closes early.</p> <p>Any major development anywhere in Wyre Forest will increase these problems and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Schools Local schools will have to be enlarged putting more pressure on staff with larger classes etc. and will increase traffic outside schools. At present it is not safe outside Heronswood School or King Charles lower school in Borrington Road due to heavy traffic.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt The loss of local Green Belt, threatening existing public Rights of Way. With the large number of properties already in existence on Spennells and Heronswood Park being the only open public space, after the council decided to close the smaller play areas, the adjoining Green Belt is pleasant for walkers, dog walkers and the like and is a great area for wildlife.</p> <p>Rather than double the size of Spennells alternative areas must be built.</p>
	<p>LPPO102</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the proposed houses to be built on the Spennells Green Belt fields. Why build houses on countryside where birds nest etc? Bad enough when Wilden top was reduced to flat fields and two beautiful woods were demolished, they could have had both woods and flatland, birds of prey used to nest there.</p> <p>Enough land which has nothing to offer to use for building without destroying a beautiful area which is used by a lot of residents, it is Green Belt. There are a lot of elderly residents who have chosen to live in a quiet area. This is bound to change and have an effect on them if they are surrounded by new houses. I suppose they are to build</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>housing association homes as well as private? Spennells school could not cope with additional need. What about the traffic, this will cause havoc.</p> <p>We pay council tax and should be able to have a say on our area and what happens to it. Local council is concerned with council tax that each house will be paying. This area is very populated as it is without ruining it for the tax payers who already live here.</p>
	<p>LPPO105</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerning plans for house builds on Spennells, I am incredibly angry and frustrated as we have bought a small dwelling on Stanklyn lane which we are renovating to get a nice house in a very relaxed area, we bought this house in 2014 and we were not aware of any plans for this, our solicitors did not give us any surveys that this would ever and was in the pipelines, yet I feel it had, as the build is adjacent to the side and rear back of our property</p> <p>I hope a noise survey and traffic survey will be implemented, as there are no speed restrictions on the lane and I feel the traffic will be compromised and speeding WILL be a problem.</p> <p>I hope there will be more schools built, doctors and hospitals for the number of people moving in, pressures on these services will be horrendous.</p> <p>Wildlife that will be disturbed, fox burrows, badgers setts and birds will be affected, there is a bridle way at the top of Spennells which I use, will this be affected?? Of course it will!!!</p> <p>I will not be happy to be looking out my new home to see huge buildings staring back at me, noise and pollution around my home, this is an absurd plan and only people who want a nice big salary out of this are bothered.</p> <p>Elderly people walk down the lane to get there only exercise which will be dangerous for them as the traffic will be busy and frightening for them, there are no continuous pathways down Stanklyn lane so how can we be safe walking as we walk on the roads as the traffic is very quiet most days, also hospital waiting lists will be affected, I'm a nurse and I know this will be, we will also have loss of flood planes if the fields are removed and sewage will be a big problems too, has this been taken into consideration????? I will want to be compensated for the inconvenience this</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>will cause and will be calling on my solicitor for support.</p> <p>House valuations will be compromised and a once sought after area will be a noisy, polluted area like a busy town where I lived, countryside will be no more, how sad that these plans are to be and nobody cares about the countryside anymore, I'm sure there are plenty of other areas nearer the towns that could be built on?</p> <p>I will be demanding a pollution and noise survey as soon as these plans if so are final!!!!</p>
	LPPO106	Object	<p>I want to formally object to the plans for housing on the Spennells fields. I have lived on Spennells for twenty four years and it continues to be where my family have their roots and where my children spend the majority of their time and walks on these fields occur often - the thought that they will be deprived of that is so sad. The fields were an integral part of my childhood and where I was first introduced to the vast nature that occupies those fields. I can appreciate there may be a need for more housing, but the plans are far too extensive and rob the area of its natural beauty and appeal. I also worry about how the local schools will cope, particularly Heronswood - generally in Kidderminster, many schools are over-subscribed and I cannot see how this new development would improve this predicament.</p> <p>I feel that this new development would be an awful way to use such beautiful land and I am truly sad that my children will perhaps not get the chance to have the same appreciation for living in a place where countryside and its nature are so easily accessible.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I truly hope the concerns of residents are kept in mind.</p>
	LPPO107	Object	<p>I formally state my objection to the plans for housing on the Spennells fields. I have lived on Spennells for twenty four years and it is the place where my family have their roots and where my children spend the majority of their time and walks on these fields occur often - the thought that they will be deprived of that is so sad. The fields were an integral part of my childhood and where I was first introduced to the vast nature that occupies those fields. I can appreciate there may be a need for more housing, but the plans are far too extensive and rob the area of its natural beauty and appeal. How will local schools cope, particularly Heronswood - in Kidderminster, many schools are over-</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>subscribed. I cannot see how this new development would improve this predicament.</p> <p>I feel that this new development would be an awful way to use such beautiful land and I am truly sad that my children may not get the chance to have the same appreciation for living in a place where countryside and its nature are so easily accessible.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I truly hope the concerns of residents are kept in mind</p>
	LPPO108	Object	<p>Objects to the plans to build on Spennells fields, which are on Green Belt Land. These fields are used by walkers, dog walkers, cycle, and various other reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased traffic and higher emissions. 2. Schools, and hospitals being overrun 3. Also the effect on wildlife 4. Loss of good quality land
	LPPO109	Object	<p>I would like to add my objections about further proposed building plans on the Spennells Estate. I think it would be ruinous, detrimental, and spoil a very pleasant place to live. It is well cared for by residents and our Local Councillors, who have a group of Volunteers, who go out Litter Picking, to help keep everything neat and tidy.</p> <p>I have lived here over twenty years, it is one of the better housing estates in Kidderminster, in very pleasant surroundings let us keep it that way.</p> <p>There are plenty of Disused Factory buildings around Kidderminster that are being left to go to ruin, why is it not possible to do something with those?</p>
	LPPO110	Object	<p>I read with horror 'Option A' of the Wyre Forest Local Plan Development Consultation that it is considering removing the 'Green Belt' status of the fields at the back and side of the Spennells housing estate, which will enable the fields to be sold for development with the loss of these lovely well farmed productive fields for ever. I have been a resident on Spennells for 32 years and I would like to object to this proposal in the strongest manner, this would be a</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>tragedy for the residents of Spennells and surrounding area. I walk across these fields 6 or 7 times a week in all weather conditions and experience relaxation and pleasure from these walks and it keeps me both physically and mentally fit and keeps my weight under control. During these walks I often meet others usually with dogs, some come from Offmore Farm or further away. Walks de-stress and clear my head.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the traffic situation as getting off the Spennells estate between 7.30 to 9.00am can be a nightmare as is trying to get out of Kidderminster under the viaduct towards Worcester. This situation would be made far worse if the area was further developed, likewise in reverse between 5.00 and 6 pm. This situation appears to have been made far worse since the opening of the much needed new link road, with traffic regularly backing up to the Black bridge lights.</p>
	LPPO113	Object	<p>We have lived on Spennells for over thirty years, a very pleasant place to live. Any swallowing up of land between the edge of Spennells and the houses on Stanklyn Lane will have the following two very serious effects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The pleasant rural aspect of living in Stone will disappear and 2. The proximity of the open fields will disappear and will have a detrimental effect on residents' quality of life. <p>This land is agricultural and should not be used for house building. Loss of habitat for numerous species of wildlife. Potential to build many dwellings on Sion Hill School and also Lea Castle hospital sites. Aware of the need to provide more homes in Kidderminster but we do urge you to consider Option B as proposed in the review.</p>
	LPPO121	Object	<p>I wish to put on record my total opposition to 'option A' I believe if the development goes ahead it will affect the quality of our life.</p> <p>Please consider carefully: Impact on drainage in the area as the fields are a valuable soak away. In my time on Spennells heavy rain "run off" from the fields behind my house have flooded our garden resulting In us having to install additional drainage... The development up to the rise of the bill will exacerbate this run off flooding water even further. Proposal A would see housing located partly on the brow of a hill and so spoil the aesthetics of the surrounding countryside. The land is designated Green Belt and should not be used so to prevent relentless urban sprawl.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Building on Green Belt should be the last possible option.</p> <p>There will be extra congestion in traffic exiting from the only two exits onto Spennells Valley road. At the moment there are traffic queues at peak times.</p> <p>There will be extra pressure on our already full school and nursery. In particular there is a traffic problem at the moment with parking for parents taking their children to nursery/school.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife that feed and live on the fields. There are many Skylark nest in the fields that should not be disturbed. Skylarks are on the red endangered list In this country. The RSPB I suspect will have an interest in this. What right have we to take away their habitat?</p> <p>Foot paths around the fields are used by people for exercise and interaction with neighbours and friends met on the walks seven days a week. The consultation document describes the land in option A as poor for agriculture and poorly maintained. I have looked out for years on healthy crops such as mixed cereal, sugar beet and oil seed rape. Other land in option A has been used for monthly agricultural auctions and as a horse gallop.</p> <p>I understand that the Option A is the easy option and one likely to be preferred by developers but it is us who have to live with the consequences of the impact on the quality of our lives. I am sure that If the proposal option A goes ahead it will be a major source of regret in the future that the decision was unwise and not thought out.</p>
	LPPO125	Object	<p>Formally object to the proposals option A to expand housing around the Spennells estate area.</p> <p>I have major concerns about the effect this will have on not only me and my family- but the whole of Spennells estate.</p> <p>I visit the fields daily to either walk my dog, take my children on bike rides and nature walks and also exercise and keep healthy after working in the city. It keeps me sane and mentally healthy to be able to walk in this countryside at the end of a busy day...literally 2 minutes from my home. Your plans will destroy this...adding pollution.</p> <p>My children go or have been to Heronswood primary school. Our new intake has already increased to 60 per year</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>which will now continue as the children move through the years. The school is at bursting point; limited amount of playing fields for the kids...the school simply will not cope if Spennells almost doubles. The facility is simply not there.</p> <p>The stores by the school just about manage to maintain the kids hanging around....I dread to think what will happen with more children on the estate.</p> <p>My boys regularly play and ride bikes around the fields...and I allow them to as they are close by....if you get rid of this...the countryside will be too far out for the children to safely reach and play.</p> <p>Many other sites in Kidderminster that could be used...half of the towns centre are unused retail shops...surely these areas should be considered?</p> <p>Green Belt land is a valuable and necessary area we should be protecting and I am disgusted that these options to build are being considered.</p> <p>I chose this area for direct access to the fields for me and my family. The plans will devalue my property and ability to sell on.</p> <p>The road infrastructure will add pollution and noise...traffic is already horrendous travelling to the high school to town and this will increase severely.</p> <p>There are so many reasons why I strongly object to these proposals.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY OUR COUNTRYSIDE.</p>
	LPPO126	Object	<p>Formal objection to the proposals option A to expand housing around the Spennells estate area.</p> <p>I have serious concerns about the effect these proposals will have on our daily life and most importantly worried</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>about the detrimental effects they will undoubtedly have on the whole of the Spennells estate.</p> <p>We visit the fields on a daily basis, for dog walking, taking our children on bike rides and nature walks, jogging and exercise to keep healthy. Beautiful nature spot, literally on our doorstep, is a gift which we are desperate not to lose. Proposal will bring problems of pollution and overcrowding.</p> <p>Our children go or have been to Heronswood primary school. Our new intake has already increased to 60 per year which will now continue as the children move through the years. The school is at bursting point. Limited amount of playing fields...the school will not cope if Spennells almost doubles in size. Facilities are not there to cope with increased numbers.</p> <p>The stores by the school already have problems with kids hanging around....will worsen if the proposed building works go ahead.</p> <p>Our boys regularly play and ride bikes around the fields...and we allow them to as they are close by....if you get rid of this, the countryside will be too far out for the children to safely reach and play.</p> <p>Many other sites in Kidderminster that could be used...half of the town centre is made up of unused retail shops...surely these areas should be considered?</p> <p>Green Belt land is a valuable and necessary asset we should be protecting and I am disgusted that it is being considered as an option to build on.</p> <p>We specifically bought our house in this area for the direct access it offers to the fields. The plans will devalue our property and negatively affect our ability to sell.</p> <p>The road infrastructure will add pollution and noise. Traffic is already horrendous when travelling to the high school and to town and this will increase severely if the number of residents increases so dramatically.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There are so many reasons why I strongly object to these proposals.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY OUR COUNTRYSIDE.</p>
	LPPO127	Object	<p>Oppose option A in the current planning review. I believe the following issues will occur with the implementation of option A;</p> <p>The fields upon which the new housing will be built are used extensively by local people to walk, jog, walk dogs, cycle, ride horses, etc. The loss of this site would diminish the mental health and physical well being of the people who use the field.</p> <p>Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes will result in risk to health and further reduce the air quality. Alternatively building housing in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution.</p> <p>Local schools being stretched further with fewer resources per student.</p> <p>Increased pressure on doctors, dentists, hospitals and opticians.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</p>
	LPPO190	Object	<p>I want to put on record my total horror and opposition to “option A” going forward. I live on the edge of Spennells and overlook land that is outlined in option A. I do not want to see this development go ahead as it will affect our quality of life. More specifically,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am disappointed that the plan names option A and Option B which suggests that option A is the preferred

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>option of the planners. There are two options, one to use green field sites or alternatively to use existing other sites located throughout the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is designated Green Belt and should not be used so to prevent relentless urban sprawl. Building on Green Belt should be the last possible option. • Proposal A would see housing located partly on the brow of a hill and so spoil the aesthetics of the surrounding countryside. (look at the Brierley hill flats as an example of bad planning, on the top of a hill, that can be seen as far away as the Clee hills) Option A, in my view is nothing short of environmental vandalism. • In my time on the Spennells estate, heavy rain “run off” from the fields behind my house, has flooded our garden and around the house up to damp course level, on a number of occasions, to the extent I have had to install additional drainage. I am concerned that development up to the rise of the hill will exacerbate this run off flooding water even further. • One of the pleasures I have in the summer is the sound of Skylarks singing. There are many Skylark nests on this field that should not be disturbed. Skylarks are on the red endangered list in this country. What right do we have to take away their habitat? I suspect the RSPB will have an interest. • The land in option A, I can attest for the last 35 years, (despite being described in the consultation document as poor agricultural land that is poorly maintained) has always grown healthy crops. These crops being mixed cereals, sugar beet, and oil seed rape. Other land in option A has been used for monthly agricultural auction and as a horse gallop. Numerous dog walkers also use the rights of way on these fields to exercise their pets and themselves. The pathways are in constant use throughout the day seven days a week. <p>I understand that Option A is the easy option and one likely to be preferred by developers, but it is us who have to live with the consequences of the impact on our quality of life. Please don't blame the government; we have a choice let's make the correct one, protect the Green Belt.</p>
	<p>LPPO193</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I oppose the proposed option site for future housing around the Spennells area. On the grounds that.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are surely "brown fields" sites that can be developed, more difficult to build on, but will not occupy Green Belt land.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Empty retail town centre buildings can be converted into much needed flats.</p> <p>3. The increase in local traffic around Stanklyn Lane and Bromsgrove Rd will result in major road traffic jams around the surrounding junctions.</p> <p>4. Public services/ amenities and other infrastructures will have to be expanded greatly to cope with the increase in population, at great cost to the public purse.</p> <p>5. The water run off from these new properties that will occupy virgin land, which is a natural soak away, will probably result in far more extensive flooding in Spennells Valley.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to object.</p>
	<p>LPPO194</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We wish to strongly object to the development of the whole area of OPTION A nearly doubling the size of Spennells.</p> <p>This would lead to a larger loss of Green Belt which in the face of climate change has an increasingly significant role in storing carbon and preventing flooding and is a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection.</p> <p>The fields are farmed for crops and provide annual nesting grounds for declining bird species such as Skylarks and other wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The fields are used extensively to walk, jog, walk dogs and ride horses, with mental health on the increase the loss of these fields would have a detrimental effect on all who live in this area not to mention physical well being especially as the district has one of the highest levels of obesity.</p> <p>Existing rights of way threatened i.e. Bridal paths Increased traffic noise and pollution resulting in increased risk to health putting pressure on local medical services.</p> <p>Option A is too large a development for one area, whereas Option B would be a better solution as less Green Belt</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>would be used, not concentrated in one area but dispersed across the district so less impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Rather than encroach upon our countryside we urge the council to develop and regenerate town centre sites including unused shop premises which should be considered as a priority in all three Wyre Forest towns.</p>
	<p>LPPO197</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>All of these sites use Green Belt Land and I quote the following from the Wyre Forest Site Allocations and Policies Local plan adopted 2013: “Agricultural Land Quality 7.110 Within the District, land quality is generally very high in the area running from east and south-east of Kidderminster eastwards to the District boundary. Other significant blocks of high quality land <i>can</i> be found to the north of Kidderminster and around Rock Policy SAL UP14 Agricultural Land Quality Development of the best and most versatile agricultural land will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the development cannot be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land. Development on agricultural land should not prejudice the viability of farming operations on any remaining land.”</p> <p>The Green Belt In the sites quoted above are farmed by a tenant farmer, and shortly <i>after</i> the photographs shown In the report Amec Foster Wheeler Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited chose to use, when the fields were fallow, was subsequently fully planted with cereal crops, which are now close to harvesting, These fields are classed as Grade 2 Agricultural land and since I took residence in 1979 have always been planted with either cereal or in the past sugar beet crops. These fields also have footpaths and permitted paths running around and thru them, which are used by the public, some having walked thru the Nature reserve at the front of the Spennells estate The loss of this Green Belt will be detrimental to the environment and there be the loss of the mental and physical wellbeing of the many people who visit the area from local and adjacent communities to enjoy the amenities these fields provide.</p> <p>People benefit from being able to go to a rural setting, see and observe local wild life, birds, wild flowers, and various</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>creature/birds habitats. You can do all this whatever your age and mobility and without having to pollute the environment by using a car. Children learn how agriculture works to provide crops which we need; With the number of homes that are proposed to be built under this review is the infrastructure of Kidderminster itself going to be able to cope with the increase in population?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out local Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded and our Worcester Hospital is in special measures • Doctors surgeries are now saying that their patient lists are full, • National Health Dental Surgeries have full patient lists. • Local schools are full or have limited places available. If places are not available close to your home Children have to travel to where places are available, which in many cases necessitates the use of a car, causing air pollution <p>I believe children living on the new development called Silver Birch located on the Stourport Road are commuting to Heronswood School located on the Spennells Estate.</p> <p>I am against any use of Green Belt land, however Option B appears to use slightly less Green Belt for a very similar number of dwellings to be built.</p> <p>I feel that we would be better to use every available piece of land already within our boundaries before contemplating the use of any of our Green Belt in either plan A or B.</p> <p>I quote from a Press Release from the Government In February 2017— Page 5 Green Belt “Government announces ambitious plan to build the homes Britain needs From: Department for Communities and Local Government, The Rt Hon Gavin Barwell and The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP Part of: Housing white paper, Rented housing sector and House Building Published: 7 February 2017 “Green Belt Ministers have reaffirmed this government’s commitment to the Green Belt - that only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter Green Belt boundaries after consulting local people and submitting the revised Local Plan for examination, and set out for the first time all the actions local authorities must take before considering the Green Belt. The plan for ‘Urban Regeneration’ includes: strengthening national planning policy to create a ‘de facto’ presumption in favour of housing on suitable brownfield land and to drive up density levels in high demand areas while ensuring that developments are well-designed and respect the character of the local area. Also taking action to radically increase brownfield development and to bring life back to abandoned sites. That</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>means high quality housing for families in town centres, breathing new life back into our high streets, turning abandoned shopping centres into new communities and increasing density of housing around transport hubs to build homes that people want to live in.”</p> <p>The proposed expansion using plan A will be an</p> <p>People benefit from being able to go to a rural setting, see and observe local wild life, birds, wild flowers, and various creature/birds habitats. You can do all this whatever your age and mobility and without having to pollute the environment by using a car. Children learn how agriculture works to provide crops which we need; With the number of homes that are proposed to be built under this review is the infrastructure of Kidderminster itself going to be able to cope with the increase in population?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out local Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded and our Worcester Hospital is in special measures • Doctors surgeries are now saying that their patient lists are full, • National Health Dental Surgeries have full patient lists. • Local schools are full or have limited places available. If places are not available close to your home Children have to travel to where places are available, which in many cases necessitates the use of a car, causing air pollution <p>I believe children living on the new development called Silver Birch located on the Stourport Road are commuting to Heronswood School located on the Spennells Estate.</p> <p>Having read the review I am against any use of Green Belt land, however Option B appears to use slightly less Green Belt for a very similar number of dwellings to be built.</p> <p>I feel that we would be better to use every available piece of land already within our boundaries before contemplating the use of any of our Green Belt in either plan A or B.</p> <p>I quote from a Press Release from the Government In February 2017— Page 5 Green Belt “Government announces ambitious plan to build the homes Britain needs From: Department for Communities and Local Government, The Rt Hon Gavin Barwell and The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP Part of: Housing white paper, Rented housing sector and House Building Published: 7 February 2017 “Green Belt Ministers have reaffirmed this government’s commitment to the Green Belt - that only in exceptional circumstances</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>may councils alter Green Belt boundaries after consulting local people and submitting the revised Local Plan for examination, and set out for the first time all the actions local authorities must take before considering the Green Belt.</p> <p>The plan for 'Urban Regeneration' includes: strengthening national planning policy to create a 'de facto' presumption in favour of housing on suitable brownfield land and to drive up density levels in high demand areas while ensuring that developments are well-designed and respect the character of the local area.</p> <p>Also taking action to radically increase brownfield development and to bring life back to abandoned sites. That means high quality housing for families in town centres, breathing new life back into our high streets, turning abandoned shopping centres into new communities and increasing density of housing around transport hubs to build homes that people want to live in."</p> <p>Option A is an extremely large expansion of housing and roads on the eastern side of Kidderminster, which will be a large urban sprawl. The Spennells Estate will connect to Summerfield and be extremely close to Stone.</p> <p>Overall I feel that the plan is unethical, and environmentally disastrous. You have to consider the environment you create for living. It must be greater than a house and a road on which to gain access to your place of work. It must be a place you can live and enjoy life with your family, be contented, happy and relaxed in an environment of peace and tranquillity.</p>
	LPPO199	Object	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the reclassification of the Green Belt and the proposed options for development A & B on fields adjacent to Spennells. Clearly to locate such a massive development in one location is a huge mistake. Whilst one has to plan for the future it would be more appropriate to identify a number of separate locations spread around the area. Further reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is next to a designated Nature Reserve. Huge residential and industrial development would have a severe detrimental impact on the habitat of the fauna and flora and deface the natural environment. 2. The area is used by local people for recreational and dog walking along with other activities such as cycling and jogging. This is important since the existing area has no other community benefits whatsoever and further development would exacerbate this unsatisfactory situation. 3. Increased traffic flow would be inevitable and result in unsociable noise which at times is already a nuisance from the nearby A (Kidderminster— Worcester Road). I.e. speeding motor cycles and constant traffic hum' particularly at busy times. There would be increased air pollution from exhaust gases which is a health hazard.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>4. I would express concern at the potential impact of surface water run off generated by rainfall causing localised flooding and the distress that this would cause. It would have a detrimental impact on house prices when trying to sell a property. Maintenance of downstream channels and culverts would also be a problem. They are probably inadequate and never designed to accept the increased flow.</p> <p>5. Development would result in loss of valuable productive agricultural land.</p> <p>6. Brownfield sites in the area should be developed before virgin land is encroached on. There seems to be numerous disused buildings in Kidderminster that could be utilised which apart from accommodation would greatly improve the aesthetic appearance of the town. It certainly needs it.</p> <p>7. There will be further pressure on the current medical services (doctors, hospital. dentists etc) and also the local school</p> <p>8. In view of the relative static population in Kidderminster It is questionable if the proposed development is necessary anyway. Who exactly is it for?</p>
	<p>LPPO221</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I walk along the footpaths in the fields round Spennells, enjoying the outlook and watching the countryside change with the seasons. Many people walk the paths through the fields for the good of their health. There are people with various complaints, including an elderly gentleman with asbestosis, who rely on this facility.</p> <p>From January onwards there are Sky Larks singing away, cheering folks up. They must nest somewhere.</p> <p>We have so few facilities in Kidderminster. The site will be seen from a large distance. You must have brown field sites that could be used so that housing could be in small blocks.</p> <p>Easter Park has still got vacancies; this has taken years to fill. I am told that there are also vacancies on the Hoo Farm estate.</p> <p>Kidderminster is not a beautiful town and you are about to spoil it again.</p> <p>I know this is an easy option but please think hard, once our beautiful landscape is gone it will never come back.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO222	Object	<p>We object strongly to Spennells expansion including OC/13 WFR/ST/2 WFR/ST/1 AS/10.</p> <p>We object on grounds of:</p> <p>1 loss of Green Belt. Beautiful fields and hedgerows loss of current public rights of way.</p> <p>Brown sites should be used</p> <p>2 increased traffic noise and air pollution. Reduction of mental health and well being. Loss of leisure space</p> <p>3 loss of wildlife habitat for example skylarks and linnets</p> <p>4 increased pressure on public services e g schools doctors hospitals</p> <p>5 loss of agricultural land which helps feeds the nation</p> <p>We don't want urban sprawl we do want the council to develop and regenerate the town centre.</p>
	LPPO223	Object	<p>I wish to object to option A.</p> <p>The fields provide a real sense of community to the people of Spennells & local areas due to the social aspect of how many people use them to either walk dogs or meet with friends & walk socially. Using this Green Belt land for housing development would have a massive negative impact on the local community.</p> <p>I know the huge impact destroying these fields will have on our local wildlife population.</p> <p>Having easy access to these fields have really helped children in their development & understanding of community.</p> <p>I feel option B would be more suitable.</p>
	LPPO224	Object	<p>We strongly object to the building of 1,735 homes.</p> <p>The whole of option 'A' is Green Belt land; impact on habitat for the nature contained therein will be catastrophic.</p> <p>UK Skylark population has diminished by 50% over recent years yet it is proposed to reduce their habitat.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The housing will diminish views from the properties overlooking the fields from Spennells and Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Bridleways and public rights of way are heavily used by many from Spennells. Taking these pathways and views away from existing residents will negatively impact on all who use them.</p> <p>This proposal will be visually overbearing, is inappropriate and totally out of keeping alongside a present large development. Especially when considering there are a number of brown field sites that need to be utilised.</p> <p>We have no doubt that the proposal also includes road links onto Spennells estate. This will cause noise, pollution and level of traffic that the estate was not designed for. Furthermore, any link to the A448 will again cause chaos to roads permeating away from the town, in particular Mustow Green.</p> <p>There appears to be no mention of infrastructure required to meet the needs of residents living in the proposed new homes. Spennells has a small but very much needed supermarket, a pharmacy and take away restaurant(s). These shops are already well patronised and parking is often at a premium. Any increase in traffic will place strain not only on road infrastructure but parking and the shops themselves.</p> <p>Fundamentally, to even consider utilising this Green Belt land we feel is unacceptable.</p>
	LPPO225	Object	<p>I object to the proposal to build on the Green Belt adjacent to Spennells. My reason are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Plenty of Brownfield sites available. 2) These should be built on first before using any Greenfield sites. 3) Spennells already well populated area, further housing would add to pressure on local schools and shops etc.
	LPPO226	Object	<p>The Spennells Estate is big enough already. Previous mistake was allowing large scale unsuitable and ill-considered development.</p> <p>Further development with expansion into the Green Belt undermines the original thinking behind the design of Spennells and its Nature Reserve. Residents and others take advantage of the outdoor amenities provided by the existing Rights of Way and access to the fields off Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Not be possible without bulldozing the whole area to create an infrastructure which will cope with such an increase in occupation. Already impossible sometimes to access the Spennells Valley Road, traffic queuing down the Worcester Road beyond the traffic lights at the Droitwich turn on the A449.</p> <p>Siting the total development in Spennells is a quick fix easy option.</p> <p>Planning a dispersed option would better enhance Kidderminster in general.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO227	Object	<p>I express my concerns.</p> <p>I moved to Spennells for the quality of life and beautiful surrounding countryside. This area had lakes, nature reserves and open countryside to exercise, relax and enjoy. Safe place traffic wise. My Children had good schools, safe areas to play and learned about the environment and nature. We walk around Spennells fields & countryside. We watch the seasons change and the creatures that live there, Sky larks, finches, Owls and Buzzards & the Green Wood Peckers and other red-listed birds all live here too and have been here longer than all of us.</p> <p>The Councils are obligated to supply housing but I do not accept obliterating our area is the best answer.</p> <p>I urge the Council to do what's right for the Town and its people.</p>
	LPPO229	Object	<p>Please look alternatives rather than expanding Spennells.</p> <p>Green Belt around Spennells is an essential habitat for skylarks their numbers have increased. Their habitat should not be destroyed and consequently their survival.</p> <p>The area is an unspoilt rural setting, fresh air, meeting others experiencing similar, definitely helped my getting back to work and recovery from depression.</p> <p>Traffic getting in and out of Spennells is sometimes gridlocked, and have a negative effect on air quality and safety in the area.</p> <p>Please listen and act on comments of people who care about the health and wellbeing of the residents.</p>
	LPPO231	Object	<p>I formally object to the LPR especially with regard to proposed building of houses and a relief road to the side of Spennells Estate. I base my objections on the following :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This stretch of land is Green Belt land and is therefore protected 2. This stretch of land contains 2 pools, woods, a bridle path and public rights of way which in their own rights are

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>protected.</p> <p>3. This stretch of land is used for walking, running, dog walking, horse riding, fishing, bird watching and other leisure activities</p> <p>4. National trends show house demand to be flat lining therefore there is no justification to build more houses.</p> <p>5. No infrastructure to support an additional 6000 families and associated transport, schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals, Police support, Fire support. We have downgraded most of our public services and our town centre is half empty.</p> <p>6. The so called relief road has been poorly consulted and there is no justification to build one if the 6000 homes are not built. We have reduced the main route out of Kidderminster to a single carriageway and the same with the Worcester Road. If you want to improve communications then widen them again. Simply building another road is not the answer.</p> <p>7. Where is work for another 6000 jobs coming from? Most of the available brownfield sites are down to failing industry. You have just allowed a massive build on the old sugar beet factory are all those houses taken up? Could the new leisure facilities cope, no one can find a parking spot there.</p> <p>8. The people on Spennells do not want this.</p>
	<p>LPPO335</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to object to Option A and my reasons are as follows:</p> <p>Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -As the fields in Option A are in a valley, building roads and houses here make the area more polluted as the fumes cover and stay in the area. • -The increased pollution from car fumes etc... Will cause higher rates of asthma. • -With no crops being grown in the fields food will be grown further away which will increase car fumes.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -There are a number of species of animals whose habitat can be found on this land. E.g. - badgers, bats and birds are just a few. Having looked at the RSPB website Corn Bunting is in danger of extinction. I have seen these birds when walking my dog. • -Loss of the fields would be bad for dogs as they would have to walk in the streets. This would mean they have to stay on leads. Dogs would also have to walk by car exhausts, which are located close to their mouth and nose. • -Building the houses on the fields will increase global warming and impact other animals not just in the fields. <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -The fields are used by a variety of people of all ages to interact and exercise. The fields are a free resource and you do not have to drive there. • -Cyclists have a higher chance of getting knocked off bikes with the proposed development. <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -As the town centre is not used by many residents, I propose that houses are built on Brownfield sites near the town centre as it will encourage the residents to spend money in local shops. This could encourage more shops to come to Kidderminster. <p>I hope you consider the points carefully. We need to protect the Green Belt for future life.</p>
	LPPO336	Object	<p>I strongly object to Option A, i.e. Large scale development of fields adjacent to Spennells with associated infrastructure changes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a beautiful area of Green Belt used by walkers and dog walkers. Giving a place to exercise. 2. The school is too small and would create extra traffic problems around the area.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>3. We already have congestion. The area cannot cope with extra vehicles on the roads.</p> <p>This area was originally supposed to have a church and a pub. Where are they?</p>
	LPPO341	Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposal to expand Spennells by robbing the very distinctive Green Belt to build new dwellings on. The very special character of the estate blends well into the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and would be totally destroyed by a further 1700 dwellings, which would result in an urban sprawl. Kidderminster is a lovely Market town. By building further, we would have our own 'Castle Vale' estate on the edge of town, with most of the residents commuting to Birmingham or the Black Country.</p>
	LPPO665	Object	<p>Proposed development between Spennells Estate and Stanklyn Lane raises number of concerns:</p> <p>1 proposed relief road - visual and noise impact - significant screening needed</p> <p>2 junction with A449 likely to cause further traffic flow issues</p> <p>3 Land between proposed road and Stanklyn Lane unlikely to remain viable for farming - concerned re future uses</p> <p>4 should consider reusing empty buildings in town centre before releasing Green Belt land. Persuade more elderly to downsize and free up family homes.</p>
	LPPO754	Object	<p>Shocked to see how many houses are proposed on fields at Spennells.</p> <p>Area is used by lots of people, area cannot cope with another 2 to 3,000 people, cars and children, roads cannot cope now. Fields needs to be kept for conservation and recreation, not enough open spaces for people to walk.</p> <p>Look at Brownfield sites and the town centre, lots of empty spaces and CROWN HOUSE which has been empty for years.</p> <p>Save Our Spennells.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO758	Object	<p>Development of GREEN BELT LAND south of Spennells would have an adverse affect on the amenities of this agricultural land.</p> <p>Residents use this land for walking, exercising their dogs appreciating wildlife, hedgerows and the ambience of the area.</p> <p>If housing were built on this Greenfield site it would have an adverse impact on local amenities. Traffic density which is already substantial and the road system would need significant expansion and widening.</p> <p>Proposed expansion of Spennells towards Stanklyn Lane would increase traffic density on Stanklyn Lane itself. This would entail extensive road and railway bridge widening.</p> <p>Residents on Spennells chose this location as adjacent to beautiful open countryside and opportunities for enjoyment, exercise and peaceful relaxation.</p> <p>Doctors, Dentist and the community healthcare services, including the hospital and emergency services are already overstretched.</p> <p>Logical to build houses on Brownfield Sites between Kidderminster, Bewdley and Stourport on an infill basis. This could contribute to the regeneration of these towns.</p>
	LPPO760	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development on Green Belt fields at Spennells.</p> <p>Concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of prime fields with associated footpaths & bridleways • Loss of already endangered songbirds, namely Skylarks • Loss of other wildlife that use the fields, trees or hedgerows. • Massive impact on already very busy access roads. • Local school, doctors etc will be put under even more pressure to deal with the enlarged community.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A massive negative impact on Spennells. • We need the green space around the existing estate.
	LPPO762	Object	<p>We object to change Spennells fields from Green Belt to enable houses etc to be built.</p> <p>So much wildlife to be disturbed. Many people enjoy these fields, families feel safe using it with their children. Dog walkers and lots of people who walk alone. There is not enough open spaces now for an estate of this kind.</p> <p>No facilities for young or older people to get together now, so more people will make it worse. People benefit from our green spaces, both physically and mentally, they are so important. Housing is just as important but it's too easy to take green spaces rather than develop derelict spaces.</p>
	LPPO1686	Object	Loss of valuable agricultural land for recreation would affect users physical/mental wellbeing and wildlife.
Spennells Against Further Expansion	LPPO1717	Object	<p>The fields are productive, agricultural land which also serves as popular recreational and social facilities for walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers, photographers and horse rider.</p> <p>The area offers a number of different habitats for wildlife, including important nesting sites for corn buntings, larks and linnets (all of which are included on the red list as endangered birds), badger setts and bats.</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Amenity Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report' published in 2013 emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan removes. • The Local Plan's suggested Option A, building houses to the north of Stanklyn Lane would be to the detriment of the visual landscape. To build houses in these fields would spoil the current visual amenity and represent clear evidence of Urban Sprawl. This would be evident from the A449 trunk road approach to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster and from the railway line as it approaches Kidderminster in a northerly direction.</p> <p><u>Drainage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are also historical drainage ditches in this area of archaeological importance that should be protected and enhanced. • During the last 20 years, there have been severe flooding issues on Spennells estate around the Linnet Rise area. • Development of these sites will reduce the natural drainage maintained by the fields, crops, trees and hedgerows, and not only pose real issues to flooding for the new development, but exacerbate and pose further flooding issues for the existing properties and road structures already in place • This is well-farmed prime grade 2 arable land which needs to be protected <p><u>Health and Wellbeing of residents</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The open space, public footpaths and Rights of Way across the fields are intensively used by local residents which have positive effects upon their physical and mental wellbeing. A cycling route through a housing estate could not claim to meet the needs of all the current users of the PROWs and Bridle paths. Footpaths that allow walking in the open countryside cannot be equated with ‘Green Corridors’ between housing developments. • Kidderminster has higher obesity levels than the national average and this would be exacerbated by reducing local access to these fields for local health and recreational. • Other threats to the health and wellbeing include: • The proposed new road (Eastern Relief road) causing increased traffic noise, air pollution, light pollution and additional traffic vibration to Spennells’ residents. • Increased demand on infrastructure including medical facilities and schools • Social problems; evidence exists that large housing estates suffer more crime and anti-social behaviour (as acknowledged in the WFIDP May 2017).

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><u>Strain on local infrastructure</u></p> <p>A new large residential development requires proper infrastructure to support its current and future residents. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospital services • GP & Dental surgeries • Schools – Existing local schools are nearly full. We are not confident that extra school places will be made available in time for the projected new arrivals to this part of town. • Local shops, pharmacy and post office – We are not confident that adequate additional local shops will be constructed to serve any enlarged Spennells • Local leisure such as a village hall, pub, and fitness centre/gym – We are not confident that adequate local leisure facilities will be built to serve an enlarged estate, leading to a soulless estate with heightened youth alienation, graffiti and crime. • Local roads and transport – The absence of adequate schools, shops and leisure facilities will increase car journeys which will contribute to local air pollution and traffic congestion. The building of an estate on the fringe of Kidderminster will see more car journeys rather than walking and cycling, compared to development closer to the centre on brownfield sites. <p><u>Loss of Green Belt</u></p> <p>The purpose of Green Belt is to:</p> <p>a. Check unrestricted urban sprawl. The proposed Option A development would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, whereas development under Option B would have a more dispersed effect upon a range of town boundaries. The Wyre Forest Review states that "The parcel is largely open in character, part of the strong division between the built edge and open countryside." The claim in the LPR that "extending the built edge of Kidderminster south-eastwards would not constitute urban sprawl" is contradicted later in the Report by the need to "reduce the impression of urban sprawl" in the Green Belt evaluation (LPR Appendix C).</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>b. Stop neighbouring towns from merging. The development on this land would mean that Spennells would merge with Summerfield and Stone, thus losing their separate identities.</p> <p>c. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The development in Option A would encroach significantly into open Green Belt land.</p> <p>In the Green Belt Review Report on both Sprawl and Encroachment, weightings were scored as 'Considerable' for this parcel of land (SE1). This parcel of land also scored 2 'considerables' but was weighted alongside other areas (not selected for development) that scored only 1 'considerable' impact assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Option 'A' plan removes 22% (48 Hectares) more Green Belt from Wyre Forest than Option 'B' and we strongly support the minimum removal of Green Belt land.</p> <p><u>Wildlife and Bio Diversity</u></p> <p>The Spennells fields have a diverse and flourishing wildlife population. There are protected trees and ancient hedgerows that are home to, and provide a vital food source for, a wide range of birds, mammals, insects and bats. There is evidence of Red and Amber Listed Bird species such as Corn Buntings, Skylarks and Linnets in this area and sightings of European otters, 3 species of Bats and badgers setts with breeding pairs. We suggest that you fully consider the ecological impact of continuing with your proposed development on these fields.</p>
	<p>LPPO1798</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The housing proposed in Option A is enormous to say the least.</p> <p>The mere thought of constructing a bypass road so close to the existing Spennells estate is a preposterous proposal; the diabolical row from fast moving traffic would be unbearable.</p> <p>A shame to lose the protected bats that dwell on the fields.</p> <p>The skylarks are a wonderful asset that will also be lost.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The fields contain excellent barley growing soil.</p> <p>Dog walking and recreational space is so vital to the existing Spennells population.</p> <p>Taking all of this into consideration the choice of option A is totally out of the question.</p>
	LPPO1828	Object	<p>I would like to object to option A of the local plan review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is totally unjust for the people of Spennells and surrounding areas due to the disproportionate size of the proposed build. • Spennells does not have the infrastructure to cope with 1065 extra houses. • Herenswood School is already overcrowded and there is no room for expansion without the loss of playground. • The District suffers with a huge child obesity problem, taking the fields on which we exercise and reducing the school playground will worsen this. • The fields at the rear of Spennells are valuable grade 2. With Brexit looming we ought to be saving our agricultural fields until we are sure of our future in the importation market. • Believes that Option A has been pushed by WFDC and the whole report is heavily weighted towards it. Questions that it's already a 'done deal.'
	LPPO1844	Object	<p>Object to using Green Belt land adjacent to Spennells to build 1700 new homes. The fields are used for exercise, and provide access to the countryside close to the already large housing estate. It provides an escape for humans and is also a home to wildlife/threatened species. Spennells is already large/too large and is the largest estate in Wyre Forest. Why make it larger?</p>
	LPPO1845	Object	<p>A bypass road so close to the existing Spennells estate is a preposterous proposal; the diabolical row from fast moving traffic would be unbearable.</p> <p>A shame to lose the protected bats that dwell on the fields.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The skylarks are a wonderful asset that will also be lost</p> <p>The fields contain excellent barley growing soil</p> <p>Dog walking and recreational space is so vital to the existing Spennells, population.</p> <p>Taking all this into consideration the choice of Option A is totally out of the question</p>
	LPPO1855	Object	<p>Objection to proposed development to the rear of Spennells.</p> <p>Fields are used for exercise and observing nature locally including bats, building would be detrimental to the local wildlife.</p> <p>Services and schools oversubscribed and doctors' surgery is always busy.</p> <p>The traffic is already awful and the local infrastructure cannot support hundreds more cars. Only solution is an Eastern relief road, ripping up more Green Belt land, this is also an awful idea that should not be entertained for any reason.</p> <p>Developers want to maximise profit by building on Green Belt land to command higher selling prices for the houses they will build.</p> <p>There are several other sites that could be developed that aren't Green Belt. Say NO!</p>
	LPPO1859	Object	<p>Object to the proposed 'Option A' involving the building of 1735 new homes on land adjoining Spennells.</p> <p>We do not believe that there is a need for so many new homes in Wyre Forest, and feel that it would be sensible to wait until the Silverwoods site is completed an every property sold, and to utilise other brownfield sites such as Lea Castle.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The proposed development would create significant additional traffic on our already congested roads, causing pollution and frustration. This valued Green Belt land should be protected, and only lose its status if all other options are exhausted and it is really needed.</p> <p>There are few employment opportunities locally, so unless new industry is brought into the area, where would the occupants work? If they do not have employment then they will not be able to afford to buy these homes, but by then it will be too late.</p>
	LPPO1865	Object	<p>Objects to proposal to build on Green Belt land to the rear of Spennells.</p> <p>Main reason for objecting is due to the health benefits that access to the land gives to local people.</p> <p>The fields are used for exercise for young and older people, as a place to learn about wildlife and nature for children, a safe place where they can build confidence and be away from roads.</p> <p>Older people use the space for exercise and socialising to combat isolation.</p> <p>The area provides so many benefits to both physical and mental wellbeing and is easily accessible for local residents.</p>
	LPPO1879	Object	<p>Spennells estate is large enough. Unacceptable to extend it further and destroy open field lands. The environmental impact would be devastating. The area supports a vast variety of wildlife that would be lost for all time. These include insects, butterflies, plants, grasses, birds, mammals and amphibians. Larks losing another site to breed. The ecology would be destroyed.</p> <p>Many people walk this area to enjoy the wildlife and fresh green open space. Protect what we have now.</p> <p>All the extra traffic etc would impact on health, heavier air pollution. Asthma sufferers but it much more than just that.</p>
	LPPO1919	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spennells Estate is already a very large estate and does not need further expansion on to the Green Belt.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO1930	Object	We object to the proposal of the development which will cause huge problems to the environment and infrastructure of the Spennells Estate, in particular schools, medical facilities, shops, roads traffic congestion.
	LPPO1938	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spennells is set in lovely surroundings. • Facilities of the estate would not be enough if the development went ahead. • School is full to capacity. • Loss of Green Belt. • Very little work in Kidderminster currently - where will the influx of people work? • There are a number of empty shops and factories which could be put to use for living accommodation instead. • Object plans A&B as there is no sense in the developments.
	LPPO1945	Object	<p>I strongly oppose new houses on the fields at Spennells. Therefore I oppose option A.</p> <p>Do not believe that Wyre forest is expanding by such an amount and question the need for so many houses, other than for the council to receive a government payout for each dwelling built.</p> <p>It would put huge pressure on existing roads, schools, shops, doctors and dentists, the police and hospitals. I do not think that the infrastructure is there to support such a huge growth in population.</p> <p>The fields, which are part of the Green Belt for a reason, are enjoyed by huge numbers of people each day of the year. It inhabits a wealth of wildlife which would be disrupted.</p> <p>I believe that affordable housing could be built in other areas of Kidderminster and that enough land lies derelict on brownfield sites to cater for the population growth</p>
	LPPO1947	Object	<p>Object to development around Spennells. I walk there daily; it is both physically & mentally uplifting. Our estate will lose its identity if the fields were built on.</p> <p>Our town centre is practically dead. There is so much space there that could be built on without destroying our much</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			loved fields & all the wildlife that inhabits it. Why else are all our roads named after birds?
	LPPO1950	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to development at the rear of Spennells Estate. • Development would see wildlife lost.
	LPPO1954	Object	<p>We are writing to raise objections to the proposed further expansion along the southern edge of Spennells estate from the railway line to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</p> <p>We enjoy walking in the Green Belt land and have done so for the past 39 years. Many people from the community benefit from easy access to the public footpaths and rights of way alongside beautiful countryside. We enjoy meeting other residents walking dogs and pushing prams. Access to the countryside enhances wellbeing, physical and mental, and helps to promote community.</p> <p>The proposed area for development is very attractive countryside. There are woodlands, pools, streams, agricultural fields, hamlets, wildlife habitats, lanes with blackberries for foraging, and many varieties of birds. This is one of the most attractive parts of the Green Belt around Kidderminster.</p> <p>There are plenty of areas of Kidderminster which need to be improved and this is not one of those areas. Our preference would be more development on brownfield sites in the urban area.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre has been badly affected by poor historic planning decisions and now needs substantial investment. If additional housing is needed in the area, we would prefer for this to be concentrated on the town centre in order to provide investment and much needed improvements. A greater sense of community would be developed when compared with a satellite commuter suburb. Housing in the town centre would also encourage use of public transport, such as the train and walking, rather than more cars.</p> <p>The proposed development would also cause additional traffic congestion on already busy roads and would put additional pressure on already stretched public services, such as hospitals and schools.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO1969	Object	<p>I object to “Option A”</p> <p>I use these fields everyday,</p> <p>What happens to the wildlife that currently lives there?</p>
	LPPO1970	Object	<p>I object to both options A and B and core housing sites for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My property backs onto the A448 which is already a very loud and busy road. I am worried about the level of extra road noise in my garden. I have 2 small children who love to play outside and I believe this would have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of my family • Increase in traffic volume. The island at Stone Manor and Spinals Valley Road are both already heavily congested at peak times. • There is no evidence that this has been thoroughly planned and where this road would go to support the traffic from extra houses. • There are only plans to provide 1 extra primary school but no plans for any extra services such as doctors or another secondary school. • Loss of Green Belt. There are many brown site areas around Kidderminster sitting derelict and dangerous where houses could be built. Churchfields, old carpet factories in the town centre and the old Sion Hill School site to name a few. • The fields are a beautiful part of town they provide so much happiness to residents in and around Spennells as well as support wildlife and birds
	LPPO1973	Object	<p>Please registrar my objection to the planned use of Green Belt on Spennells Fields. The Hospital is already unable to cope, Doctors Schools are struggling, Railway and Station needs further development</p>
	LPPO1985	Object	<p>Our objections regarding Option A the building of 1735 dwellings between the Birmingham to Worcester railway line and the A448 Bromsgrove Road to the south of the Spennells Estate are as follows:-</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Objection 1</p> <p>Very few job opportunities in the area. The majority of the new residents will travel further afield for work i.e. the West Midlands area. Extra commuters will impact on the local environment because the only viable method of commuting is by car.</p> <p>The only industrial addition is an extension to the Easter Park site. This will only provide few warehousing and retail jobs. This is not an addition of facilities that will provide a large number of well paid jobs for the new residents.</p> <p>A local Kidderminster estate agent stated that there are large numbers of families that would like to move from the West Midlands to the Kidderminster area. Houses are being built to accommodate West Midlands overspill NOT extra housing needed for Wyre Forest residents. Extra housing should be located nearer to industrial areas where jobs are available, better for the environment with a reduction in the pollution from commuting cars.</p> <p>Objection 2</p> <p>If an extra 1735 houses are built the current road network in the Spennells area will not be able to cope with congestion and increased pollution at peak times.</p> <p>No current plans to improve the road network, the best option for residents is to drive towards Kidderminster town centre via Heronswood and Spennells Valley Roads and being that there are only currently two exits from Spennells this would lead to high traffic congestion.</p> <p>Because of this the development is not viable.</p> <p>Objection 3</p> <p>Another objection is effect on schools and recreation facilities in the area. No concrete plans to build extra school buildings or to improve recreational facilities. Without extra provision for schooling the additional homes are not</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>feasible.</p> <p>What is needed is a plan not just showing extra homes but also the infrastructure to support this plan (roads, schools and recreation facilities). The plan including this should be presented to county council and central government and then a plan presented to the current residents that shows new roads, schools etc. with time frames.</p>
	LPPO1998	Object	<p>I object to further building on the area between Spennells estate and Stanklyn Lane. This Green Belt area is so precious to people on the estate, it's a free social area where like minded folk meet daily for a breath of fresh air, relaxation and mental welfare. The wildlife there is beautiful, sky larks nest there, and the Corn Bunting bird which is extinct in Wales and Herefordshire is nesting and breeding there. The Green Belt should be protected for future generations.</p>
	LPPO2016	Object	<p>Objects to proposed development at Spennells and Stanklyn Lane for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of fields that are an important source of well-being for local residents. Fields are used extensively by local people for; relaxation, exercising, walking, jogging, dog walking, mindfulness and contemplation. • Increase in traffic. The noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes will result in a greater health risk, particularly to those living in the immediate area. • Strain on existing education providers. • Increase pressure on doctors, hospitals, dentists, police, fire and other services. • Result in the loss of the Green Belt area which protects the countryside and existing Public Rights of Way. • Result in the loss of wildlife including: Skylarks, swallows, linnets and other red-listed birds as well as squirrels, foxes and badgers. • Result in the loss of agricultural land. • Result in the loss of hedgerows, which are conservation areas, along Stanklyn Lane. • Result in the reduction of property prices in the surrounding area.
	LPPO2049	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt in these areas is thriving. The birds and hedgehogs and their habitats rely on all the hedgerows you intend to build over. • Residents use these fields daily to walk round with their children and dogs.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Spennells estate is already over populated. • The park for children is already too busy. • The facilities on the Spennells estate are too small to cope with more houses.
	LPPO2053	Object	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to the invasive expansion in Spennells area.</p> <p>Expansion on the Green Belt land is lazy, and done simply because it is cheaper and quicker, but it is utterly irresponsible. Green Belt expansion should only be developed as a last resort; these houses will not be affordable.</p> <p>Brown Field sites that are in need of renovation could serve far better as locations for new houses, for example the area of the old Leisure Centre at Stourport.</p> <p>Strain on local resources such as schools and doctor's surgeries.</p>
	LPPO2058	Object	<p>We object strongly to the above development. The area is unspoilt countryside (Green Belt) and benefits: views, walks, bike rides, dog walking, picnics and observing and appreciating the countryside. Greenfields are accessible to all. We are encouraged to do more exercise for our physical and mental wellbeing. Walking is a cheap and therapeutic form of exercise. Skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds are to be found in the fields</p> <p>The Green Belt is part of our heritage and our children's, once it has disappeared will not be restored.</p> <p>Relevant searches on the immediate area did not reveal plans for the abovementioned development, so why were we not told about the development by the council?</p> <p>How will people on average salary (£26,000) in Kidderminster be able to afford the executive homes which will be built on Green Belt land? People will buy them from further afield,</p> <p>Plenty of brownfield sites in Kidderminster and Wyre Forest areas, among them, former carpet</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>factories/warehouses, e.g. Tomkinsons Carpets at Churchfields, Bouchers Textiles Ltd on Green Street, Lionfields on Worcester Street and Sion Hill Middle School on Sion Hill. Possibly using the facades of the aforementioned buildings (if they have historical significance) and turning them into stylish yet affordable homes... If used for dwellings it would reduce car journeys and pollution. If brownfield sites used it will improve the local environment.</p> <p>Infrastructure has to be further developed. This will increase pressure on health services, schools, bus services and emergency services. This is a substantial argument for greater employment, but will local people get these jobs?</p> <p>Finally, if Green Belt is developed on, good quality agricultural land will be used up and "buying local" means buying from Herefordshire, Gloucestershire and further afield?</p>
	LPPO2061	Object	<p>I object to option A because it relies on the use of Green Belt land which should be kept for food production.</p> <p>The evidence on size of future population growth/new employment opportunities are unconvincing.</p> <p>Housing on the eastern side of Kidderminster in option A would end up as commuter suburbs and create overwhelming demand on public services.</p> <p>The eastern relief road, which forms part of option A, would funnel increased traffic from new housing onto the already busy A456, A448 and A449 roads esp. at rush hour.</p> <p>Option A offers very little 'affordable housing'.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre should be regenerated and more housing built there.</p>
	LPPO2088	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While there is a desirable need for town centre redevelopment, particularly in the retail area of Worcester Street, there is no logical sense to build new housing on the Spennells fields. • These fields, while serving the local agricultural economy have for many years provided the local community a place of recreation where people of all ages can relax and unwind from their ever increasing pace of life. • There is a rich abundance of wildlife thriving all year round. Birds, small insects, butterflies and wild flowers

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and plants all play a part in these fields. It is their habitat and must be allowed thrive without human interference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions for schools, hospitals, GP surgeries and other public services will be under further strain. • The road network even with a nearby relief road built will still suffer further congestion with Hagley and Halesowen taking the full brunt of commuter traffic between Kidderminster and Birmingham. The same will apply to commuter traffic from Stourport, Bewdley, Bromsgrove, Worcester and Wolverhampton etc. • The only bus service serving the Spennells is not a reliable service and it wouldn't be able to serve an expanded Spennells estate.
	LPPO2110	Object	<p>I am particularly objecting to Plan A and the Spennells' fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These fields are used daily for walking, cycling, horse riding, dog walking etc by people for a number of reasons such as recovering from illness/surgery, mental health problems, trying to keep healthy and lose weight, some just to socialise. It is a "feel good" aspect of living which is free. • The fields behind Spennells are used for agriculture. Less locally grown vegetables will mean having to import goods at a higher price, thus making us all poorer; this doesn't make sense to me in this unknown time of Brexit. • Then there is the wildlife on Spennells fields. • The impact of development on infrastructure such as the hospitals, local surgeries, schools. • Traffic - it can take up to twenty minutes to get off the Spennells estate when traffic is heavy. The proposed "relief road" will do nothing to help this, in fact it would probably become a rat run and become dangerous within this built up area. • Brexit will mean less immigration so we will need fewer houses.
	LPPO2158	Object	<p>I am writing to object to 'Option A' - the proposed development of houses on the Spennells fields.</p> <p>I use these fields every day to travel to and from work. I do this as a healthier option for me, and also a healthier option for the environment. Me and my family also regularly go for walks over the fields on the weekend to take in</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the beauty, fresh and wildlife this area has.</p> <p>By removing this area to use for housing it would mean we wouldn't have somewhere to go that is just on our doorstep. It would mean I may have to drive to work, rather than walk meaning an already congested road system around the area would be a lot more pressured.</p> <p>In addition removing Green Belt land which is already so precious in the area rather than using the Option B area, would mean a lot less Green Belt land lost. Surely this is a much better option for the environment and families around the Spennells area.</p> <p>My preferred option is Option B.</p>
	LPPO2167	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development is to facilitate the building of the Kidderminster ring road. The resulting bypass would increase traffic, raise noise and emission levels from exhaust fumes, a risk to the health of the local population. • Land is good agricultural land, also used for recreation or leisure purposes, Walking In the countryside offer huge benefit to health saving huge amounts of money and pressure on local healthcare services as a result. • Schools hospitals are already struggling. This plan would put added pressure on the existing education system in Wyre Forest. • Brownfield sites alone should be a good alternative to expansion of Spennells. Save our countryside ONCE ITS GONE IT GONE
	LPPO2169	Object	<p>Development is unnecessary and irrevocably damaging to the local environment. Why build on Green Belt land when there are brownfield sites such as The Lion Works” on Worcester Street, Boucher Textile Engineering Ltd on Green Street which could be made into apartments, keeping their façades in order to preserve their architectural historicity. Such buildings could actually be purchased by Kidderminster residents. Kidderminster residents could never afford proposed houses.</p> <p>Keeping the countryside is good for local tourism and economy; such as pubs and restaurants which are frequented</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>for their rural charm.</p> <p>Damaging as loss of the habitats of skylarks and linnets, and damaging to residents of Spennells, Stone and surrounding areas. Many use the fields for jogging, walks, picnics and dog walking. Walking is available to young, old, regardless of budget or socio-economic background. We're also being told to buy local British produce, but how can we do this if fields where crops are grown are being developed?</p> <p>Once this rural and unspoilt "green and pleasant land" is gone, it's gone. We must not and will not lose our beautiful English countryside for which our county and Indeed country is renowned.</p>
	LPPO2181	Object	<p>Object to development There are many Brownfield sites that could be developed. One example of these is a factory on Green street formally called Bouchers Textiles LTD.</p> <p>I use the fields at Spennells for walks with family, dog and friends.</p>
	LPPO2182	Object	<p>I object to the proposed expansion of Spennells in the Local Plan review. This objection is for to Options A, B and also the Core housing sites.</p> <p>My reasons for the objection are as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effects on health and wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Noise pollution from Increase the amount of traffic travelling along the A448. ○ Air pollution that will be caused by the construction of development between now and 2034. ○ Light and noise pollution that will be caused due to the number of houses in such a small area. • The eastern relief road should not still be under negotiation. Residents are not being provided with all the necessary information in order to make an informed decision. • Lack of infrastructure to support development – schools, hospitals, doctors, roads. • Increase in vehicle traffic. The roundabout at Stone Manor is already deeply congested at peak rush hour times development will cause further traffic congestion to this area. • Green Belt should be protected for future generations.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are more brownfield sites across Wyre Forest that should be considered prior to building on Spennells Green Belt land. Such as Churchfields, Sion Hill School and areas of Kidderminster town centre which have become abandoned and desolate.
	LPPO2197	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on Spennells Green Belt is unnecessary when there are plenty of brown field sites available. • Using brown field sites would help regenerate the town. • Regenerating existing sites will reduce the need for commuting and extra traffic on stretched infrastructure. • Spennells roads/Stanklyn Lane are already gridlocked. • Local schools are full.
	LPPO2233	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt and Urban Sprawl: Option A would take 2% of the area's Green Belt and would almost double the size of the Spennells estate. Green Belt should only be used in exceptional circumstances; it is to prevent urban sprawl. Inclusion of the Green Belt adjacent to the Spennells estate would join Spennells to Summerfield, Stone, Comberton and Offmore, a huge area of urban sprawl. I suggest that building west of Kidderminster should be take place instead. The expanded Lea Castle site should be fully developed for housing, with associated provision of a primary school, shops etc. The plan has not considered Blakedown. Parking at Kidderminster station cannot be expanded but there is scope at Blakedown. Consideration should also be given to building at Chaddesley Corbett and Wolverley, rather than focusing upon the area joining the east of Kidderminster. The plan should be revised to include this option.</p> <p>Loss of Agricultural Land: The area adjacent to Spennells is very good quality, agricultural land, currently being well farmed and yielding well. This year a fine crop of barley has been harvested from the central field (WFR/ST2) and the fields running from Captains Pool to Stanklyn Lane (OC/13) are currently growing acres of carrots. In past years potatoes, spring onions, peas and sugar beet have been grown, as would not be the case if the land were of lower quality.</p> <p>This very good quality and productive agricultural land, graded as high as any in Worcestershire should not be used for housing, it would be a crime. Where is food to come from if productive land is used for housing? Option B would</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>avoid building upon so much highly productive farmland.</p> <p>Traffic: Large scale development to the SE of Kidderminster would put increased pressure upon the existing roads. The A449, A448 and A456 are already full to capacity at peak times. The proposed Eastern link road would not solve this problem. Moving heavy traffic from one road to another would cause unacceptable noise and pollution from exhaust emissions in a residential area.</p> <p>The B450 already provides a link from the Worcester road to the Birmingham road. If the low railway bridge at Tortan was modified and the roundabout at Mustow Green improved then this route could be used for heavy traffic seeking to avoid Kidderminster.</p> <p>Full use of the extended Lea Castle site, as suggested in Option B, would not put additional pressure upon roads to the east of Kidderminster. Development at Blakedown would have good access to the A456 and the wider motorway system for those heading for work in and around Birmingham.</p> <p>Access to new development through Spennells would lead to existing traffic problems. At peak times there are already long tail backs at both entrances to the estate.</p> <p>Rail Transport: Housing adjoining the SE of Kidderminster would be too far from the railway station (1 hours walk or a greatly improved bus service). Is there to be additional parking at the new station? Why does the new station need to be so grand and expensive?</p> <p>Option B with development around the town centre would have much easier access to the station. Inclusion of Blakedown in the plan would give easy rail access.</p> <p>Physical and Mental Health Issues: The report raises concerns over the level of obesity within the local population. The footpaths and bridleways within the rural area adjoining the Spennells estate are regularly used by walkers, runners and cyclists seeking to remain fit and healthy. (Wear on footpaths bears witness to this.)</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Access to open countryside and the opportunity to engage with nature is a proven factor in maintaining and improving mental health.</p> <p>I and many like me have chosen to live on Spennells because of the semi rural environment that it offers. Option A would remove this facility by surrounding the estate with a built up area, increasing its size by 85% and making it a more stressful place to live.</p> <p>The report implies that walking and cycling to the town centre will improve the fitness of the population. This is not a realistic expectation for walkers because of the distance involved. Provision for cyclists is not good.</p> <p>I propose that the area adjoining Spennells should remain open countryside (Option B) and continue to be used by all to remain healthy. Provision for cyclists wishing to access Kidderminster town centre should be improved.</p> <p>Loss of Wildlife Habitat: Option A will have a detrimental impact upon wildlife. While the Spennells fields are not areas of great biodiversity, they with their associated hedgerows and the woods and lakes that they enclose, do provide extensive habitat for wildlife that lives and feeds within the area.</p> <p>I regularly see groups of fast flying Bats feeding over my garden and the fields at dusk. <i>In Britain all Bat species and their roosts are protected by British and international legislation.</i> I suspect that there may also be slower flying night feeding bats in the area. I am informed by an expert carrying out research into bat behaviour, that Bats use hedgerows to navigate, building would disrupt feeding patterns. Bats will be using the local pools to drink; lighting associated with housing would disturb them. Before any building takes place research into Bats in the area must take place.</p> <p>There are Badgers in the area. Badgers are fully protected by UK law.</p> <p>I have often heard Foxes in the fields.</p> <p>Skylarks constantly fly above their nests in the fields in Spring and Summer. <i>The skylark is a Red Listed endangered</i></p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><i>species, fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult skylark, or to take, damage or destroy an active nest. The only exception is farming practices that cannot be delayed, although farming methods can often be modified to reduce impact on the skylarks. Late harvesting of corn this year, beyond the end of July, has meant that second batches of young skylarks have had time to fledge.</i></p> <p>There are also Linnets, another Red listed bird, nesting in the area and wild geese feed upon the stubble fields in the autumn and winter.</p> <p>I have recently seen a Kestrel, another protected species, flying over Spennells fields and a neighbour has photographed it sitting upon her fence.</p> <p>I object to Option A as it would be unlawful in not protecting wildlife and does not encourage biodiversity, one of the council's objectives. Spennells fields should remain as agricultural land which supports wildlife.</p> <p><u>Schools and Medical Care and Crime Prevention:</u> Expansion to the SE of Kidderminster of the proportions proposed in Option A would put extra strain upon existing infrastructure. It is claimed in the report that a new school will be built to serve the area. Wyre Forest no longer provides new schools. Would an existing academy want to build a new Primary School? 1000 new homes need to be built before a school has to be provided. If just 700 new homes are built where do the children go to school? Where will children of High School age go, King Charles High School does not have room for expansion? The Council are committed to raising educational standards. Higher population would put additional pressure upon existing schools. Larger class sizes do not lead to rising standards. If local schools become full, children would need to travel further afield leading to more pollution from additional traffic.</p> <p>GP surgeries are already struggling to cope with case load. How would the health care of an expanded population be catered for? Worcester hospital is already unable to cope at times of high demand and Kidderminster hospital has been downgraded. Will more money be made available to increase hospital provision or is a poorer standard of care throughout the community to be expected?</p> <p>Expansion to the SE of Kidderminster will almost double the urban area. Greater density of urban areas leads to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more antisocial behaviour and higher crime figures. Will extra funds be available to increase the police force?</p> <p>Option B, with a more widely dispersed population and major expansion centred on the expanded Lea Castle site would result in less pressure upon the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Conclusion: I strongly object to the proposals laid out in Option A of the Draft Local Plan for Wyre Forest and support the proposals in Option B, as I feel that these best meet the needs of the local area and its people.</p>
	<p>LPPO2237</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to object to the Option A redevelopment as described in table 6.0.6.</p> <p>I believe the council’s fixation on an eastern relief road does not address the congestion issues experienced within Kidderminster town centre. Table 6.0.6 suggests that this road will reduce congestion on the Kidderminster ring road and Horsefair area which. Surely people living in all these new homes around Kidderminster will want to travel into the town centre via the current roads including the ring road to shop etc. An eastern relief road would do nothing in reducing this congestion.</p> <p>This table covers the expansion of new schools. If the council were to choose Option A then the table describes a requirement for 4x 1 form entry expansions to current secondary schools in Kidderminster. Has the Council fully considered this; our secondary schools are already full and there is not the funding/pace for this sort of expansion so pupils in Kidderminster will suffer from increased class sizes and less teaching support leading to lower exam results in the area.</p> <p>It would be most beneficial to concentrate funds on the regeneration of Kidderminster town centre and improve current infrastructure, before the strain of an increased population appears. By improving current infrastructure, like schools, the hospital and bus service then Kidderminster will become a more desirable area to live in and possibly result in increased demand for housing which would then warrant such a development as described in the preferred options document.</p> <p>Table 2.0.1: I wish to comment on this table in relation to the proposed redevelopment, known as option A.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The fields surrounding the Spennells Housing estate are used extensively by residents for activities such as (dog) walking, jogging and riding. I have found the fields to be perfect for jogging, improving both my physical and mental health. Table 2.0.1 in the council’s ‘Preferred options document’ states that the district has problems with high obesity levels; How does the council expect to reduce these levels when the only outdoor safe space for physical activity is taken away? Walking the dog in these beautiful fields also allows residents the time to reflect and get away from their stressful everyday lives. I believe this is very important in maintaining a positive mental outlook and makes Spennells a desirable place to live. By taking this away from the residents I believe Kidderminster will only continue to decline, and with Kidderminster hospital in the state it is in, only encourages an unhealthy population. Furthermore, point 8 of the plan objectives includes maximising ‘the benefits of walking and cycling’. Where are residents expected to enjoy these benefits with the redevelopment of this land?</p> <p>It is also imperative to consider the knock-on effect this change would have on the local wildlife in such a green and biodiverse area. Within the Spennells nature reserve we are fortunate enough to hold a population of Black Poplar trees. These are one of Britain’s rarest native species which are rapidly reducing in number, hence their protected status under Section 13 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. If the surrounding fields are no longer Green Belt then this species will not have the space it needs to reproduce and spread further.</p>
	LPPO2252	Object	<p>I would like to express my concerns about the draft Local Plan in particular Option A.</p> <p>Green Belt is a very valuable asset and although I accept that in some cases there may be marginal degraded areas within the Green Belt that could be removed from Green Belt status and usefully redeveloped this does in no way apply to the area between the Spennells and Stanklyn Lane. According to the National Planning Framework Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts, take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.</p> <p>There is no good case for removing this area from Green Belt status. Certainly there are no exceptional circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is high quality agricultural land. A light sandy soil with a south facing aspect the soil is quick to warm up in the spring giving crops a good head start and high yields. This is the sort of land we can ill afford to lose to production, especially with the prospect of leaving the EU in the near future we need to aim to be more self-sufficient in agriculture. • This is an area with high amenity value, the footpaths and bridleway are well used by walkers, with or without dogs, cyclists and horse riders. Not just from the immediate area. • Wildlife, the field margins provide a good habitat to a wide range of wildlife, recently the area has been teeming with butterflies. • Birds: This area supports a wide range of birds. In particular very large numbers of larks. Nationally this species is in decline so we can ill afford to lose habitats which support it. I would remind you that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined. Due to its importance such an assessment should definitely take place. <p>In my Opinion Option B is preferable.</p>
	LPPO2253	Object	<p>I have looked at the local plan review and I object to Option A, as it will use a greater amount of Green Belt land. This will have a dramatic effect on the wildlife in these areas, which once lost can never be enjoyed by future generations. Core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework are that ‘planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local plans should include strategic policies for the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment’ There is only one mention made about wildlife, this is the proposed Stourminster site and the badgers that live in the woods, though we have skylarks and other RSPB red-listed birds nesting in this Green Belt area. We also have bats and badgers, protected species, living in the core sites mentioned as well as on the other areas shown in Option A.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The Local plan states ‘As previously stated, there is insufficient sustainably located readily available brownfield or non-Green-Belt land to accommodate the necessary housing and employment growth required in the plan period’ I believe that there are sufficient readily available brownfield sites that can be used before we use the Green Belt land in either Option A or Option B. Of course, builders will prefer to use Green Belt land but we urgently need to regenerate parts of Kidderminster including the rest of Silverwoods, now it is not going to be used for the Emergency Services Hub, Worcester St, Bromsgrove St, Sladen School, Sion Hill School and Park Lane. All of these sites should be used for housing, before we use our Green Belt land. There are also brownfield sites available in Stourport e.g. Bewdley Rd.</p> <p>I object to Option A as it will mean creating a huge amount of housing on the eastern side of Kidderminster this will put pressure on the doctor’s and dentist’s surgeries and other facilities on this side of town. Planning officers stated that if Option A is taken then a primary school could be provided, this assumes that all children moving into these houses are below the age of 11. King Charles the only secondary school on the eastern side of town is already working on a split site causing problems for teachers and students in wasted time during the school day moving from upper site on Comberton Rd to lower site on Borrington Rd and vice versa. It will also lead to more traffic, air pollution and noise in this area.</p>
	LPPO2256	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are you not building on brownfield sites before using Green Belt sites? • Why not develop the derelict area in the town centre, for example Sion Hill, Sladen School, Worcester Street and knock down the old Post Office building and develop. Consider building in Blakedown instead. • Increase in noise, traffic and pollution from cars, it will become unsafe for me to play outside and will harm my mental health. • More pressure on local schools, class sizes will be more than the government recommended size, less resources and parents will be using cars to bring children to school so more pollution. • Wildlife will be lost which uses the fields as a source of food and grazing I'd linnets, dormouse and skylarks. The vast majority of the trees on this estate have Tree Preservation Orders on them, they need to be protected. • There will be a loss of agricultural land which is of a good quality. • Public right of way across the fields will be lost. This will affect my mental health and may lead to illness. • Further increase and pressure on doctors surgeries, hospitals, dentists and opticians including schools and

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the nursery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a loss of internet speed and quality. • Drainage issues as the fields are a soak away; the showers would lose water pressure. • Extra buses and traffic will be on the estate and will be a safety issue. • A lot of people use these fields to walk, run, meet friends, recuperate from illnesses, just to get a bit of fresh air, exercise. • Traffic congestion is already an issue as there is only one road on and off the estate, more pollution and more accidents.
	<p>LPPO2257</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I strongly object to option A on the following grounds:</p> <p>Kidderminster is historically a town with a carpet industry; which has declined in recent years leaving an unattractive town centre that has many vacant properties, with few shops that will encourage people to this area.</p> <p>If any building takes place on Green Belt this contravenes Government policy of keeping any urban sprawl to a minimum. If any building is carried out on the Green Belt land behind Spennells this will merge Kidderminster into Summerfield, Stanklyn and Stone thus creating a mass of houses. This is a semi- rural area and this boundary should be maintained at all costs.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells are farm land is Grade 2, the best Worcestershire has, as we prepare to leave the EEC we will have to provide more home grown crops for our UK population, we should be ring fencing this type of farmland for the future crop now so we can protect British jobs and reduce our imports and follow what has been suggested by central government becoming more self-reliant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees on the edge of Spennells are covered by the blanket Tree Preservation Order. These trees now over 50 years old should not be felled. • Bats, Skylarks and Badger sets are all present around the perimeter of Spennells and fields which are protected by British and European Legislation.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By not encouraging Bio diversity you are actually contravening the Councils Planning Policy statement 9. <p>Many people, not only the residents use these fields for a variety of leisure pursuits, walking, birdwatching, keeping fit and dog walking, running. Government / Local government are trying to encourage this in order to reduce NHS costs by encouraging a healthy lifestyle. Using the local countryside cuts down on vehicle emissions and helps with people’s health and well – being both physically and mentally. People would not tend to walk around the streets so this would be a detrimental step to health and well- being.</p> <p>If these houses were built it would put an extra 2000 / 3000 cars onto the road system in rush hour – our road system simply cannot cope with this extra traffic.</p> <p>Rush hour traffic at the viaduct island is already queuing up the Worcester road and this often starts before the children leave school in the afternoon, so what’s is it going to be like with a further 2000 houses being built.</p> <p>Access to these properties would have to come from behind Spennells due to volume of the extra cars & commercial vehicles and safety. Spennells cannot be used as a “rat run” for any new builds. This must not be allowed to happen.</p> <p>Drainage work has been carried out recently on parts of Spennells to help with insufficient drainage of the area. In the last 20 years Avocet Drive residents have been flooded several times as well as the area around Linnet Rise. If further building work is carried out then this will prevent any natural ground drainage thus creating the potential for further flooding in this area.</p> <p>Heronswood School cannot take any more pupils due to the lack of land.</p> <p>The town centre & surrounding area does not have enough to offer an increasing population, Doctors Surgeries, Dentists, Hospital, Police and shops need to be increased if the population is to expand. Further to this the hospital will need to have more services bought back to Kidderminster.</p> <p>My belief is that any new housing would only attract further people from the Birmingham area thus putting even</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more congestion on the over crowded roads for example Hagley, Halesowen Bypass, Bromsgrove & Worcester. As these roads would not cope, the extra traffic would find alt ways cutting through side streets etc. causing more pollution and safety issues for those local residents.</p> <p>If Option A goes ahead then all brownfield sites, abandoned buildings and all empty properties should be developed before any green field sites are touched. If building takes place on the Spennells fields it has to be sympathetic to the existing area with pollution kept to a minimum, speed/weight restrictions on any new roads and low intensity housing possibly using it for bungalows to allow the aging generation to downsize, freeing up the larger family homes that are already available.</p> <p>I strongly reject Option A.</p>
	LPPO2258	Object	<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed further expansion of Spennells and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>I walk my dogs here regularly, without access to this it would make life very hard for me & the dogs.</p> <p>I also use the road twice daily to commuted to work and the traffic is bad enough as it is queuing up to the roundabout at Stone....another 1735 new homes would cause major chaos on the road.</p> <p>This is not a good idea; the knock on effect will have far reaching consequences.</p> <p>As pointed out by Spennells Against Further Expansion, there are plenty of brownfields site within Kidderminster which would be a far more sensible option for regeneration.</p> <p>Please stop this madness and save our Green Belt!</p>
	LPPO2260	Object	<p>I object to option A of the Local development plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Kidderminster is historically a market town with a carpet industry. This industry has almost completely disappeared with an unattractive town centre that is full of empty properties, minimum shops that will encourage people to the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>area.</p> <p>If building takes place on Green Belt this contravenes Government policy of keeping the urban sprawl to a minimum. Historically urban sprawl policy has been to keep areas of Green Belt to minimise this. By building on the Green Belt behind the Spennells estate you will merge Kidderminster into Summerfield and Stanklyn stretching also to Stone. We are a semi-rural area and this boundary should be maintained.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells are Grade 2 farm land which is the best Worcestershire has. As we leave the EEC we will need to provide more home grown crops for the population, therefore we should keep valuable farm land for this purpose.</p> <p>When I visited the roadshow at Heronswood School no representative was available from Highways to discuss the proposed road. The local planning officers appeared or unwilling to answer any questions with a blanket response, “well it’s a draft plan we don’t know.”</p> <p>No information was forthcoming on how you propose to cross the railway or the type of road surface, lighting etc. that would be needed, other than it would serve the houses only no other traffic would use it.</p> <p>In my opinion this is not thought through at all as large lorries would use this to get to the Worcester Road to avoid the Black Bridge or vice versa with its height restriction.</p> <p>The implications of this road to Spennells residents are the following:</p> <p>Light pollution – lighting would be required, and as the road would be used by 44 ton trucks high, bright lighting would be needed especially as a bridge flyover would be needed to clear the railway line.</p> <p>Noise pollution – the increase in traffic would increase the noise in the area, the road surface would need to be of a type that keeps noise to a minimum.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Air pollution – this would be increased and is detrimental to health and well being.</p> <p>Environmental & Countryside grounds – this area at the present time has a number of trees that are on the edge of Spennells and are covered by the blanket Tree Preservation Order. These trees are over 70 years old and should not be felled. There are also Badger setts, Skylarks and Bats all of which are protected by British and European Legislation.</p> <p>By not encouraging biodiversity you are contravening the Councils Planning Policy statement 9.</p> <p>Health grounds – many people, not only residents, use the fields for a variety of leisure pursuits; walking, birdwatching, keeping fit and dog walking. The government and local government are trying to encourage this to reduce costs to the NHS. Using the countryside locally not only cuts down on vehicle emissions but helps with people’s health and well- being both physically and mentally. People would not walk around streets so this would be a detrimental step to health and well-being.</p> <p>At the moment congestion on Spennells at particular times can build up, if more traffic was accessing the newly built properties it would cause excessive problems. Therefore I do not think that if houses are built on the fields behind Spennells access should be from the existing Spennells area.</p> <p>Drainage work is currently underway on part of Spennells to help with insufficient drainage of the area. In the last 20 years Avocet Drive residents have been flooded several times as well as the area around Linnet Rise.</p> <p>Héronswood School would not be able to accommodate any more pupils due to the lack of land. This may have been hampered by the Council's lack of insight, had the Council built a middle school as well as a first school originally as they had planned this would have helped accommodate a greater number of pupils.</p> <p>The town centre and surrounding area does not have enough to offer an even greater population, Doctors Surgeries, Dentists and shops need to be increased if the population is to expand along with more services being bought back to the local hospital which in hindsight should never have been down-graded, but again local people were side-lined and ignored on local issues. I do however wonder where this population increase will come from as the growth of</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the Wyre Forest has not been overly large and I question whether the figures being given are a true reflection of the population growth we can expect as the figures quoted by Wyre Forest appear to be much higher than those proposed by other Government departments.</p> <p>I am also concerned that we are being used as an overflow of the Greater Birmingham area, this incoming population would not be working locally but Kidderminster would become a commuter town to Birmingham and surrounding areas. The road infrastructure to areas beyond Wyre Forest is already congested so I would question what measures are being put in place to upgrade roads to Hagley, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Worcester, and Bromsgrove to access the motorway systems.</p> <p>In summary I would say that until Kidderminster has a thriving shopping area, employment through local industry we should be very careful about building housing to accommodate another areas overflow, particularly as reports are now showing that as we withdraw from Europe many people are returning to their own homelands, so we could end up with empty properties built on the Green Belt thus losing valuable farm land forever.</p> <p>Should option A go ahead I feel we should insist that all brownfield and empty properties should be developed before any green field sites and if building takes place on the Spennells fields it should be sympathetic to the existing area with pollution kept to a minimum, speed/weight restrictions on any new roads and low intensity housing possibly with this land used for bungalows which would allow the aging generation to move from larger homes to allow younger families to have the larger family homes already available.</p> <p>For the above reasons and my belief that building should be kept within the footprint already here I prefer option B and object to option A.</p>
	LPPO2263	Object	<p>I write in relation to the Local Plan Review Consultation for Spennells estate in Kidderminster. I would like it known I strongly object to Option A and Option B.</p> <p>I shall outline my reasons below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be an increase in traffic, noise and pollution from cars. This will have a detrimental effect on our

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>mental health and wellbeing. Unsafe for our children to play out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be an increased pressure on local schools. The class size will become too large and there would be fewer resources available to the students. Parents will have to bring their children to school in their car; again which will have an increase in pollution. • There is a good variety of wildlife in the area which will be lost, that nest on the fields i.e. Linnets, Skylark, dormouse etc. Wildlife should be protected. Also a lot of the trees on Spennells have preservation orders on them. Impact on the wildlife which feeds and grazes the land is to be protected. • It will have a loss of agriculture land which is of a good quality. • There is a public right of way on these fields which would be lost, which would contribute towards our mental health. • There would be a large increase in pressure on already stretched services for Doctors surgeries, hospitals, dentists and opticians, school and nursery on Spennells. • These fields are an important/integral part of the Spennells estate as a lot of people use the fields in a variety of ways. For instance, just going out for a stroll, walking their dog, riding/training their horses, children playing, running/jogging training, to recuperate from illness, exercise and interaction with friends for a walk and chat. • There is already an issue with traffic trying to get off Spennells during the day, this new development will only make matters a lot worse, more accidents can occur. There will be an increase in noise and car pollution which again has an effect on mental health. Extra pressure on our roads, more potholes to fill in after winter, heavy congestion. • Loss of internet speed and quality. • Extra busses and traffic which will be a safety issue for adults and children alike. • There will be drainage issues as the fields would be a good resource for soak away, showers will lose pressure.
	LPPO2265	Object	<p>Please find below my views and consequential objections to Option A for large scale development of fields adjacent to Spennells.</p> <p>As a layman in these situations it is my understanding however that planning policy should not conflict with adjacent</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>land use and there must be no adverse effect on existing properties typically in terms of overlooking, loss of light, noise or other disturbance such as existing enjoyment of property and the loss of well used recreational spaces for all ages.</p> <p>This proposed high density development will in no doubt adversely affect the intrinsic environmental value and rural character of the local landscape and as such will cause serious harm to the local wildlife with specific reference to birds of ‘conservation concern’ of which there are species of ‘Red Listed’ status nesting in these fields. It may also be the case that the Governments own National Planning Policy Framework could be compromised in terms of the loss of recreational areas, checks on unrestricted sprawl, wildlife and regulations that keep our air clean.</p> <p>The proposed scope of this development is on such a vast scale it will clearly dominate the local area and in turn significantly impact on the existing Spennells estate especially as the proposed feeder road is allegedly planned to run between the A449 and the A458 behind existing housing. Whilst there appears to be no current detailed information regarding the feeder road I am assuming that at some point the existing Spennells roads ending adjacent to the fields could well be opened up giving the new development access to the Spennells estate.</p> <p>As stated above, this development will result in the loss of the natural environment and the eradication of available and accessible open space and its consequential effects and also the loss of good quality productive food producing agricultural land. This is not poor Green Belt land; it has enormous value in many ways and should be preserved at all cost.</p> <p>If the proposed Option A development were to be approved, it would create a poor precedent and as such make it difficult for the Planning Appeals Commission for instance to refuse similar developments on green field sites. It is not just a case of trying to incorporate local concerns into the designs for such a vast project but perhaps more the case that the development concerns cannot be ‘designed out’.</p> <p>It should be recognised that the cumulative impact associated with any such vast singular development severely affects the character of the area and the resultant overload of local services including but not limited to, local schools, hospitals, doctors, fire services, public transport etc. Tourism and commercial development could also be</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>adversely affected if visitors and business find the Kidderminster area impossible to negotiate.</p> <p>Road safety has been at the forefront of local concern for quite some time now and speeding especially in the Spennells area seems to get worse year on year. With a potential for many hundreds of additional vehicles trying to negotiate Kidderminster’s already crowded roads, the grid lock conditions currently the norm at rush hour, will only increase current problems not least of all the exhaust fume emissions. It seems ludicrous therefore to propose nearly 2000 new homes and associated vehicles into an already congested co2 and noise polluting urban traffic system.</p> <p>With the general trend of devolution of Central Government responsibility, many important decisions on open spaces are now being made at a local level whilst still hopefully maintaining government policies on preserving open spaces. Whilst local authorities may gain from financial contributions intended to be spent on offsetting the effects of such new developments it should not be the driving force behind this vast development. Councillors must push back against all proposals for Option A regardless of any potential accusations from senior officials of being ‘anti growth’.</p> <p>It seems to me that Option B is by far the most viable proposal as it clearly allows the dispersal of new build homes across the district and allows much needed improvements to existing roads and infrastructure, area regeneration and in some cases neighbourhood revival of local families with ties and supportive social networks in the area.</p> <p>I would suggest that the Option A proposal must not succeed for the many good and valid reasons given.</p>
	LPPO2266	Object	<p>Social issues: The proposed Option A has a disproportionate negative impact on the residents of Spennells and increase the size of Spennells by 87%. Option A will encourage localized sprawl, and the merging of Spennells to Offmore & Comberton. The linear approach of the option will result in amalgamating two estates with very different characteristics. Spennells has very little green space per resident for recreational use such as physical exercise, cycling and off lead dog walking. It would be inappropriate for dogs to be off lead close to the children’s play area, which is also close to the main Spennells Valley Road. Street walking ensures all are at the emissions level of any passing vehicle, therefore consideration for increase in respiratory diseases such as asthma must be given. Otherwise it is a car journey to Hartlebury, Habberley, Hurcott or further afield to take a dog for a walk – with increased congestion on the roads and additional emissions.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Green space is necessary to promote physical and mental wellbeing for all generations. The fields to the south of Spennells provide a huge recreational resource for the residents of Spennells, Stone, Stanklyn, Summerfield, Hoo Road, Aggborough, Hill Grove, Oldnall Road. The fields are used by ramblers, ornithologists, photographers, star gazers, cyclists, joggers, horse riders, dog walkers, children, families, and the elderly. The fields encourage a community spirit, which was very publicly highlighted by the protest march to the Town Hall.</p> <p>The LPR identifies the benefits of Green Belt space and the problems faced with modern society - mental wellbeing, obesity, general ill health - then appears to begrudge the residents of its very existence. I know many people who use the fields for exercise to help with medical conditions. This is a free resource, one that is costing the NHS nothing.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter town on the southern flank of Kidderminster will be divisive for the town, as Kidderminster town centre is in desperate need of rejuvenation. If funding to improve housing and small retail units within the town centre is continually overlooked, it will become the future slums – only encouraging existing crime to escalate. A lack of policing within Kidderminster is already a problem, with needles to be found in all parks and drinking on the streets prevalent. The residents of the proposed commuter estate will be encouraged to shop in Birmingham / Worcester and their money spent outside Kidderminster’s local economy. Such residents will be disengaged from Kidderminster. I believe Option A sets a precedent to place affluence above need within Kidderminster. Such a blinkered approach will lead to a rise in tension within the community, which is already evident on social media.</p> <p>Environmental Impact: The environmental impact of releasing the Green Belt for development is huge. Two thirds of Green Belt land, is of high value, agricultural land. The London School of Economics supported by the NEA (National Ecosystem Assessment) agree that Green Belt land is high value agricultural land, both in terms of food production and ‘cultural services’. The ramifications of Brexit are yet to be felt and the future population growth of the UK very uncertain. Now more than ever the UK needs to hold on to productive agricultural land to ensure consistent food supplies. The land to south of Spennells/Kidderminster is identified as some of the best (most productive), agricultural land within Wyre Forest. We must also look at food miles and carbon footprint.</p> <p>Green Belt space provides the lungs of the planet – climate change makes the value of Green Belt even higher. It is an important factor in the storing of carbon; prevention of flooding and soil protection.</p> <p>The fields to the rear of Spennells play host to a plethora of wild life Bats, Badgers – there are active sets within two of the fields. Corn Buntings, Skylarks both of which are red listed birds. Waxwings that winter visit have been</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>photographed. My list could be endless and is supported by Worcestershire Biological Records Centre.</p> <p>Economic impact: PFI's (Private Finance Initiatives), and their scandalously high interest rates have ensured hospitals across the UK have debts that are beyond their control, none more so than 'CRISIS-HIT' Worcestershire Acute Hospital Trust, which has just been named one of the worst trusts in the country for A&E waiting times. This alongside the down grading of Kidderminster Hospital has now put existing resident's lives at risk. Worcestershire Hospital Trust will not be able to support the Pro-Growth Agenda actively pursued within the LPR and supported by WFDC.</p> <p>Doctors are under pressure to take up any existing slack from the hospital service – appointments requiring a weeks notice in some cases. There is a shortage of trained Doctors. So where will funding come from to extend existing practices or Doctors to open new practices? This argument extends to NHS Dentists.</p> <p>Educational standards within WFDC are lower than national average. 1000 homes required before a feeder school built. The LPR implies the 6000 'required homes' will be phased in over the time span covered by the LPR, averaging 360 homes per year. This potentially takes us up to a three year period of (continual) development on one site before additional school requirement is deemed necessary – then put out to tender. Shoehorning children into existing schools will only mean fewer resources per capita and poorer learning outcomes. Children from Silverwoods development are currently attending Heronswood Primary School. A distance that requires a car journey – not only adding to congestion on the estate during peak traffic times, but poorer health outcomes for children not being able to walk to school – perhaps we need to revisit obesity here! We currently have a population bulge within primary schools. These children will all need to receive higher education and at present that provision will again be met by existing secondary schools operating at full capacity. Where will additional children be educated? Portacabins?</p> <p>GCSE results in Wyre Forest are lower than national average, standards in schools need raising not diluting by increased pressure.</p> <p>In-migration will add to the pressure of Wyre Forest's frontline services. If finances can't provide a safe level of cover now it is blinkered to believe more housing equals more tax for better services, because more tax equals more people and more people equals more demand - status quo.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter estate with a road that provides a direct corridor to Birmingham, Worcester and associated Motorways will ensure money from the south of Kidderminster will not be spent within the local</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>economy. There is very little to draw people into the town centre and it is not true to say online shopping is the cause. Lincoln and Leicester are good examples of how to manage a vibrant community - independent, small, eclectic shops working alongside flagship stores despite the availability of online shopping. Stourport and Bewdley are more vibrant than Kidderminster. Even Hagley manages to support the village centre.</p> <p>The LPR highlights the need to market Kidderminster as an attractive tourist destination to encourage money into the local economy – an over developed visual approach on the south-eastern flank to Kidderminster will not achieve this.</p>
	<p>LPPO2279</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending. • <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990’s and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the congestion that already exists. • <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity. • <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>rural areas. Worcestershire’s Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school. • <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion</u> and sprawl at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land. • <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals. • <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall. • <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely. • <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited. • <u>Good place to live</u> – this proposed development does not enhance my surroundings or improve my place to live.
	LPPO2280	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending. • <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990’s and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>congestion that already exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity. • <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more rural areas. Worcestershire’s Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk. • <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school. I have to drive a lot for my job and this will not help my journey time or experience. • <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion and sprawl</u> at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land. • <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall. • <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees. • <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely. Already happens on the Estate in certain places. • <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited. • <u>Good place to live</u> – I have lived here since 2001 and have regularly used this field for exercise/running. This development will not improve the place where I live.
	LPPO2281	Object	I am particularly concerned to make representations concerning the Council’s Option A, requiring the massive re-designation of valuable Green Belt land to the south-east of Kidderminster and to make reference to the Council’s

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>stated objectives.</p> <p><u>Objective: To determine where houses are to be sited.</u> This objection, to the Council’s apparent preference of Option A as its selected area for major development, clearly shows why this option is the lesser appropriate of the 2 choices offered for public review. It also suggests that there are various other potential alternative sites, available to relieve pressure on the Council to re-designate Green Belt for housing and infrastructure. Incidentally, it’s common practice for planners to avoid urban development across ridges into valleys, in order to take account of visual intrusion into surrounding countryside. The existing Kidderminster boundary is so screened from Summerfield. Selection of Option A would extend the boundary into the valley occupied by Stanklyn Lane, with the next ridge being a further half mile, or so, away at Shenstone. That visual intrusion could be seen as unacceptable to Summerfield residents, who will quite reasonably wish to perpetuate separation of their village from the town, both physically and visually. The mere nature of a mega-estate with little or no open space makes it environmentally unattractive and, as such, that prospect should be avoided.</p> <p><u>Objective: To provide necessary Infrastructure (transport, schools, health etc.)</u> Consideration has to be given to the significant needs and the problems emanating from planned urban expansion including (a) the need for new surgeries and the lack of qualified doctors/nurses, (b) similar considerations for dental and other health services, (c) Hospital provision (Worcestershire Royal is already at breaking point), (d) a really substantial increase in the need for school places (new developments always attract young families), (e) the current lack of local bus services and the apparent inability to improve the situation, etc. Importantly, it has to be established if it’s practical to provide these services and if Government money will be made available, as the cost, which will undoubtedly increase substantially over the period of the Plan, should not be borne by the local purse. The practicality and affordability of providing (a) road access, (b) gas supplies at required pressure - already low at peak times, (c) electricity, (d) water and sewerage, remain questionable – there’s been little change since the existing Spennells Estate was developed and previous investigations considered by Tribunal identified that such works can be potentially problematical and costly. If Option A were to be selected:</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road access will present a particular problem, (see also *** below). • There’s every possibility that ‘Severn Trent Water’ would still have “supply difficulties which would cause financial problems” • The cost and practicality of contract works, and the adequacy of the water table to supply water to a massively extended Spennells Estate, will presumably need to be determined. • The difficulty of dealing with surface water is another issue, requiring investigation. It’s believed there’s no natural drainage from the valley surrounding Stanklyn Lane and that the ‘run off’ from the proposed development would simply exacerbate the problem. • Existing foul sewers are unlikely to have the capacity to handle sewerage from a vastly expanded estate. It’s understood there’s a small ‘pumping station’ in Summerfield (Wychavon) but, it’s probable that entirely new contract works, with related costs and difficulties, will be necessary. • Broadband has now become a further consideration. <p><u>Objective: To avoid traffic congestion and resulting health and nuisance issues.</u></p> <p>There should be no need for new motorways and trunk roads, but simply to improve communications to resolve local issues.</p> <p>In this context, any proposal for development of Green Belt between Spennells, Stone and Summerfield is premature. It is questionable as to how the proposed site can be served by roads. There are two road exits from the existing Spennells Estate on to Spennells Valley Road which, at times, are already heavily congested. These exits could not possibly cope with a massive expansion of the estate, which would simply exacerbate existing traffic problems and certainly not provide safe pedestrian and vehicular access. Any decision to select Option A, therefore, should not be concluded until it can be established that additional access is both practical and affordable.</p> <p>It’s reasonable to submit that further development of Spennells would require a completely separate road network. The only obvious alternative being access from Stanklyn Lane, which is not practical, as the existing junction with Worcester Road is already dangerous and inadequate for present needs. Access to the Bromsgrove Road is understood to have similar difficulties.</p> <p>It can only be assumed that the Council’s plans are reliant upon the future potential for the construction of the long-postponed Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, which would require massive expenditure, including for the bridging of the railway from Worcester Road. The financing of any such project would be the responsibility of Worcestershire</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>County Council and, presumably require Government financing. Recognising that available finance is extremely difficult to secure and that the Government has many other major priorities, it has to remain in doubt as to whether such a major project would receive the necessary backing.</p> <p>It goes without saying that increased volumes of traffic = more emissions = more illness and early deaths, noise pollution, vehicular and pedestrian hazards, nuisance etc. The Council's planning does not appear to have addressed this problem, which has no obvious solution.</p> <p><u>Green Belt is valued</u></p> <p>The countryside (particularly Green Belt), is a valuable asset in its own right. It should be safeguarded, and indeed restored where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economy of Wyre Forest is to a large extent dependent on tourism and the District's natural environment is part of its attraction. • The Worcestershire Wildlife Trust is aware that the land designated for Option A has, for many years been habitat for nesting skylarks and more recently to substantial flocks of corn buntings, varying numbers of wintering fieldfares, redwings and waxwings. Song thrushes have returned, as have linnets, house sparrows and starlings, all of which appeared amongst the 67 species identified on a recent 'Red List' of endangered species. Even the herring gulls we see in our fields are on that list. We are also privileged to share our local area with swallows, goldfinches, greenfinches, chaffinches, siskins, jays, carrion crows, rooks, nuthatches, dunnocks, great spotted and green woodpeckers, kestrels, buzzards, tawny owls, and other bird species. The area is also home to various moth and butterfly species, most of which are in serious decline, foxes, badgers, rabbits and, importantly, bats ... a really fantastic biodiversity to protect! • The Green Belt provides a buffer zone between the large urban areas and the pleasant surrounding country residential areas of Stone and Summerfield. • Retention of Green Belt avoids the possibility of the whole area becoming a built up urban sprawl. • It's an invaluable asset for public recreational use – Healthy exercise and relaxation, use of the bridle path and public rights of way for walking, jogging/running, , horse riding, dog walking, nature /bird watching etc. and simply the peaceful enjoyment of open 'green space'. • Agriculture – It was confirmed in writing, some years ago, but nevertheless still relevant, that most of the land in question (Option A), had been surveyed by the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food and had

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>been classified as “Grade 2, with a small proportion falling within Grade 3a”. It was then made clear by the Ministry that this land is “of a high quality and should be retained in agricultural production”.</p> <p><u>Objective: The protection of, and support for the role of the Green Belt - limited strategic release.</u></p> <p>The Green Belt is an important aspect of regional planning. The Council has had a Green Belt Review carried out by Planning Consultants, as part of the Wyre Forest Local Plan. It’s apparent however that, until recently, there’s been no public consultation on this issue. Every effort should be made to retain this important asset for the District. The Green Belt gives legal protection to the English countryside, whilst avoiding urban sprawl, notwithstanding the significant pressures being put on Councils to provide for unrealistic housing and infrastructure. The Council’s planning, so far as it relates to Option A, makes no attempt to achieve its stated objective of a “limited strategic release”. It is indeed planning for the wholesale destruction of a most valuable, local asset. N.B. If this plan were to go ahead, there would be little, if any, remaining Green Belt where Kidderminster (Wyre Forest) adjoins the District of Wychavon.</p> <p><u>Access to Option A and other potential alternatives</u></p> <p>If, and only if, all other avenues have been investigated and it is established beyond doubt that there is no other alternative than to remove some selected areas from Green Belt protection, it will be entirely preferable for the burden to be shared, so far as possible. All interested parties will have some empathy with the efforts of other groups to protect their local environment and most will have persuasive representations. However, the foremost considerations in such circumstances must essentially be the comparative practicality and cost of constructing access to the selected land and the provision of related infrastructure. In selecting Option A, the Council is gambling on the most unlikely prospect of a massive injection of Government money to finance the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road.</p> <p><u>Objective: To give due consideration to Nature protection issues.</u></p> <p>Clearly the proposed development of massive areas of countryside, including Green Belt to the south and east of Kidderminster, takes very little consideration for the protection of nature in this area. It simply suggests that other areas may have been given more favourable consideration. The value to nature of the land designated as Option A, particularly to endangered species of birds and bats, is the subject of earlier comment. To develop this land will,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>therefore, be counter-productive in achieving the Council’s objective.</p> <p><u>Objective: To help resolve traffic issues in Kidderminster by providing an alternative route for through traffic and enhancing rail services.</u></p> <p>Comments concerning the reliance on Government funding and the lack of any certainty regarding the construction of the long-planned Kidderminster Eastern Relief road are given above. The Council should re-address this objective. The rebuilding of the Rail station at Kidderminster will result in a much better image for the town, as will a new bus station on Comberton Hill. It will, however, be much more difficult to persuade rail operators to enhance the quality and regularity of services and the cost of public transport generally is offputting. Neither rail nor bus services are relevant to the objections included in this communication.</p> <p>The local traffic issues on Spennells have been created by the excessive use of land for housing and past failure to plan adequate vehicular access for such a large residential area. To proceed with plans to develop Option A without planning an entirely new road access, irrespective of proposals for through traffic, will simply exacerbate the problem and, for that reason, any consideration of this option is premature.</p> <p><u>Summary</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents may be forgiven for believing that local planning is bureaucratic and unproductive and, that their participation is unlikely to make a difference. Since the widespread loss of valuable agricultural land was identified after World War II and the Town & Country Planning Act of 1947 established rules for the long term protection of farmland and the monitoring of planning decisions, land loss to urban sprawl has continued at an increasingly alarming rate. That will, if allowed to continue, decimate most of the Country’s green spaces. This ‘creeping’ phenomenon is now seriously threatening quality of life in Wyre Forest and must be addressed. It cannot be reasonable for planning ‘blight’ to continue enforcing one new housing development after another, each leapfrogging over the last incursion into Green Belt, ad infinitum. • Spennells was originally planned in the late 1970’s/ early 1980’s, as a ‘village type’ development. In subsequent years, however, this ambition has got completely out of hand. Further expansion and consequent deterioration of residents’ quality of life is, in itself unacceptable but, where does this stop? Continuing development is self-perpetuating. It goes without saying that more roads/industry/housing = more population = more development = more need for development land, ad infinitum. It’s important therefore, for planners to keep expansion under control and take account of the damage being done to a

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>desirable residential district by an over-indulgence in the use of tarmac, concrete, bricks and mortar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The National Planning Policy Framework, as the main statement of Government policy, explains that Green Belt is fundamentally designed “to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open”; the essential characteristics being “openness” and “permanence”. Any decision to remove that “permanent” protection should only be considered therefore, in the most exceptional circumstances. It has to be recognised that, once Green Belt protection is lost and land developed, it can never be returned to the countryside. Indeed, the loss of that protection simply puts under threat the next area of our countryside environment. Green Belt protection should therefore be the first consideration of any Local Authority’s Structure Plan. • No Green Belt land should be lost unless it can be shown beyond doubt that there’s an imperative need which cannot be resolved in any other way. The land designated as Option A has been previously proposed by the County Council for re-designation but after due consideration by Planning Tribunal has retained its protected status. • The existing Green Belt in Wyre Forest and, specifically that between Spennells Estate, Summerfield and Stone has functioned well for the last 35/40 years or so and, has continued to achieve its objectives. , • Should it be established beyond doubt that there is no alternative than to plan for selective development of Green Belt, there are more suitable alternatives to Option A, including those designated as ‘core’ sites. The main considerations are (a) ease of access (b) uncertainty of the availability of Government finance, (c) fewer problems in providing infrastructure/services and, (d) relative development costs. • Wyre Forest District Council was successful in supporting the Spennells Valley Residents’ Association, in 1983, when objecting to the County Council’s Structure Plan proposal to remove from the Green Belt the land now designated as Option A. There has been much changed in the meantime but, if the District Council is to press on with its apparent preference for development of Option A, residents should have sight of the Council’s objections to the Hereford & Worcester County Structure Plan, for which an Examination in Public was held in October 1983. There will undoubtedly be continuing issues even after the passage of time. <p>And finally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of Green Belt is of much greater value than that of open countryside.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2282	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending. • <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990’s and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the congestion that already exists. • <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity. • <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more rural areas. Worcestershire’s Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk. • <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school. I have to drive a lot for my job and this will not help my journey time or experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion</u> and sprawl at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land. • <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals. • <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall. • <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees. • <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Already happens on the Estate in certain places.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited. • <u>Good place to live</u> – I have lived here since 2001 and have regularly used this field for exercise/running. This development will not improve the place where I live.
	LPPO2283	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending. • <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990’s and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the congestion that already exists. • <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity. • <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more rural areas. Worcestershire’s Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school. • <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion and sprawl</u> at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land. • <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals. • <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees. • <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely. • <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited. • <u>Good place to live</u> – this proposed development does not enhance my surroundings or improve my place to live.
	LPPO2291	Object	<p>Why use green fields when there are Brownfield sites which will help regenerate Kidderminster.</p> <p>Houses are required but with this comes more schools, health facilities and roads. Green Belt must be protected for the future.</p>
	LPPO2292	Object	<p>Concern regarding Spennells, we use the proposed areas for jogging. Dog walking; relieve stress, bridle paths for to ride horses.</p> <p>More houses would affect the local primary school by increasing class sizes and reducing resources per student, they are already stretched now.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, loss of wildlife habitat, skylarks, linnets, badges, hedgehogs and field mice.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Increased pollution both noise and emissions from heavier traffic which will increase the risks to our health and well being.</p> <p>It is good quality agricultural land which should be used to grow food reducing our carbon footprint.</p> <p>Alternative land should be found as there are plenty of unused, derelict properties and grounds that could be used instead for homes instead of destroying countryside.</p>
	LPPO2293	Object	Object to the proposal to develop Green Belt land at Spennells. Will exacerbate already bad traffic congestion; ruin the countryside which is extremely important for physical and mental wellbeing. Please consider the wider impact on people than meeting government targets.
	LPPO2294	Object	Object to the proposals at Spennells fields being built upon. It would cause terrible congestion, stop walkers enjoying the countryside; and destroy wildlife.
	LPPO2299	Object	I do not think the benefits of easier school provision and eastern bypass option outweigh large scale expansion east of Kidderminster.
	LPPO2300	Object	<p>I object to proposed development at Spennells (Option A).</p> <p>We use these fields.</p> <p>Green Belt land - original purpose of Green Belt, was to contain sprawl of urban development and provide green space between towns.</p> <p>Health and wellbeing of residents. Childhood obesity is on the rise, we should encourage children to stay active and healthy by taking regular exercise.</p>
	LPPO2304	Object	We have regularly used the footpaths from Spennells to Stanklyn Lane, Stone and Captains Pool to relax, walk, jog, cycle and see the wildlife, hedgerows and the agricultural crops. The loss of the Green Belt fields would severely affect our wellbeing and quality of life. Whilst respecting the need for housing developments I believe that this part of the Green Belt, with its strong links to the local community, must be protected.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>I do not believe, for the following reasons, that the south east of Kidderminster, in particular the fields between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells, are a suitable or sustainable location for urban expansion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WFDC housing strategy in the Preferred Options Document is driven by a desire to build a Kidderminster eastern relief road. It is of concern that the road proposal is not contained in the WFDC 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2012)' and that there has not been any visible planning and public consultation for it. The desire for a new road has placed a bias on the proposal for housing developments to the south and eastern side of Kidderminster (core and option A) whilst disregarding other potential areas to the north and outer regions of the town. WFDC are using the government housing demands with potential funding from the housing contractors to remake their case to government for a relief road, regardless of the impact of such a development and road near to existing communities. This appears to be a backdoor approach to planning and shows a total disregard for the communities affected. • The land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane is of the highest agricultural quality in the Kidderminster area and is well managed. The Preferred Options Document is in error as it states that the land is of poor agricultural quality and poorly managed. • The fields between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane are in the Green Belt and combine good agricultural land with a multitude of footpaths, bridle paths and hedgerows. The elevated position also provides views of Stone Church, the Abberley Hills, Habberley, the Clee Hill, the Brown Clee and across Kidderminster. The footpaths and bridle ways are well worn and used extensively by Spennells, Stanklyn, Stone and Summerfield communities for walking, jogging, cycling, dog walking and horse riding. They are also accessible for people of all ages. Loss of this Green Belt would deprive the community of a much used and valued open space, essential for their health and wellbeing in this age of stress and obesity. • If the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane are built on then accessible open spaces for residents will be lost as the Green Belt to the south of Stanklyn lane does not have public access. • Building on this elevated area of Green Belt would have a significant visual impact on Spennells Summerfield and Kidderminster alike, particularly for those residents who are adjacent to the Green Belt. • The elevated position of the fields has caused flash flooding to Spennells residents on two occasions to my knowledge. Building on the fields could increase the risk. • The Spennells community is large and further expansion could not be accommodated by the school. The school acquired the community hall to accommodate current levels of intake.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic congestion during Spennells School opening and closing times is already high, further housing development would render this intolerable.
	LPPO2306	Object	<p>Object to proposed development on Green Belt land between Spennells Estate, Stanklyn Lane, A448 and the A449.</p> <p>Spennells is one of the largest estates in the Wyre Forest area, but because of the fields and footpaths everybody can walk into countryside. There are no public footpaths south of Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>New relief road will add to pollution and traffic around Kidderminster making the A449 even busier. Often long queues starting before the Black Bridge. Encourage lorries to stay on the motorway and not head for Kidderminster.</p>
	LPPO2312	Object	<p>Option A. Building on fields at Spennells. Locals and others enjoy walking, walk dogs, countryside, enjoy nature.</p> <p>Relief road - poorly thought out as 5 junctions between new Hoobrook/Stourport Rd relief road and Droitwich Road turnoff which causes long tailbacks for all especially at peak times.</p> <p>Currently getting out of our lane is a nightmare as very busy and been the scene of numerous accidents. This will only get worse if more traffic is added.</p> <p>More pollution to the local area.</p>
	LPPO2315	Object	<p>Object to the Spennells proposal.</p> <p>We need more houses, but only if the residents have local jobs, therefore encourage investment in industry for the town.</p> <p>We need a better transport infrastructure, upgrade the A456, and A449 to a dual carriage way.</p> <p>We need improved rail infrastructure, we need more trains, and bigger trains. A large number of homes would need</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more energy whereas a smaller number of homes could benefit from a solar/wind farm.</p> <p>The bypass from Stourport road to Worcester Road has eased traffic going towards Kidderminster but prior to it, at peak times is backed. Roads need sorting before more housing or better public transport.</p>
	LPPO2319	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to Option A - Spennells development. • Recently moved to the area and the main attractions were the countryside and views. • Have opportunity for exercise and do leisurely activities such as bike rides, walking etc. regardless of financial status. • Countryside is good for our wellbeing. • Our children enthuse about the local wildlife. • Children from nearby schools visit these fields to appreciate the wildlife. • Once Green Belt is gone it will not be restored. • Concrete playground is no substitute for green fields. • Our solicitor did relevant searches on the immediate area - they were not told about this development by the council. • Local people will not be able to afford new homes built on Green Belt land. • There are plenty of brownfield sites which could be used instead to create affordable homes - therefore reducing car journeys and pollution. • Using brownfield sites would improve the local environment. • Good quality agricultural land will be lost if Green Belt land is developed - how are we expected to buy local produce and reduce carbon footprint if it is not produced locally.
	LPPO2328	Object	<p>Looking at the proposals it appears that there are plenty of brownfield sites already available for redevelopment which should be used before any new areas are considered for development.</p> <p>The case for such a large increase in house building in the area appears to be based mainly on optimistic guess work which will need a large expansion of the employment prospects within the area. This at the present time appears most unlikely. If the employment prospects are not available a large increase in housing will bring in people who</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>become commuters and the current infrastructure, roads and rail, will not cope with this, meaning large investment in the area. Is this funding available in the current economic climate, which with Brexit about to happen could well cause economic cutbacks to extend well into if not beyond the local plan period.</p> <p>The area to the rear of Spennells estate in option A should remain in the Green Belt. The footpath/bridleway and the edges of the fields are currently used for people exercising and walking their dogs, not all of these people are Spennells residents. I object to this facility being lost as we are all urged by the Government and medical professions to take more exercise to keep healthy.</p> <p>The fields are currently productive from an agricultural viewpoint, if this land is reclassified this will be a loss not only to the farmer but to the country as a whole. I therefore object to the reclassification on these grounds as with Brexit approaching we are told we need to be more self-sufficient in our food/drink needs. The Barley regularly grown on these fields must help with this need.</p> <p>There is a small coppice adjacent to the southern boundary of Spennells, this includes several Scots Pine and Oak trees all of which have preservation orders on them. Also this area is visited by many species of birds which are not common in our gardens as well as bats and badgers. Both of which are subject to legal protection, therefore I object to this area being removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>I strongly object to the fields to the south and south east of Spennells being reclassified and developed, if this should be done it should be subject to very strict planning rules, because it will cause urban sprawl linking Kidderminster to Summerfield, Torton and Stone.</p> <p>There should be no direct vehicular access to the new housing development from the existing estate. Currently at peak periods there is frequently a 20 minute waiting time to access Spennells Valley Road and then further congestion to the Worcester Road. I therefore object to any further vehicular access being provided from the existing estate roads. Not only will it cause increased traffic congestion but it will affect the quality of life for existing residents by increasing pollution, which the council are supposedly trying to improve.</p> <p>To sum up this is a very vague plan with no decisions being made until it is adopted. There is nothing included to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>improve the quality of the town centre. This would attract business and employment to the area, which would increase the requirement for housing within the whole of the Wyre forest district and not just Kidderminster which the plan proposes.</p> <p>I therefore prefer Option B and object to Option A.</p>
	LPPO2330	Object	<p>Preferred Options Document Consultation flawed; Option A offers little benefit.</p> <p>The proposed housing projection overstated.</p> <p>Is this another attempt at getting a relief road (para. 31.5), existing road system is insufficient more houses would exacerbate</p> <p>The Council’s track record for building new roads poor.</p> <p>How will already over-stretched Health/Social Care Services cope with aging population</p> <p>Building on Green Belt = less outdoor exercise opportunities</p> <p>Evidence suggests enlarging Spennells could lead to an increase in crime</p> <p>The town centre has already and continues to decline</p> <p>Multi-plex cinema a non-starter</p> <p>With increase in online shopping, use town land for housing</p>
	LPPO2338	Object	<p>Strongly objects to Option A.</p> <p>There Is No Significant Natural Interest in Spennells Fields. Rather than meet the required objective of enhancing</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>biodiversity and geological conservation, Option A will destroy an area which the report incorrectly states has no natural interest. As an owner and breeders of award winning show dogs, in recent years we have walked in Spennells Fields more than 200 times each year. The fields are teeming with wildlife with over 90 species of birds being identified on Captains Pool and a further 20 species in and around Spennells Fields. Many of the birds listed in these records are Red and Amber listed (Birds Of Conservation Concern 4) including on the Red List Lapwing, Merlin, Skylark, Starling, Ring ouzel, Fieldfare, Song thrush, Redwing, Mistle thrush, House sparrow, Yellow wagtail, Grey wagtail, Linnet, Yellowhammer and the Corn bunting.</p> <p>In addition to the bird life there are badgers and foxes present (the boundary to the south of Captains WFR/ST/1) comes within 2m of a very large fox earth. Foxes are protected under a series of wildlife protection laws against poisoning, gassing, asphyxiating, maiming, stabbing, impaling, drowning, clubbing and most forms of snaring, with anyone convicted of carrying out such acts liable to 6 months imprisonment and/or a £5,000 fine per animal. The fields and hedgerows of this area are where the animals forage.</p> <p>Grass snakes are widely distributed in the area of Spennells fields and in 2016 there was signage warning walkers that adders were in the area.</p> <p>Four species of bats are identified in and around Stone Hill South (OC13). These include Long Eared Bats, Pippistrelles, Soprano Bat and Daubentons Bat.</p> <p>A large number of moths and butterflies have also been noted in the area widely now known as Spennells Fields.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Demands Are Inadequately Addressed. If all the development takes place as in Option A, there would not be the pupil numbers required to build a new primary school for a number of years. Heronswood Primary does not have the capacity to expand exponentially during this time.</p> <p>Secondary schools in Wyre Forest are underperforming BUT if option A is adopted the secondary school in the Wyre Forest with the least opportunity to expand is King Charles, where the upper school site is landlocked. Other schools have greater possibilities for quality expansion of resources and so it would be sensible to distribute the new units</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>around the area as in Option B.</p> <p>Hospitals throughout Worcestershire are in Special Measures. This issue should be addressed before either Option is adopted. It is also becoming increasingly difficult to obtain a doctor’s appointment. This matter also requires rectification if and when Wyre Forest expands further.</p> <p>Open Space and PRoW’s do not as such feature in our community facilities plans in the detail we would expect, and yet this is the reason that the area of Spennells Fields is so admired. It is a natural community asset which must not be lost as would be the case in Option A</p> <p>If Spennells doubles in size how could traffic enter and exit the estate? The results of the complete adoption of Option A will be unbearable for current residents of the area.</p> <p>Policing costs also appear greater in Option A and it is also probable that doubling the size of Spennells Estate would promote anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>With a modified Option B development (making greater use of Blakedown and Wolverley) across the Wyre Forest will maximise the use of current resources and as a consequence reduce demands on the infrastructure of one area.</p> <p>Option A will not address the need for affordable homes. WF Council require 30% of new homes to be affordable. Yet the Local Plan Review suggests that WF is an area with a household income that is below average. The percentage of affordable homes therefore needs to be greater in order to attract a greater proportion of younger families to Wyre Forest and to allow these families to purchase a property and to make Wyre Forest a desirable place to live.</p> <p>The Campaign for Rural England has produced a report stating that dwellings built on green land often do not meet such criteria. Based upon planning consultant Glenigan data shows demonstrates that just 16% of houses built on Green Belt land since 2009 outside local plans were classed as ‘affordable’.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>A point which applies to all development is the capacity of large companies to avoid even a 30% target as they have greater resources to call upon than local planning officers who are working with small teams on limited budgets.</p> <p>There will be a major and significant loss of amenity to the residents of Spennells should Option A be adopted, and no details are given relating to the compensatory amenity that residents will enjoy.</p> <p>Proposals within, or conspicuous from the Green Belt, must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, by virtue of their siting, materials or design. The openness of the Green Belt is its most important attribute. By placing a very large proportion in this one area as detailed in Option A this openness will be lost. It would be further compounded if the bypass were also to go ahead as this would require a large buffer on both sides of such a route in addition to the area required for four carriageways and a central reservation.</p> <p>The removal of these open spaces in largely one area will have a detrimental effect upon active lifestyles of Spennells residents and damage the biodiversity of an area it seeks to enhance.</p> <p>The visual amenity and unique landscapes of Spennells Fields will be lost forever’ and the southern and eastern routes into Kidderminster damaged.</p> <p>Watercourses. Whilst the major watercourses of the Severn, Stour and Canal are detailed in the report, the series of pools leading to Stanklyn Pool and onto Captains Pool receive little attention. This area in the early 1990’s was classified as a site of ecological interest forming part of the linear landscape leading to Spennells nature reserve.</p> <p>We have addressed this issue further in our consideration of developing site OC/12</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt and Arable Land and Hedgerows. Although both Options appear to use roughly the same amount of Green Belt land, the amount used of around 2% is double that which the Government recommends. With Option A this is compounded should the southern/eastern bypass go ahead as this will consume considerably more of the Green Belt to the south of Wyre Forest. The rural nature of Stone Parish will be destroyed.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Spennells Fields also provide a green space enjoyed by many of the residents of the current Spennells estate. This space is essential for the well-being, air quality and health of the population. There are also numerous PRow in the Fields the character of which would be destroyed should Option A proceed. These assets have for decades been used and enjoyed by residents.</p> <p>Furthermore it is not only the development of the fields themselves to consider but also the accompanying destruction of the hedgerows which are an environment for many forms of natural life.</p> <p>Spennells Fields are also used intensively for the production of both cereal and vegetable crops. A stated objective in the plan is to prohibit the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Development will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it cannot be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land. The case to develop this land has not been made.</p> <p>Summary. The use of all the fields suggested in Option A is not a stand-alone decision as the development of a southern/eastern bypass would have a compounding effect in this one area.</p> <p>The doubling in size of Spennells estate will place an unacceptable proportion of the new housing in the Wyre Forest, an area which does not have the infrastructure which can be developed, whereas an amended Option B including both Blakedown, and Wolverley and a development of Lea Castle are better served by the existing infrastructure in terms of transport and schools than is the case in Option A.</p> <p>The doubling in size of Spennells may well increase anti-social behaviour in the area.</p> <p>Unless planning conditions are enforced with vigour the plan would not develop the required number of affordable homes. It is widely accepted that many large building companies often do not deliver the infrastructure promised in their original plans. Therefore whatever plan goes forward it must contain watertight conditions that ensure development companies do not renege on any undertakings made.</p>
	LPPO2341	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I object to Option A • Fields used extensively for recreation would be lost and users would have to travel to similar increasing

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic congestion/pressure on public areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of farmland/wildlife • Use Brownfield first and plan better so units are not built and left unused where houses could have been built. • Option B provides preferred.
	LPPO2344	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in traffic already congested at peak times = impact on air quality/noise • There is no objective assessment of future trends • Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape • Loss of wildlife, should sustain biodiversity. • Impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage in • Detrimental visual impact forever. • The proposal to build next to one of the already largest housing estates in the area is poorly considered. <p>Regenerate brownfield areas to attract new businesses. Implement plan B - more dispersed strategy across the district</p>
	LPPO2345	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At event Council staff appeared before end of consultation period to favour Spennells in hope of getting bypass which I don't think is needed • Use brown field sites first e.g. Lea Castle/former Sion Hill school/land next to Wolverhampton road - already good transport links. • Regenerate town centre with affordable housing for residents not large detached properties for commuters. • Loss of recreation space/healthcare provision issue/increase in air and noise pollution • Are housing needs figures correct?

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more industrial units needed, Easter Park still has some empty units <p>This is not a done deal take people's views into account</p>
	LPPO2346	Object	<p>I object to the plans to build east of Kidderminster:</p> <p>It's Green Belt land, wildlife be lost/increase in traffic on already congested roads/School capacity issue</p> <p>Everything is in favour of LEA CASTLE</p>
	LPPO2347	Object	<p>I wish to raise my strong objection to the above with regard to plan A - the proposal to use Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster with associated infrastructure (land adjacent to Spennells and Offmore).</p> <p>My grounds for objection are as follows -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal will result in a huge increase in traffic volumes on minor local roads which are already heavily congested particularly during school term times and bad weather. 2. This increase in traffic will lead to a significant increase in impacts on air quality and a significant increase in noise causing nuisance issues for local residents. 3. The fields are used by many local residents for walking; the loss of this community facility will have an impact on both the physical and mental well being of residents. The plan will result in the loss of this open space. 4. The loss of the fields will have an impact on the diversity of wildlife living in and around the habitats in the area of the fields; we have a responsibility not only to retain suitable areas for wildlife but to improve upon them. The plans to use this Green Belt destroy this valuable space. 5. The building of houses on this area will have a significant detrimental visual impact on the natural beauty of the

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>area forever.</p> <p>6. The proposal to build so many properties in a concentrated area in addition to what is already surely one of the largest housing estates in the area is poorly thought through.</p> <p>7. There are many brownfield areas in Kidderminster and the surrounding area which would benefit greatly from redevelopment and regeneration. This could ultimately encourage new businesses to those areas.</p> <p>8. The current infrastructure will not be able to accommodate the increased pressures from so many new homes, families and traffic in an already large housing estate.</p> <p>9. The loss of the Green Belt land to development will have a significant impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage leading to an increase in surface run off.</p> <p>I strongly request the above concerns are taken into consideration and ask that plan b is implemented - the proposal to have a more dispersed strategy across the district to accommodate the required development</p>
	LPPO2349	Object	Object to Option A: Loss of Green Belt/impact on residents/wildlife/local infrastructure which will not cope
	LPPO2354	Object	<p>Object to plans for area adjacent to the Spennells. Serious concerns about the negative impact that the proposed building works would have on both the estate itself, and on the area as a whole.</p> <p>Primary concern is with the already problematic traffic in and around the Spennells estate. Insufficient road infrastructure to support additional traffic as it is already heavily congested at busy times. The provision of the suggested eastern relief road would not solve the problem of the additional traffic volume entering towards the town.</p> <p>Spennells offers a safe, semi-rural area with easy pedestrian access to nearby countryside. To take away a large section of the surrounding Green Belt land would be damaging enough to the environment, not to mention the detrimental effect it would have on the wellbeing of the local residents. It also seems highly unreasonable that the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster vicinity alone should bear the majority of the development, when there are so many areas across other nearby towns far more suited for this purpose. This would distribute the housing requirements more fairly and provide opportunities for people on a wider, but still local, scale.</p> <p>Another great concern is the pressure the proposed plans would have on the provision of all the necessary services. The local schools are already stretched to their limits. Sufficient educational facilities would be required to accommodate around 2500 children over the coming years in this area alone. More imperatively, healthcare and emergency services would require huge supplementation both practically and financially in order to suffice the inevitable increase in demand.</p> <p>To summarise, we believe strongly that the proposals to use all of the land adjacent to the Spennells estate for the purpose of housing would be hugely detrimental to the local vicinity. We feel that the best option would be to disperse the housing requirements more evenly across a wider area, using previously developed land first, and Green Belt land only as a last resource once all other available areas have been exhausted.</p>
	LPPO2361	Object	<p>Loss of recreational asset</p> <p>Capacity issues for schools, doctors, hospitals</p> <p>Use Brownfield sites before Green Belt</p> <p>Traffic already bad would be much worse</p>
	LPPO2369	Object	<p>Object Spennells:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Roads already regularly gridlocked/new link road has added to it 2. Local schools are already full and hospitals are unable to cope

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2377	Object	Object to Spennells: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of open countryside for recreation • Impact on local farms/wildlife • Increase in traffic • Schools - capacity issue • Large housing developments can encourage poor/anti social behaviour • This is significant in size, use other key Kidderminster sites first
	LPPO2380	Object	Object to Spennells. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of fields for recreation/education • Extra pollution/congestion, more dangerous for children • Strain on local schools, doctors, shop
	LPPO2382	Object	Object to Spennells. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Brownfield sites first, e.g. Kidderminster town centre • Loss of recreational land/wildlife • Traffic already heavy would be worse
	LPPO2383	Object	Object Spennells/Stanklyn Lane Area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of recreational land • Increase in traffic/noise/fumes • Strain on existing education providers/medical services/emergency services • Loss of Green Belt/rights of way/wildlife/agricultural land/ conservation areas (hedgerows), along Stanklyn

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall in property prices • Use Brownfield sites instead
	LPPO2384	Object	<p>Object Spennells/Stanklyn Lane Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of recreational land • Increase in traffic/noise/fumes • Strain on existing education providers/medical services/emergency services • Loss of Green Belt/rights of way/wildlife/agricultural land/ conservation areas (hedgerows), along Stanklyn Lane. • Fall in property prices • Use Brownfield sites instead
	LPPO2387	Object	<p>The document contradicts itself, P14 'Virtually static growth' and P33 'needs of the growing population' Wyre Forest population has not grown on the last 10 to 20 years, so assumptions and rounding up of figures have been done to justify building on Green Belt land. Use actual numbers and don't round up housing can be supported by brownfield development. The document should be rejected.</p> <p>The plan appears unbalanced with major expansion to the east of Kidderminster with little to the west. Development of the town centre is not balanced, with plans for a cinema multiplex around the old Glades leisure centre, this could be improved by moving the multiplex into Worcester Street (number of large stores vacant or little used), and use the Glades area for housing, keeping the multiplex closer to the current shops.</p> <p>On expansion to the east of Kidderminster, there would be a loss of Green Belt land and subsequent quality of life, with loss of fields used by Skylarks and other field birds. Option A should be dropped for Option B (lower loss of Green Belt Land).</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Using the fields to the east of Spennells would effectively merge the communities of Spennells, Stanklyn Lane & Stone which is contradictory to Green Belt rules which is there to prevent communities being merged.</p> <p>Section 31.6 talks about keeping Stanklyn Lane community separate from the proposed development however Option A shows it going right up to the edge of that community, even if only 50% is developed this is still contradiction so Option A should be rejected.</p> <p>Section 31.6 also talks about keeping the view up to Stone church clear yet Appendix A map shows development right along the A448 another contradiction.</p> <p>Option A land adjacent to the railway line (Rear of Spennells & Easter Park (AS/10)) is this within a 600 metre blast zone of the Roxel Summerfield site?</p> <p>The plan talks about a relief road from the A449 to the A456 though this proposed development, this should be dropped along with Option A and develop relief road starting around the around the A449 / A450 Black Bridges area.</p>
	LPPO2400	Object	<p>Object Spennells area:</p> <p>Impact on wildlife/Increased traffic congestion/School capacity issue</p>
	LPPO2406	Object	Object to the Spennells planning proposals
	LPPO2407	Object	<p>As AS/10, WFR/ST/2, OC/13and WFR/ST1 all of which lie at the rear of Spennells estate.</p> <p>My reasons are that the land is greenfield and should remain so. Also the extra traffic on the already congested A449 from Hoo Brook would become intolerable. Added to the extra number of new inhabitants the already struggling schools in the catchment area would not cope, Heronswood Primary school has no scope for expansion and is already having to use portacabins. The local infrastructure is sufficient but would not be able to handle an influx of the number expected.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2417	Object	We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed extended development of Spennells estate on the grounds of Green Belt destruction instead of use of brownfield land.
	LPPO2418	Object	<p>Object to building on Green Belt land within Kidderminster especially the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn lane.</p> <p>Housing requirements within Kidderminster, based on previous growth, do not warrant anywhere near the proposed amount of houses to be built. There are enough brownfield sites within Kidderminster to meet the current demand.</p> <p>I would like to see evidence of a compiled list of brownfield sites within Kidderminster, including an estimate of the number of dwellings possible on these sites as a total, before considering eating into our precious Green Belt. Suggestions include the old Sladen school site on Hurcott Road, the Old Magistrate's Court and Glades Leisure Centre. There are many more brownfield sites with dwelling potential as you will be aware.</p> <p>We are regular visitors to the fields backing Turnstone Road and have been for many years. On our walks we have seen some wonderful wildlife, including Skylarks, Starlings and Corn buntings (All of which are on the Red List), an array of amazing insects as well as evidence of Badgers (I have photos of their Sett).</p> <p>Once Green Belt is built on it can never be regained. We obviously need the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl but it also provides a corridor for wildlife.</p> <p>I think that the council should concentrate on regeneration of the ghost town centre and its many empty derelict buildings which could be converted to dwellings.</p>
	LPPO2424	Object	<p>I should like to register my opposition to the proposed plans you have outlined to use Green Belt land at the rear of Spennells and Stanklyn to build further residential homes.</p> <p>My reasons for my opposition are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spennells is already a sprawling residential development, and at peak times the surrounding area suffers from traffic congestion, almost doubling the size of the estate will only serve to increase this congestion. I

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>understand that the current road layout within Spennells and the surrounding areas will not be changed. You have indicated a through road but this will not reduce the amount of traffic needing to access an expanded housing development. Increasing traffic will not only create further congestion but also increase air pollution which has been highlighted in recent studies as a factor contributing to thousands of deaths in the UK each year.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="701 485 2051 692">2. Published data indicate that the population in Wyre Forest has increased only slightly over the last 15 years, whilst surrounding areas have increased at a much faster rate. Predictions used to justify this development somehow predict a much faster rate of future population increase than indicated by the ONS. I am concerned that this Green Belt land is earmarked for development not to cope with future population increase in the Wyre Forest area but to solve the housing problems of surrounding areas who presumably are reluctant to build on their own Green Belt land. This should be investigated thoroughly. <li data-bbox="701 699 2051 1086">3. Green Belt land is surely in place to protect our green open spaces and to stop further urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with? All possible alternatives should be thoroughly explored before the use of any Green Belt land is approved. To me there seems to be a number of sites in Kidderminster that could be used and redeveloped first. These include disused and derelict buildings like those in park lane (by Matalan), the old indoor market, the old Woolworths and the ugly crown house. I understand that the old leisure centre site will be redeveloped into a cinema complex! If the need for housing is so great then surely it would be better to develop this land into town centre affordable apartments. Many areas within the town are ripe for regeneration into low cost housing and should be regenerated before any consideration is given to destroying Green Belt land. Owners should be obliged by law to regenerate disused buildings or land themselves or sell to those who are prepared to develop these sites. Better use of these urban areas would negate the need to expand into our surrounding countryside. <li data-bbox="745 1129 2051 1374">4. It is an area enjoyed my many children, walkers, exercisers, birdwatchers & nature photographers from Spennells and beyond. It is a great place to relax, de-stress and enjoy the natural environment. These recreational activities are important to the mental health and physical wellbeing of those who live in Kidderminster. The area also attracts a wide variety of species and wildlife, I understand that bats and some rare birds nest within the fields. Destroying this Green Belt space will have a devastating impact on the existing community and the natural wildlife that exists within it. We will never get this wildlife back once it is destroyed.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>5. I cannot see the justification in placing such a large proportion of the proposed new homes in this Green Belt area. You have an option B, which almost provides the same housing yet is more evenly distributed throughout Kidderminster. This should not just be about efficiency, cost and profit. Impact on the environment, existing communities, natural habitats, local services and infrastructures all need to be considered.</p> <p>6. Adding a large number of houses in one area will put huge pressures on already oversubscribed services like local schools, doctors, dentists and hospitals. How will this be addressed if we are adding a large number of new homes and therefore increasing the population in this one area alone? I have seen very little information about how this increase in population will be catered for. The closest hospitals in Worcester and Redditch are already struggling to cope with the demand placed upon them and are currently in special measures due to poor performance.</p> <p>In conclusion do not let Kidderminster become an overflow for commuters from other areas. Look at realistic predictions of future population increase. How many residential properties are actually needed compared to how many the developers want to build in order to maximise their profits? Look at all the unoccupied, empty derelict buildings around Kidderminster first. Surely it is better to regenerate buildings that stand empty or vandalised and breathe life back into the town centre before considering any development that will destroy surrounding Green Belt land.</p> <p>I object to both proposals put forward but if I have to choose an option then I choose Option B which more evenly distributes the developments around the town of Kidderminster.</p>
	LPPO2428	Object	<p>We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health, pollution and social problems.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Alternative brown field sites are available along with pockets of derelict land ripe for redevelopment.</p> <p>The amount of development required has also been vastly overestimated and the actual amount needed could be sustained on alternative brown sites (Lea Castle, disused pubs, disused factories such as those in Park Lane, Sladen/Sion Hill schools).</p> <p>Pollution: Any development of these areas would substantially increase the already heavy traffic pollution.</p> <p>We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. Also the speed of this traffic is seriously dangerous, especially to children, the vulnerable and animals. This development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. Add to this an increase in the already incessant traffic noise levels.</p> <p>I would not wish to see a further increase in traffic using Hurcott Road.</p> <p>The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Road infers that Hurcott Lane will require the road to be blocked for vehicle access at either the Birmingham Road or Stourbridge Road ends but this will not prevent traffic flow just divert more traffic into Hurcott Road increasing pollution and volumes of traffic on roads only designed for local residential traffic which have inadequate flow characteristics.</p> <p>In conclusion, this is not a healthy and community spirited decision to develop the area. Baldwin Road is similarly treated like a rat run and as for the Horsefair how much more can this bottle neck sustain? We are trying to improve the look of this run down area not destroy it and end all hope of engendering a happy community spirit. Extra housing would require a by-pass to be built as the aforementioned roads just cannot sustain more traffic and the pollution it brings.</p> <p>Wildlife: The area is known and loved for its beauty and wildlife. This Green Belt plays an aesthetic role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation and these green fields are the first glorious introduction to Kidderminster on the A451 and A456. Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. Consider the importance of recreational activities in terms of health,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>wellbeing and tourism. People need space to thrive. It's unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. Compared with neighbouring towns like Stourbridge we are lucky to have such big green spaces. Don't destroy it for future generations when alternative brown or derelict sites are available. Endangered species, indeed wildlife in general would be threatened. Development would seriously impact and cause irrecoverable change to wildlife habitats especially on buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSIs.</p> <p>Some proposed development sites have steep gradients which could raise the risk of potential flooding. The proposed development behind Baldwin Road has the potential to flood, on one side with run off towards the Birmingham Road with a natural hollow in the main road and on the other side run off towards the lower end of Hurcott Road where it is a narrow lane which in turn would run off into the outfall from Hurcott Pool and transfer to Broadwaters with the potential for flooding the adjacent main road.</p> <p>Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is generally much higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and not blend in spoiling the beauty of the area. The field height to the rear of Baldwin Road means that the proposed properties would adversely overlook the existing properties & their gardens at the lower end of Baldwin Road.</p> <p>The Government's own policy regarding planning decisions is to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological interests. In brief all planning decisions must consider location on alternative sites to green fields.</p> <p>Amenities and Community Spirit: We already suffer from a lack of amenities in this area. One shop in which our post office was taken off us. A smattering of shops in Spennells and Offmore. Can local schools accommodate extra housing on this level? Offmore is already full and can't be developed. We no longer have an acute hospital so all this extra population would place more pressure on Worcester Royal already facing special measures. This also raises questions with regards the existing level of doctors, dentists and opticians in the area. Public transport is poor and infrequent.</p> <p>Big developments generally have no community spirit. Building on smaller pockets of land fosters integration. Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Doubling the size of Spennells would not be a wise move.</p> <p>Conclusion: We need smaller numbers of houses proposed which can be sustained by brown sites like Lea Castle. Smaller pockets of once used land should be considered like factories on Park Lane, closed pubs (The Broadwaters?) closed schools like Sladen and Sion Hill.</p> <p>We need to reinvigorate existing eyesores such as disused schools & factories which are frequently vandalised and this will improve some of the more rundown areas rather than permanently erode Green Belt sites, which once gone they are gone forever.</p> <p>Don't bulldoze green field sites prior to using up every brown field or derelict site in the locality.</p>
	LPPO2437	Object	<p>Please note my objections to the proposed expansion option A, on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The already large Spennells estate has not got the infrastructure to support the amount of housing proposed, the school is small and to expand this would cut necessary recreation facilities in the school going against government objectives for healthier lifestyles and more exercise for children. If, as what is suggested in the report, the population of elderly is to rise significantly, local doctor and hospital services, already heavily burdened would collapse. Even with the proposed link road onto the A449 from the expanded estate, traffic is ALREADY struggling at other points along the A449, at the Droitwich turn, at Black Bridge, at Sytchampton school to name a few. As Kidderminster has very little work one would suppose new residents would also need to commute using this road towards Worcester or the more industrialised areas of the West Midlands. The A449 certainly cannot cope on most weekdays with the amount of traffic it already has, let alone looking to increase this. 2. Taking away the last vestiges of Green Belt land under Wyre Forest control to the east of the district leaves the District Council with no future control to the east of urban sprawl. It will be for Wychavon to protect against further expansion. This cannot be right, please look at this again. 3. The fields to be lost are not poor agriculturally as is required for Green Belt land to be considered for change of use, otherwise peas, carrots and spring onions that have been grown in rotation in previous years, not to mention other high value crops such as potatoes, beet and oats would not have been produced in

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>abundance.</p> <p>4. The wildlife to be lost by these proposals is frankly unacceptable. The fields behind Spennells are rich in rare bird, mammal and insect life. Skylarks frequent the fields, as do a large number of bats easily seen at dawn and dusk around the edges of the fields, along with several badger colonies (3 active setts of which were purposely razed to the ground earlier this year by a tractor then ploughed through).</p> <p>I strongly think both proposals are not acceptable. Please go back and rethink. The figures and assumptions made on the scale of expansion required by the town are very debatable and as such need to be looked at in more depth before a huge and irreversible decision such as this is made. You as our representatives have one chance to get this right and an absolute duty to be sure of your facts and make completely informed assumptions. More work is needed, reconsider!</p>
	<p>LPPO2438</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to object to the council plan to possibly build up to 2000 new houses in the Spennells area, this includes Captains Lodge and opposite side of A448 Bromsgrove Road. Objection is based on:</p> <p>1) Spennells estate is already big enough you will have to provide more schools as Spennells, Comberton and King Charles Schools would not be able to cope with possibly 2000 extra families, not forgetting shops etc also.</p> <p>2) The roads on this side of town are choked at peak times of the day already, you can't say that you will build an eastern bypass because this has already been turned down by Ministry of Transport. On this side of town at 8.00am there are queues at Comberton Hill, Low Hill, Goldness Corner (Black Bridge) and Mustow Green.</p> <p>How do you relieve this situation?</p> <p>3) Kidderminster is not a growing town, a lot of businesses are closing, especially carpet related companies or moving to other areas in the country. I would suggest you wouldn't require anything like 2000 new houses over the next 15 years i.e. 2019-2034.</p> <p>Please don't pile more misery on the residents of Spennells. I hope common sense will prevail. The council should use common sense and don't do anything at the moment.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2443	Object	<p>I write in objection to any proposed development of the “Spennells Green Belt Fields” located at the end of Turnstone Road/Imber Place.</p> <p>My Objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any Development would increase the traffic access/exit on Turnstone, Captains Pool and Heronswood Roads. (In support of this point I would draw attention to the Severn Trent Water works in Linnet Rise during the recent months of 2017 which caused a considerable increase in traffic delays exiting the estate at school/work time.) • The additional traffic would also put children at <i>extra risk</i> during the walking commute to the local school. • I don’t believe there are sufficient local services to support further development. • Encroaching onto Green Belt areas when there are other brownfield areas more suitable to use. <p>My Reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The space is currently a superb natural nature habitation. • This Green Belt is so important to the locality and balances the light industrial/commercial investment with the current levels of housing of the Wyre Forest Area. • I support the practice of ‘infill house builds’ vs. ‘creeping into Green Belt space’ as this brings a balance to areas and uses space that is/or could be wasted. • By spreading the development over ‘smaller brownfield sites’ the required local services will also be spread making it a more viable plan. • It is of prime importance that as an island we retain Green Belt areas.
	LPPO2450	Object	<p>I feel strongly about the fields of Spennells being saved as these fields mean so much to myself and the local community.</p> <p>There are lots of brownfield sites that could be used to build on instead rather than our beautiful countryside.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>If that is not an option, please just save two fields so that we have somewhere to walk our dogs and play with our children.</p> <p>Spennells doesn't have the facilities such as schooling and shops to cope with the large growth you are proposing.</p> <p>I have just bought my first house on Spennells and that heavily was based on the surrounding areas and the village like feel the area has to it.</p> <p>Please do not ruin all of our beautiful fields, at least meet us in the middle.</p>
	LPPO2453	Object	<p>I herewith put forward my objection to the building of homes on the Spennells fields.</p> <p>Family walks are taken along the fields throughout the year enjoying the ever changing fields of poppies, wheat etc.</p> <p>To lose this whole area to housing is an utter disgrace. Along with the extra traffic, noise and the loss of wildlife it would be completely wrong go ahead with such plans.</p> <p>I hope that my objection along with the other objectors will be enough to change the decision.</p>
	LPPO2454	Object	<p>We object to the development of the whole area of Option A as shown on the plan for Spennells for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These fields are used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle, walk dogs and ride horses which aids physical and mental health. • Traffic and noise pollution causing harm to health. Alternatively building higher density homes in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution. • Local schools having larger classes and fewer resources per student • Increased pressures on our hospitals, doctors, dentists and opticians • Loss of Green Belt and threat to the existing public Rights of Way • Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land • Traffic entering and exiting the new development from Spennells would cause further traffic disruption to an already busy road at peak times. <p>Build on Brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.</p>
	LPPO2460	Object	<p>I believe the quality of life on Spennells estate will reduce not increase if the new development on the southern edge of Spennells goes ahead. The reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of fields that are used extensively by local people on the estate for recreational purposes • The impact on the wildlife within those fields and hedgerows and surrounding Green Belt area. There are a number of red listed birds within these fields and area such as Skylarks and linnets • Increased traffic and noise – the estate can get congested now and the roads that service Spennells will not cope with the extra through Hoobrook onto Worcester. • The internet quality is very poor already and this will add extra pressure to another service that probably isn't scheduled to be upgraded • There will be an impact on drainage as the fields offer a soak away • The quality of housing and space allocated for frontages, drives and gardens need to be consistent with the current estate and planners ensure that there are drives on the front of houses not used group parking areas. The housing companies need to make a few less homes and money to ensure that the area is decent • There seems to be no additional plans for road infrastructure changes or additional public transport services and impact assessments on the increase in population to additional services for GPs, schools, hospital, benefit offices, council services, etc. • Loss of the Green Belt status means an impact on protecting further urban spread, it sets a precedence and is an “easy option” as its cheaper for the builders than insisting the spend extra money preparing derelict or brownfield sites. <p>The plan mentions 10% of the population in the district currently attend swimming or gym and the new leisure centre has not been built to sustain the increase in usage for the next 10 years so already this is a short-sighted approach by a council who knew they would need to expand within the next 15 years. The current site cannot be</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>expanded to take this increase.</p> <p>It would be useful to ensure that the contracts with the building companies who want to buy the land actually put something back into the community by way of renovating something else - be it a building or park space or similar as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility and therefore the council get something extra than just easy money for easy land.</p> <p>The town centre needs to be regenerated otherwise all the money that additional residents will bring will be spent outside of the town because it looks deserted and run down.</p> <p>The land is currently Green Belt and there are plenty of areas in Kidderminster that are rundown or derelict and these areas/buildings could be renewed to make the place more pleasant to live in as a while not just expand the edges with nice new homes and keep the old all rundown. The whole Kidderminster town has become dis-jointed from many years of different decision making on development in the centre. Sadly it is more expensive for the builders to renovate and regenerate sites then build on land that doesn't need work and this influences the decisions.</p> <p>I don't believe that the surrounding infrastructure, roads, schools, shopping areas, supermarkets will be changed enough to managing the increase in population.</p>
	LPPO2462	Object	<p>The parcels adjacent to Spennells estate – designated “Rear of Spennells & Easter Park AS/10”, “Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2”, “Stone Hill South OC/13” and “Captains and the Lodge WFR/ST/1” – should remain as Green Belt and not be subject to housing development.</p> <p>Green Belt: the purpose of Green Belt is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check unrestricted urban sprawl. The “Option A” proposal would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, while development under “Option B” would still have a more dispersed effect upon a range of town boundaries. • Prevent neighbouring towns from merging. The development adjacent to Spennells would mean that

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Spennells would merge with Summerfield and Stone, thus losing their separate identities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The development in “Option A”, in particular, would encroach significantly into open Green Belt land. • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land – Thereby providing the planning imperative to use brownfield sites first. <p>Once an area of land has been defined as Green Belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include and are clearly seen in Wyre Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population. • Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas. • The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live. • Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns. • The securing of nature conservation interests. • The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. <p>Building on Green Belt is fraught with issues of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of the natural environment and habitat of rare and threatened species; • Infrastructure provision; • Loss of countryside’s positive effects on health and wellbeing; • Increased risk of flooding; • Loss of productive farming land; • Increasing car dependency; • Large new developments placing strain on local infrastructure. <p>I assert that no Green Belt is necessary to meet a realistic population growth projection, with all housing demand being met on brownfield sites, including at Lea Castle, up to 2034.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Protection for the Natural Environment: There are supportive words in the Draft Local Plan about “protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation”. However, any development on the natural environment in countryside areas will have serious negative impacts.</p> <p>Spennells Fields is said to have no nature conservation interests pertaining to them, however the area offers a number of different habitats for wildlife, including important nesting sites for corn buntings, larks and linnets (all of which are included on the red list as endangered birds), badger setts and bat roosts. Also sighted in Wyre Forest in areas earmarked for development are European Otters. The rare and protected Tower Mustard plant thrives along the lanes adjoining Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Endangered species like the Corn Bunting, Linnets and Skylarks would not nest in an area of “Green Corridor” adjacent to a large housing development as they need wide, open spaces to thrive. Tree Preservation Orders on old and venerable trees and woodlands must also be respected.</p> <p>I am concerned that issues of drainage and flooding have not been given serious enough consideration in the Draft Local Plan. Countryside typically has trees and hedgerows upon it which assist in water absorption and mitigates run-off, so replacing fields and hedgerows with urban development will literally have downstream effects.</p> <p>There is no indication/mention in the Local Plan of a Design Exceedence Flow Pathway, indicating what would need to be built into any new development in the event of a ‘Flash Flood’, to prevent ‘runoff’ from any new development causing flood damage to existing properties.</p> <p>Much of the Green Belt land, notably Spennells Fields, are used for productive farming activity which should be maintained and enhanced on ecologically sustainable principles rather than destroyed. Section 5.6 mentions “...promotion of local food production.....” whilst the planned intrusion into the Green Belt will reduce local food production. The proposed extension of Spennells, for example, will mean the loss of good quality agricultural land which in summer 2017 was growing barley. Past years have seen crops of wheat, peas, potatoes and beets.</p> <p>Recreation Landscape and Visual Amenity: Many fields threatened by this Draft Local Plan serve as popular recreational and social facilities for walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers, and horse riders, amateur astronomers and wildlife and landscape photographers. There are a number of well-used Public Rights of Way and bridle ways across the fields which allow fast and easy access to open countryside.</p> <p>The landscape around many areas, such as Spennells, is an important part of people’s lives, contributing to individual, community and national identity and offering a wide variety of benefits in terms of quality of life, well-</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>being and economic opportunity. The ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report’ published in 2013 recognised that Landscape provides a shared resource which is important in its own right as a ‘public good’ - something which is very obvious by the current use of Spennells’ residents as a local amenity on the Public Rights of Way. This Report also emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan removes.</p> <p>Implications for Health and Wellbeing: There are already well-used and designated Public Footpaths and Rights of Way across the Spennells Fields that the Local Plan recognises as being intensively used by local residents (people of all ages) – with the positive effects this produces upon their Health and Wellbeing. Many reports (e.g. World Health Organisation April 2017) have identified the positive effect that natural open spaces have on people’s physical and mental wellbeing. Access to the countryside has been proved to promote physical activity, positive mental wellbeing and healthy childhood development. Regular physical activity contributes to the prevention and management of over 20 conditions including coronary heart disease, diabetes, certain types of cancer and obesity. Access to the countryside has also been shown to have a positive impact upon mental health. Responses to nature include feelings of pleasure and a reduction in anxiety. Moderate outdoor activity is claimed to be as successful at treating depression as medication. Children with access to safe green spaces are more likely to be physically active and less likely to be overweight. Outdoor play also encourages healthy brain development and promotion of healthy wellbeing through to adulthood. Indeed, the Wyre Forest Public Health Profile 2016 lists improving mental health and wellbeing, along with increasing physical activity in the area, as its main priorities. The Sustainability Appraisal (May 2017) states that it recognises the “positive effect of links via pathways and cycleways” and intends to provide wide cycle paths in any new development. However, a cycling route through a housing estate could not claim to meet the needs of all the current users of the PROWs and Bridle paths. Footpaths that allow walking in the open countryside cannot be equated with ‘Green Corridors’ between housing developments. I feel that the LPR does not sufficiently acknowledge the role of the threatened fields in the provision of access to safe countryside for existing residents of Wyre Forest and certainly has not made any suggestions for protecting or safeguarding this access.</p> <p>It has already been recorded that Kidderminster has higher obesity levels than the national average (Wyre Forest Public Health Profile 2016) and this is a position which would be exacerbated by reducing local access to local fields for health and recreational use. The fact that the new Wyre Forest Leisure Centre has now been moved out of the town centre has already reduced access to some residents, especially children without their own transport, which</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>again is likely to cause reduced exercise and increased obesity. Other threats to the health and wellbeing of residents arising from development of Green Belt adjacent to existing homes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed new road (Eastern Relief road) causing increased traffic noise, air pollution, light pollution and additional traffic vibration to Spennells’ residents. • Increased demand on infrastructure including medical facilities and schools. • Social problems arising from increasing the size of the estate; evidence exists that large housing estates suffer more crime and anti-social behaviour (as acknowledged in the WFIDP May 2017). <p>Many of the six key areas which affect health will be dependent on agreement with developers to provide these facilities. The provision of public open spaces, a network of good quality cycling and walking routes, and easily accessed health facilities are important both for public health and the development of a community.</p> <p>Strain on Local Infrastructure: The claimed 6,000 homes by 2034 mean approximately 20,000 new people in Wyre Forest District. How will the Hospital and emergency services cope with this growth? Even halving this number to the number which I believe is realistic requires significant investment. An expanded residential development requires proper infrastructure to support its current and future residents. I have found no evidence of future funding to support this at Spennells. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospital services <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kidderminster Hospital (which is on the opposite side of the town centre, so there are issues with travel time) continues to see services downgraded or taken away. 2. Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust, which runs Kidderminster, Worcester Royal and Redditch Hospitals, is struggling and is one of the worst performing trusts in the country. 3. Mental health services have been reduced at Kidderminster, with service users and their relatives needing to travel to Redditch • GP & Dental surgeries – I am not confident that there will be adequate provision of GP and dental services in

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>a greatly enlarged Spennells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools – Existing local schools are nearly full. I am not confident that extra school places will be made available in time for the projected new arrivals to this part of town. Temporary portacabin classrooms and long travel times for pupils to get to a school with capacity will lead to poorer educational outcomes. The funding that is supposed to be made available for a new school if the housing development surpasses 1000 homes is no guarantee that the school will actually be built. Car parking outside many schools is already extremely hazardous at the beginning and end of the school day. • Local shops, pharmacy and post office – I am not confident that adequate additional local shops will be constructed to serve any enlarged Spennells community and there is no capacity to enlarge the existing shops and car park at Warbler Place. • Local leisure such as a village hall, pub, and fitness centre/gym – I am not confident that adequate local leisure facilities will be built to serve an enlarged estate, leading to a soulless estate with heightened youth alienation, graffiti and crime. • Local roads and transport – The absence of adequate schools, shops and leisure facilities will increase car journeys which will contribute to local air pollution and traffic congestion. The building of an estate on the fringe of Kidderminster will see more car journeys rather than walking and cycling, compared to development closer to the centre on brownfield sites.
	LPPO2464	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposed development of the Green Belt fields designated ‘Rear of Spennells & Easter Park AS/10’, ‘Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2’, ‘Stone Hill South OC/13’, and ‘Captains and the Lodge WFR/ST/1’ (marked Option A and a Core area on the Draft Local Plan).</p> <p>In support of my objection I wish to make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The population of Wyre Forest district has hardly grown in the past 25 years, so the quantity of houses that has been projected as being necessary has been over-estimated or even exaggerated. Brownfield sites and regeneration of Kidderminster town centre could provide sufficient land for new housing without resorting to taking Green Belt. Green Belt should only be taken as a last resort and we have not reached that point yet.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The infrastructure is not in place to support a huge increase in the number of households in the area. Our medical establishments are already at breaking point, our schools almost full. Our road network cannot support more vehicles. • An immense area of wildlife habitat would be lost which currently supports a number of rare species of animals and plants. Currently the fields are in use – they are not left barren. • The Spennells fields area is a valuable natural open space which has a positive effect on people’s physical and mental wellbeing. The public footpaths and bridleways across these fields are used by walkers, dog-walkers, joggers, horse-riders, photographers and birdwatchers and people of all ages and levels of fitness. This is a convenient location for taking exercise without first having to jump in a car. • If these fields were to be given over to housing, tarmac roads and driveways, what would happen during periods of heavy rain? How would drainage be managed to avoid causing flooding in the lower-lying area of Stanklyn/Summerfield? <p>Once our Green Belt has gone we cannot get it back. Once a habitat has been lost we cannot get our flora and fauna back. I urge you to make the right decision – a decision which leaves Spennells fields Green Belt land intact.</p>
	LPPO2468	Object	<p>Object to the proposed building of houses on the Green Belt land behind Spennells for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorrect figures submitted on housing requirements. • There are plenty of brown field sites to use before Green Belt land should be considered. • The protection of the environment should be important (as agreed by the Prime Minister Theresa May at the G20 summit). • The devastation of the wildlife, birds, bees, butterflies, bats, badgers, field mice etc. • The loss of good productive agricultural land. • Insufficient infrastructure in the local area - Hospital, roads, • Loss of recreational land used by the local community (dog walkers, walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders etc) <p>The town centre needs the regeneration and affordable housing – not Spennells.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2471	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed building of houses on the Green Belt land behind Spennells housing estate/land adjacent to Stanklyn Lane for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wyre Forest District has a virtually static population growth. How have the figures have been calculated for the suggested number of new houses? • Development will take away open spaces that are used recreationally on a daily basis by joggers, dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders. Benefitting physical and mental health. Also helps to address the high obesity levels in the district. • Loss of local good productive agricultural land. • There are plenty of brown field sites to use before Green Belt land should even be considered. • Development should not impact on our wildlife. This land is home to many birds, bees, butterflies, bats, badgers, foxes, rabbits, field mice etc. • Road infrastructure is already extremely poor in this area. • What provision will be made to ensure our local hospital and schools will be able to cope with the extra residents that will potentially move to the district? <p>The regeneration of the town centre should be a priority. Affordable housing could be built closer to the centre of town allowing easy access to its facilities and amenities.</p> <p>Why has no development been proposed in Wolverley?</p>
	LPPO2477	Object	<p>There are many areas of Kidderminster which would be better suited to be developed before you have to destroy fields. Town centre living, Park street by Matalan, Stourport road Golf course to name but a few.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kidderminster needs investment in the town and building more houses will not help this. • These houses are to ease Kidderminster’s existing housing problems but the houses are not solely for the purchase by Kidderminster residents so if they all sell to outside people this will not ease anything. • The types of houses that will be built and the prices they will cost are not the types of houses that are needed to ease any problems. • The houses would be better spread out around the area. That way more shops and local businesses from

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>around the area will benefit from an increase in footfall and trade and not just the Spennells side of town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local infrastructure is not sufficient for any major influx of people. Estates are already poorly maintained, so this tells me the council is already stretched. The hospital, Police, Ambulance and Fire don't have enough staff at the moment, let alone with more people to look after. • The existing road network on and off Spennells estate is already beyond capacity, based on the traffic jams at peak times that already exist. Opening up the Spennells estate as an access route to the new development will only add to these problems. • The increased traffic from opening up Spennells will increase the risk to the existing residents of road accidents. Noise and air pollution will also increase and this is not acceptable. • The school on Spennells is already at capacity and cannot take further children. • The fields are a good educational tool for young children. Encouraging exercise to combat the growing obesity crisis. <p>There are many more reasons why this is a bad idea and why I object in the strongest possible way.</p>
	LPPO2480	Object	<p>Object to Option A and B:</p> <p>Loss of recreational land/effect on health/loss of wildlife</p> <p>impact this development would have on the towns local infrastructure, medical care/schools/traffic/pollution</p>
	LPPO2481	Object	<p>I would like to register my opposition to the proposed plans to use Green Belt land for residential homes near the Spennells estate and Stanklyn Lane. My reasons for this rejection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I feel that there are sites that could be used without using this land such as Lea castle, Sion hill middle school and other areas in the town such as the leisure centre which could be developed. 2. Mental well being-research shows that the colours, sounds and smells we can encounter outdoors stimulate our senses in a way that the gym or urban environments may not. These fields are used by many for leisure activities

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>such as walking or cycling giving them the chance to switch off from the pressures of life therefore relieving stress.</p> <p>3. Wildlife-it is a natural habitat for many species and attracts a variety of creatures such as birds, bats, hedgehogs and insects.</p> <p>4. Increased air pollution- due to an increase in population and trees/green space being destroyed there will be more air pollution.</p>
	<p>LPPO2484</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Object to Plan A where all the supposed houses required immediately will be build on Green Belt land and impact solely on Spennells and the area around Stanklyn Lane. The amount of homes talked about cannot be quantified as figures have shown that population of Kidderminster has only grown 2% in last 10 years. Why are we building homes for Birmingham and its suburbs when there is plenty of land green and otherwise between them and us?</p> <p>Plan should encompass all parts but especially brown sites and vacant properties and the town centre (which is never going to be developed into the cultural centre of Worcestershire). With internet shopping increasing all the time who is going to want to try to run a business in the run down street. The empty shops show that. Build fair price houses and apartments.</p> <p>Spennells: this is Green Belt. Surely there must be a conscience about the facilities and lifestyle that Plan A would inflict on all local residents. Lack of schools, hospitals, doctors, jobs with businesses closing with regularity, social amenities, buses the list is endless. The new leisure centre is already too small and has far too few parking spaces. Traffic disruption, which is already high in the area. Talk of a road across the Green Belt fields and around the perimeter of the housing is horrifying.</p> <p>The Green Belt fields on which are now farmed must be part of a water table which would change dramatically should hundreds of houses be built on it.</p> <p>We are told that a great many in this country are obese but take away our fields and our areas to walk, run, cycle, play in is not a way to encourage exercise. There are not too many places to do these things around here. It is much simpler to walk, run round a field, ride a bike than travel to gyms, pay exorbitant prices to exercise. It's not only</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Spennells residents who use the lovely fields. Wildlife is abundant. We are always being told we need bees birds and nature of all sorts to make our world liveable. Why destroy it.</p> <p>I hope that someone somewhere would think again about these awful plans and try to come up with a plan that suits all the affected residents.</p>
	<p>LPPO2487</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The only people who use Turnstone Avenue are the home owners, prospective buyers, dog walkers and driving instructors. The cul-de-sac is safe and secure for children and homes. Now this is all put under threat because, we are told, there is a requirement for more housing for future generations.</p> <p>Firstly, I would argue that the future generations will not be able to afford to live on the Green Belt land as it will surely offer a much higher price than they can afford. Similarly to make the houses affordable that will bring down the quality of the houses at this end of the estate.</p> <p>Secondly, the brownfield areas of Kidderminster will be more enticing to the youth of today, in the same way that Merry Hill has been developed for the 'younger' generation I personally would never think of living there. Young people would much rather live where there is a nightlife close at hand without the additional expense of taxis home.</p> <p>The Green Belt around our town needs to be protected otherwise this country will just become a brick filled land. I work in education and already know that there are students who attend our school that do not benefit was fortunate backgrounds, so a simple trip to the countryside is amazing for them. If we take away these opportunities close-by then they, the future generation, are losing out. It is important that the wildlife themselves are protected too from developments that are unnecessary.</p> <p>With regard to education in the area, this is another issue that needs consideration. I know the school I work at is almost at full capacity per year group, I believe this may be the case for most schools in the Wyre Forest area. If houses were built on the Spennells Fields where exactly would these children be educated?</p> <p>These are some of my objections, I know that many of my neighbours have listed theirs at great length too, I could also mention increased traffic to the area. On Turnstone Road already there are an increased number of cars parked</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>along this narrow road due to families with grown-up driving children. This is not only a safety hazard as it is, however if this were to become a public right of way onto the fields themselves I can see a higher risk in accidents.</p> <p>I feel that we all need to be heard and consideration given to NOT allowing the option to build along the Green Belt of the Spennells Fields and Stanklyn Lane, especially when there are great areas of Kidderminster Town Centre that lie empty or derelict, which can be regenerated and make Kidderminster the town it once was.</p>
	LPPO2489	Object	<p>Object to Options A & B especially A:</p> <p>No regeneration of the town included despite potential larger population.</p> <p>Is this another attempt at getting a Bypass approved?</p> <p>More building would make Kidderminster a commuter town</p> <p>Infrastructure, schools medical services already stretched</p> <p>Wyre Forest has agreed to reduce its carbon footprint but pollution would be increased with extra traffic</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land/Green Belt/recreational space which benefits health/wildlife</p> <p>Use brownfield sites for regeneration first</p>
	LPPO2491	Object	<p>We would like to voice our concern and ill thought plans to cover our countryside in houses.</p> <p>I, like many, love the open countryside that the surrounding areas of Kidderminster provide and although my initial thoughts were that the land has “build on me “written all over I do believe that the plans are being thought through.</p> <p>All points already raised are also my concerns,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Life styles and well being of current local residents. The land is used daily by numerous people for all activities.</p> <p>Increased traffic on roads that are already fast driven and often dangerous.</p> <p>Impact on local schools, hospitals , and surgeries etc</p> <p>Green Belt status setting a precedent for future land to be used.</p> <p>Wildlife and habitat.</p> <p>Are all these concerns being heard? If so what is the thought and reply from within the council?</p> <p>The development that is planned would not have any serious impact of any positive consequence.</p>
	<p>LPPO2494</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the possible removal of Green Belt status to land at the back of Spennells Estate.</p> <p>The fields are a well used community asset with walkers, dog walkers and cyclists. In these days of obesity warnings, to have such an amenity can only be a benefit for physical and mental health of all who use it. That includes families, people of all generations and people of varying physical ability.</p> <p>These fields also provide an easily accessible opportunity to get an appreciative sense of nature and wild life. A fantastic amenity particularly for children. From being able to watch the crops grow from seed, to seeing a vast variety of wild flowers, birds, butterflies and insects.</p> <p>In addition, the access to Spennells is already at certain times very congested. There is no other viable access to those fields so the congestion and therefore pollution would increase.</p> <p>As I understand it there are options to develop ONLY next to Spennells, or to spread the developments across Kidderminster. I urge you NOT to completely remove such a valuable amenity that is close to so many people, and at</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the very least to have a sense of fairness and spread the new housing across the town.</p> <p>Further to my objection previously entered, I now have further understanding of the proposal and therefore additional objections.</p> <p>In the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, section 8.7 says that the '..... 300 dwellings per annum is at the upper end of the requirements suggested by the various demographic scenarios....'. And then in the very next paragraph 8.8, the statement seems conclusive -</p> <p>'Housing market signals suggest that the housing market in Wyre Forest is relatively stable. There are currently no indicators suggesting a need for adjusting the housing dwelling requirement on the basis of market signals. '</p> <p>So therefore I have to ask why such a massive plan is being considered when there appears to not be the need for it.</p> <p>Why are more brownfield sites not being considered e.g. the town centre particularly Worcester Street? This is much closer to amenities and the railway station. Houses behind Spennells would need people to drive to the station.</p> <p>Option A seems to be preferred because of the possible provision of an Eastern relief road for Kidderminster. While this may relieve roads within the town, this would undoubtedly add significantly to the traffic travelling to both Birmingham and Worcester, as that is most likely be where people would be going for their work thus simply shifting the problem to else where on the network. As I understand it, all concerned are well aware that this road has to cross the railway - possibly twice - therefore is likely to cost millions of pounds which means that its development is unlikely to happen for several years. So why plan for houses for which there completely insufficient access?</p> <p>At the recent consultations, I spoke to someone about IF the new houses get built, will the town centre be improved. I was told that this was nothing to do with Wyre Forest and was up to the companies that own the properties. Surely any plan for increased housing on such a scale must include improvements and incentives to the town centre otherwise the increased population will bring very little benefit to the local economy with Merry Hill, Birmingham</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and Worcester catering for the majority of shopping needs.</p> <p>The development around Spennells and Eastern Kidderminster seems to be the easy option. Surely with more creativity, and better clarity on the number of houses actually required rather than a number that appears to have no evidence to support it, solutions can be found that avoid spoiling a large part of what makes Kidderminster such a nice to play to live (current town centre excluding).</p>
	LPPO2495	Object	<p>Probable detrimental effect to local wildlife and increased congestion, particularly going in to Kidderminster from the Bromsgrove Road and also the Viaduct island, both routes which can already be heavily congested.</p> <p>Spennells is already a hugely populated estate with considerable amounts of traffic at peak times.</p>
	LPPO2498	Object	<p>Spennells is already a large estate but it has a lovely Green Belt within walking distance which is widely used and makes the estate so attractive. I fail to see how there is such a need for thousands of houses when the ones that are put up for sale are on the market for so long. Kidderminster town centre needs money ploughed into it and needs to be a place where people want to go and shop and socialise, it needs attractive, modern apartments that will ultimately bring in younger, vibrant professionals and families who want to be there. Find sites within the town to regenerate and add to Kidderminster, don't use the beautiful and precious Green Belt land which is home to much wildlife and is such a pleasure to live by and is used by so many.</p> <p>Traffic already congested most mornings getting off the estate and out of Kidderminster, this is only going to get worse with extra housing, not to mention the pollution that will inevitably get worse.</p> <p>I fear new housing will be occupied by people who do not have a connection to Kidderminster and probably work out of town, so they won't be spending money here or adding to the community in any way. The houses will not be affordable housing for current locals, and the families moving in will send their children to schools out of town, so many people already do from Spennells. Those same families will work in Worcester, Birmingham or surrounding areas adding to the pollution probably won't shop here either so will bring nothing in to the economy. Focus on getting the current education and housing right and the town centre right so that Kidderminster is a vibrant place to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>live where people want to move to.</p> <p>The Green Belt is exactly that, it is there to stop urban sprawl, if we continue to build on it where does it end, there will be none left, there has to be a point where it stops before it's too late.</p> <p>The leisure centre development and the houses being built there is still ongoing, they are still building them so surely this is providing a need for future houses isn't it?</p> <p>The population isn't growing in the Wyre Forest so we don't need to jump on the band wagon and build additional housing, the country is already over populated we don't need to fan the flames by providing more housing, let's look after what we already have and get that right first.</p> <p>So in short we strongly object to any housing being built on Green Belt land and specifically option A around the Spennells area.</p>
	LPPO2500	Object	<p>My husband and I firmly object to Wyre Forest encroaching on the fields behind our house to build houses on the fields which are Green Belt as there are many sites in Kidderminster which are better for the purpose.</p> <p>We object to the gypsy proposed, traveller and travelling show people site in Heath lane as dangerous because of the narrow roads, and is totally impractical.</p> <p>The scale of development, on our Green Belt, is much better on brown sites.</p> <p>It would totally destroy the habitat of the Skylarks, linnets and other rare nesting birds.</p> <p>Loss of our countryside Green Belt status. Threatens our public right of way, and productive agricultural land.</p>
	LPPO2502	Object	<p>If Option A is selected then land at the rear of Spennells should be removed as it is not needed. If included it should</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>not start until “core Sites” (inc Lea Castle site in Option B) have been used.</p> <p>Object Option A On the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion, pollution, safety and health grounds. • Loss of good quality fields behind Spennells. • The NPFF should prevent neighbouring towns merging • Flood Risk • Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds • Impact on the wildlife inc Corn Bunting • Loss of recreational land/associated health benefits • Unnecessary urban sprawl • Extra traffic congestion • Re-designation of the fields is contrary to core strategy. • Despite house building the Council have already closed several schools which if needed should have been kept open • The current primary school is already full and more dwellings would need more places plus the extra buses/traffic will mean safety issues for the children • There has never been a Doctors surgery on Spennells. • Use of Green Belt because of wrong decisions in the past is not in the requirements of the National Planning Guidelines <p>Therefore, from an environmental view point this must not go ahead. Concentrate instead on the regeneration strategy</p>
	LPPO2506	Object	<p>As somebody who has grown up on Spennells, the fields have played a big part in my life. It's a way of getting away from the town, and into the countryside. How can you destroy a place that brings so much happiness to so many? Think of others who won't be able to benefit from having somewhere like this as their playground.</p>
	LPPO2508	Object	<p>I feel that the proposed expansion of Spennells to build new homes will only make the situation worse by causing</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic problems and more pollution. We need our agricultural land to farm and disposing of the fields will not only take away jobs for farmers but produce. Spennells is beautiful with large open spaces for walking and playing don't take these away. I hope the Wyre Forest District Council will look brownfield sites in town centre. I am officially and strongly objecting to building 1,735 new to expand Spennells. I hope this matter is taken with the upmost importance.</p>
	<p>LPPO2511</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to state my objection to plans to release land at the rear of Spennells ,Captains Pool and The Lodge, from the Green Belt for housing development (Option A)</p> <p>The Green Belt was set up explicitly to prevent urban sprawl and protect rural or agricultural land. If we allow land to be released from the Green Belt rather than look at alternative options, eventually Kidderminster will link with Summerfield, then Hartlebury, Ombersley and then eventually Worcester. Where do we draw the line?</p> <p>Housing developers are so certain land will be released from the Green Belt they are purchasing it for vast sums of money prior to consultations and decisions by Planning Departments. The message to developers must be clear – Green Belt is protected for a reason, and will stay that way. Developers must look to build on brownfield sites and previously developed sites, rather than build on Green Belt land because it is a cheaper option for them and generates more income for the Local Council.</p> <p>The massive environmental impact in the face of climate change needs to be considered. Rural areas provide a means of generating oxygen and reducing carbon dioxide, prevent flooding and provide food resources. Indeed, the fields at the rear of Spennells have been regularly planted with crops year after year in the twenty-one years I have lived here. Loss of this agricultural land means a loss of this food resource, resulting in a larger carbon footprint to bring in food from elsewhere. It also means a loss of employment to the workers whose jobs it is to maintain this arable land.</p> <p>Wildlife of many species live in the hedgerows around this land which will be forever destroyed if it is allowed to be developed. Public rights of way across the land provide safe leisure facilities for the people of Spennells and it rare not to see families of cyclists or walkers, enjoying outdoor family time on any given day of the week.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>In addition to this there is the added pollution that extra cars alongside the extra homes will undoubtedly bring, causing increased traffic congestion to an already poorly designed road network on the Estate. Any traffic incident which causes local delays on the A449 or A448, results in the residents of Spennells becoming trapped on the Estate, as traffic cannot flow onto Spennells Valley Road from the only two exits on the Estate. More homes will only increase this problem.</p> <p>Given the Government’s commitment to protect the Green Belt, and reduce the impact of climate change I urge you not to allow Wyre Forest Green Belt to be depleted for short term gain. We must look for alternative more environmentally sustainable solutions.</p>
	LPPO2512	Object	<p>It will course chaos to the residents, with the invasion of more traffic along the roads and rat runs through the estate.</p> <p>The attraction of the estate is to be able to walk our dogs in a safe area.</p> <p>SO please reconsider changing the Spennells from a Green Belt area into an urban one!!</p>
	LPPO2513	Object	<p>I Object to development at Spennells/Stanklyn fields for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic – how will the roads cope? Stanklyn Lane junction is a nightmare to get out of and Worcester Road is already heavily congested. • There are several brownfield sites that should be used – Sugar Beet, Lea Castle, Town Centre. • The land is prime agricultural. • The fields are used for recreational walking and provide habitat for wildlife.
	LPPO2514	Object	<p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local schools will have larger classes and reduced resources per student in an education system already under pressure.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Health:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased pressure on health services already under strain – hospitals, doctors, dentists, opticians, district nurses, GP practices. • Removal of the fields will diminish mental health and physical well-being of the people who use them. The fields are used extensively by local people for exercise of various sorts: to walk, jog, cycle, walk dogs and ride horses. • Increased traffic, noise and higher exhaust emissions and subsequent risk to health <p>Environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of Green Belt status to the land indicated on the Option A plan will threaten existing Public Rights of Way and removes protection of the countryside from further urban sprawl. • There will be a loss of wildlife habitat – with skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds nesting in the fields. • There will be a loss of good quality, productive agricultural land. <p>Town planning & Economy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing with the sprawl of development as proposed in Option A will radically change the character of the town and the area and not for the better. • Building more homes around the town centres will reduce car journeys and pollution. • It will regenerate the town centres to make them more attractive for inward investment by companies and

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>quality retail outlets. It is the centre of Kidderminster for example which requires the major investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spreading the home building requirement around other smaller sites will reduce the radical changes in communities across the region.
	LPPO2516	Object	<p>I understand that the Council has conducted a review of Green Belt as part of their review of the Local Plan and that Spennells/Stanklyn fields might be built on. I would like to object to these plans and voice my concerns for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Green Belt is important as it prevents urban sprawl, the merging of towns and it safeguards the countryside. It also provides habitat, biodiversity, prime agricultural land, recreational space and it is essential to protect and promote the character of the countryside. For example there are Skylarks nesting on these fields. This is a bird in rapid decline in numbers. This is also a great social open space and currently provides somewhere for many people to meet, walk and socialise. Any removal or reduction of Green Belt will increase the urbanisation of the area with a consequent increase in traffic. Increased volumes of traffic will create congestion, exhaust and noise pollution and increase pedestrian and vehicular hazards. Where will a new road go? Any further junctions on the Worcester Road will create further back up of traffic towards Hartlebury. Surely brownfield sites must be prioritised for building on? <p>In looking at the plans, the numbers for new houses in the plan are confusing, there are so many assumptions made and I feel the plan is written with a bias towards this option. We urge you to reconsider and not to make use of Green Belt land for the above reasons. Open spaces are in rapid decline and will continue to impact on the social wellbeing of many people.</p>
	LPPO2518	Object	<p>I believe this will increase traffic, noise and disrupt the quiet lovely area we have.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>This is turn will impact on house prices for existing homes.</p> <p>My children are able to play out safely now but with an increase of traffic from all the homes this is likely to change.</p>
	LPPO2519	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposals to build on land at the rear of Spennells estate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the housing need of 6000. • Coalescence would occur between Stone, Summerfield, Stanklyn Lane and Spennells • Flood risk and drainage. The fields (at N522202 W0021337 and to the rear of south Spennells) are a valuable soak away. Flood defences have had to be installed by Severn Trent on the Spennells estate and the Victoria Carpet's old cricket field is designated flood plain. • Increase in traffic congestion, air pollution and effects on health. • Impact on wildlife, including protected species such as bats, badgers and skylarks. Option A does not encourage biodiversity. • Loss of public footpaths and the impact on health. • The current primary school is full and any more dwellings would have an adverse impact on the local schools and nursery plus the extra buses and traffic will cause increased safety issues for the children. • The fields are on the boundary with Wychhavan which would mean increased urban sprawl. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of unnecessary urban sprawl which has historically been against policy. <p>The District should concentrate on the regeneration strategy. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of re-designating the fields is contrary to core strategy.</p>
	LPPO2520	Object	<p>I am writing to inform you of my objection to the planning proposal of further expansion to the Spennells area on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Green Belt land should be preserved for our future generations to benefit from, prime agricultural land if built on would be lost forever</p> <p>I believe not enough is being done to regenerate brown sites and inner town areas, having lived in Kidderminster for</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>45years I am amazed at the lack of imagination and endeavour by the council to develop empty sites left empty for years in and around the town ,prime example being the old PO building, for goodness sake get a grip and develop this blot on the landscape for retail and housing, I really do believe the council are trying to push through an easy option to build on Green Belt and not address and rebuild our inner town areas.</p> <p>Removal of fields from this area will have a devastating effect on our children’s health and a lasting detrimental effect on the health and well being of all the people living in the area putting extra stress on health services.</p> <p>Traffic in the area will be horrendous, the traffic in the viaduct and Spennells Valley Road area is not acceptable now, I cannot comprehend the effect the extra traffic emissions will have on our children’s health and safety, so building a link road form Easter Park area to the A456 Birmingham road would only increase traffic emissions really not a good idea.</p> <p>The pressure on the health centres, schools all public amenities will be totally overloaded.</p> <p>I firmly believe the council should concentrate more on developing brown sites and land in the inner town areas being sat on by speculative developers for housing.</p>
	LPPO2521	Object	<p>Strongly against Option A. Spennells is already a very large estate, and it would be detrimental for existing residents to increase its size further. It nonsense to place such a large development in one place. I object most strongly to the loss of Green Belt land, particularly when the fields it is proposed to build on are good quality, productive agricultural land. Such land needs to be retained for food production, particularly at a time of Brexit when it is likely that importing food from abroad is going to be increasingly expensive. The fields are also valuable for local residents for walking the footpaths around the margins, for exercise, for dog walking, and for enhancing people’s mental and physical health. They also provide valuable habitat for the wildlife found there, which would be destroyed if the development was allowed. It is no good the planners thinking that retaining some footpaths through the development would suffice. Who would enjoy walking through houses between high fences with no view? It is concerning the effect increased traffic congestion will have with noise and air pollution.</p>
	LPPO2522	Object	<p>I would like to place my objection to the proposed plans to build on the Green Belt designated land at Spennells. I</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>can't see that anywhere near the amount of proposed houses are needed and I believe that there are still brownfield alternatives available which surely must all be used before Green Belt areas. Once Green Belt areas begin to be used I think it will start a precedent that we can't afford. Building more and more houses is only a short term solution that must stop at some point there is only so much land. The land is a valuable resource in an already overcrowded area used by many people for jogging, dog walking and enjoying the wildlife. The road system around Hoobrook is already terribly congested almost completely gridlocked at times and I can't see the area coping with so many extra cars. The local hospitals and schools also can't be expected to cope with such a large increase in people. I hope careful consideration goes into your final decision.</p>
	<p>LPPO2524</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to object to Option A of the Draft Local Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. People are being encouraged to get outside in to the fresh air for the good of their physical and mental well being. This is an area used and appreciated by the local community of all ages, dog walkers, walkers, cyclists, joggers, birdwatchers, parents and grandparents with toddlers in pushchairs, young families, people of all ages. The list goes on. Yet the local council wants to do away with it. 2. At a time when we are being encouraged to help preserve butterflies and bees, increase their habitat for their and our own good, it's to be vastly reduced. We are lucky enough to have birds around here that are on the Red List. Mistle Thrush, Sky Lark, Corn Crane and House Sparrow. Does it not seem a little ironic to lose their habitat when the entire estate is named after birds? 3. Increased pollution. A greater volume of traffic will result in slow moving and stationary traffic leading to more pollution ~ leading to more health issues. 4. Increased light pollution. A huge increase in light pollution in an area where nature flourishes can only have a negative impact. 5. Loss of agricultural land. The necessity for our country to be more self-sufficient is being brought to our attention. Retaining excellent agricultural land has to be far better than destroying it and having to find alternative but inferior quality land. 6. No mention is made of associated services and amenities required. Doctors, emergency services, schools, sports & recreation facilities. Existing services surely can't accommodate the increase in numbers quoted within the Draft Document. 7. Travel will be needed for anything. Not everyone has access to a vehicle. Taxis are expensive and the bus

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>service seems to be forever being cut.</p> <p>8. Kidderminster Town Centre is a ghost town to what it was 30 years ago. Why not as part of a regeneration plan encompass new homes on brownfield sites? Use the brownfield sites first. I cannot believe they've all been utilised when there are so many derelict sites within the Kidderminster borders.</p> <p>9. Big play is made of the need for affordable housing yet often these new builds are 4 and 5 bedrooms.</p> <p>10. People will move in from elsewhere, commuting outside the area and probably unlikely to support and integrate with the town by spending their money here rather than where they work etc. Kidderminster will become a satellite town.</p> <p>Once the Green Belt is gone that's it. It can't be replaced. Not everything in life is measured purely in monetary terms. We have a responsibility to preserve our beautiful land for future generations.</p> <p>I therefore herewith register my strong objection to Option A.</p>
	LPPO2526	Object	<p>As a resident of Spennells estate I would like to submit my views on the proposed plans.</p> <p>I am aware that not only myself but also other near-by residents are concerned of the impact that this will have in regards to the volume of traffic coming and going from the estate. This is already an ongoing issue on weekday morning as traffic jams and stand still traffic often forms if leaving the estate after 8am. Therefore, I can only see this problem getting worse should more homes be built and do not feel that additional road access being created would necessarily relieve the issue.</p> <p>After speaking to many neighbours, they have also expressed their interest in moving off the estate should the proposed plans go ahead, which is something that I would consider too.</p>
	LPPO2531	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the development of the whole area of OPTION A nearly doubling the size of Spennells. Option A is too large a development for one area, whereas Option B would be a better solution as less Green Belt would be used, not concentrated in one area but dispersed across the district so less impact on local infrastructure .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This new development would lead to a larger loss of Green Belt which in the face of climate change has an

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>increasingly significant role in storing carbon and preventing flooding and is a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields, apart from being farmed for crops, provide annual nesting grounds for declining bird species such as Skylarks and other wildlife habitat. • The fields are used extensively by local people to walk, jog, walk dogs and ride horses. With mental health on the increase the loss of these fields would have a detrimental effect on all who live in this area not to mention physical well being especially as the district has one of the highest levels of obesity. • Existing rights of way threatened i.e. Bridal paths • Increased traffic noise and pollution resulting in increased risk to health putting pressure on local medical services. <p>We appreciate difficult decisions have to be made especially in the light of the government guidelines, although we feel that the population of the area will decrease not increase due to the reduction in available employment (carpet factories/Sealine) and future housing is likely to be purchased by commuters to Birmingham/Worcester etc. it also seems an excessive amount (4.3 million £) that is to be spent upgrading Kidderminster Railway Station primarily for commuters. Surely it makes more sense to use less Green Belt.</p>
	<p>LPPO2534</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to object to the development of the whole area of option A, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Mental health and wellbeing would be affected. This field is used by walkers and cyclists. The social aspect of meeting and talking to people would be greatly reduced. Sometimes this is the only time some have any social interaction.</p> <p>Wild life would be habitat would be lost.</p> <p>The volume of traffic would increase and add to traffic congestion in the area.</p> <p>Pollution levels would increase, causing greater health issues in the area.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Agricultural land would be lost.</p> <p>It would increase pressure on all local amenities, already stretched to capacity.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</p>
	LPPO2546	Object	<p>It would be a huge loss to the community and area to build on this Green Belt plot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields are used by people to walk, jog, cycle etc which is good for mental and physical wellbeing. To deny people the chance to so easily walk to and enjoy these fields would be such a shame, especially when young people are now out doors so much less than in the past. • The schools are over subscribed and getting a doctors appointment is tricky at best. • Spennells is a lovely estate. The residents enjoy space, greenery... quiet. • A busy relief road will increase noise pollution which will affect the health of local residents. • The area is home to a range of wildlife including, hedgehogs, bats and a huge variety of birds. <p>I hope that this option will be rejected in favour of building on the brownfield land.</p>
	LPPO2549	Object	<p>I hereby tender my objection to Option A of the Draft Local Plan for Wyre Forest:</p> <p>The houses abutting the fields behind Spennells have enjoyed the privacy, quiet and amenity of those fields.</p> <p>The fields to the rear of Spennells provide a place to stroll and enjoy a vast array of natural features.</p> <p>This space is a valuable resource to many residents and visitors: walkers (with or without dogs), joggers, horse riders and twitchers to name but a few.</p> <p>Option A would replace a diverse natural habitat with concrete, brick and tarmac, traffic and its inevitable noise and pollution, people with families and dogs all demanding a share of what resources remain after the houses have been</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>built - all at the cost of the current residents.</p> <p>Why is such a massive destruction of greenfield even being considered - indeed, even preferred to an option that uses brownfield sites?</p> <p>The Captains was refused planning permission for caravans - now it can have houses?</p> <p>The destruction of the fields of Spennells would have serious environmental costs. Apart from the reduction of clean, natural land for the benefit of people, an abundant array of flora and fauna would suffer.</p> <p>With numerous species of grass, campions, clover, knapweed, plantain, hawkbit, dandelion etc., it is no wonder that a remarkable number of skylarks use the fields. Red underwings, fieldfares and housemartins visit. Chaffinches and great tits inhabit the smatterings of hedge around the fields.</p> <p>My own garden has been visited by sparrowhawks, nuthatches, bullfinches, goldfinches, great tits, coal tits, blue tits, long-tailed tits, greater spotted woodpeckers, green woodpeckers and goldcrests - many visit annually. Robins, blackbirds, hedge sparrows and wrens regularly nest with us. Hedgehogs and toads appear every year - probably having hibernated in the garden or nearby. Grass snakes nested in our compost bin a few years ago. Foxes, owls, badgers, sparrow hawks, kestrels and buzzards all value the land.</p> <p>In late February and March we experience the migration of toads. A massacre occurs on the Spennells Valley Road. Toads also migrate across Stanklyn Lane. They will be seriously impacted by a housing development.</p> <p>I have not even begun to mention the insect life that visits my own garden and the Spennells fields: bees, butterflies: commas, red admirals, whites, blues and the meadow species; moths: yellow underwings, eyed hawkmoths, scarlet tiger moths; maybugs and hover flies.</p> <p>All this to be replaced by strain on local resources, massively increased noise, dog mess and litter. And what compensation? It seems that there will be no gains for Spennells residents.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2551	Object	<p>Development here will automatically mean more traffic on the Bromsgrove Road. People who choose to live here are more likely to use the A448 as their local road and to commute to work via Bromsgrove and out to the Motorways. This poor quality, narrow and speed restricted A448 is already over loaded and congested, the Mustow Green roundabout in the evening is a nightmare regularly adding between 10 and 15 minutes to the evening commute.</p> <p>One of the attractions in living on the Spennells estate is that it borders on open country and affords easy access to country footpath through green fields, especially for joggers and those who own dogs and need to walk them. These footpaths encourage healthy outdoor exercise in all age groups. If they are lost then the option of pounding the pavement outside yet more houses is not nearly as appealing.</p> <p>There are plenty of sites in and around the town centre which could be restored into high quality housing. Also there are brownfield sites which should be considered first before taking the easy option of building on the Green Belt and taking yet more valuable agricultural land out of production.</p> <p>Do we really want to encourage more people to live in Kidderminster with the town centre the way it is at the moment? The town centre is a disgrace, it is depressed and an embarrassing place to take friends and family around when they visit. There are no decent shops, family run shops are driven out and the place is full of charity shops, empty shops and banks. There seems to only be one direction the town centre is going and that is down.</p>
	LPPO2559	Object	<p>Overall conclusion:</p> <p>We are presented with Options A and B - I am opposed to the concentrated development described in option A and greatly prefer the dispersed approach as described in option B.</p> <p>Housing Need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I suspect that the estimation of numbers of dwellings required is exaggerated. • I am not convinced that such a large number of houses will be required in the coming years but I am convinced that it will not be necessary or helpful to concentrate those that are built at a single location. • It seems far better to allow development to proceed in a more natural and dispersed way which would be

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>allowed by Option B.</p> <p>Proposed Eastern Relief Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal for an eastern relief road is sketchy at best - this is a disappointing oversight in the plan and requires more attention. • I assume that the relief road is primarily intended to deal with through traffic but, given the obviously limited development of the proposal, it is impossible to gauge its potential to deal with the increase in local traffic which will be generated by the development in option A. • I can only conclude that proposal A will generate additional pressure on the current Spennells access roads and lead to increased traffic through the estate, this can only add to the significant traffic congestion which already occurs at peak times. • I prefer the dispersed development which is allowed by option B which will not lead to such a marked concentration of traffic. <p>Additional pressure on Spennells infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spennells has always lacked amenities which should have been seen as essential on a large residential estate. There is no medical provision, no community provision (particularly since the youth club has been incorporated into the school) and the local primary school is operating at capacity with consequent impact on parking in Warbler place etc. It is difficult to see how the estate can be enlarged unless these deficiencies are addressed. • We are told that the increase in population will trigger additional facilities e.g. a new school but Option A will require some years to be fully implemented. I am certain that there will be additional pressure on existing facilities until such time as additional facilities become justified. • I prefer a development model which will avoid the concentration of difficulties which would be produced by Option A. <p>Environmental issues</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementation of Option A will lead to a significant and inevitable increase in traffic in the Spennells area. This will have a deleterious effect on health and the general quality of life. • There will be increased emissions with an adverse effect on Air Quality; this is unlikely to be mitigated by government clean energy policy for many years. • There will be an inevitable increase in road journeys to and from the town centre. This could be avoided if development made use of brownfield sites which are available closer to the town centre. • I prefer a development model which will avoid the increase in traffic and pollution which would be produced by Option A. <p>Impact on Town Centre Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been considerable and beneficial development in Kidderminster town centre during recent years. However, this has caused a measure of ‘blight’ in older areas which provide increased opportunity for dispersed redevelopment. • I would prefer a dispersed model of development such as that described in Option B which can take advantage of such opportunities to create a vibrant town centre <p>Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe that Green Belt land should only be used as a last resort. • Option A uses only valuable Green Belt land so; I prefer option B uses significantly less Green Belt land. • It seems wrong to build on Green Belt land when Option B would allow redevelopment of brownfield sites which are closer to the town centre and would also bring the benefits described above. <p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fields to the south of Spennells provide a landscape which provides a valuable and well used amenity. It is widely enjoyed, the footpaths provide opportunities for leisure activities and exercise which contribute to general health and a sense of well being • I would regret the loss of a valuable and well used amenity and prefer Option B as it has less impact on the

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>natural environment</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt land to the south of Spennells provides an invaluable habitat for wildlife including rare birds and small mammals. • I prefer Option B which will have less impact on wildlife <p>Agriculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt land to the south of Spennells is productive agricultural land • I prefer Option B which will have less impact on agriculture.
	LPPO2560	Object	<p>Objects to development on Spennells Green Belt for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road infrastructure is not sufficient, it is already heavily congested. • Increase in air pollution from additional cars will have detrimental impact on health. • The fields are used daily by many residents as a recreational amenity. • Development should be more dispersed through Kidderminster. • Investment should be put into making Kidderminster an attractive place to come before building extra homes for them to live.
	LPPO2561	Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to Option A and would prefer you to consider very carefully the implications to local infrastructure if you did go ahead with it. A more dispersed approach is better so I would opt for Option B. Likewise the knock-on effects on local infrastructure need to be monitored with that too.</p> <p>My main points are</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please look at the numbers of houses required in the future again. It seems to me too large an estimate. I would prefer you to investigate other ways of providing new dwellings. Our ageing population needs specialist small housing close to doctors and shops not large 3 and 4-bedroom houses on isolated estates. Our young people want to be close to their work places and night life in larger towns and cities, not “out in the sticks” in Kidderminster. I can’t see how Kidderminster Station can increase its parking to help people commute to work, it’s always full when I want to park. I have seen no mention made of Housing Association homes or other rental options in these plans, are they not essential to provide a wide variety of provision? • Green field sites should be the last resort not the first. If it needs to be green field it should only be after all brownfield sites have been used. I would prefer you to look at sites like Lea Castle which seems ideal and should be at the fore front of your plans. (Special attention needs to be made to ensuring road safety around that site if ever used.) • Spennells cannot cope with a large housing estate on its periphery. The planners at the drop-in session told me that a school would not be built until a certain high number of houses were completed. The children housed in these early new dwellings need to be able to access education easily. If Spennells School is full, other local schools like Wilden and Comberton can’t easily cope with additional numbers trying to get in either. All three schools were built without provision for parental parking hence the nightmare at school pick up time. To have to wait for a high trigger point seems harsh for the building of provision for the education of future children of Kidderminster. Housing spread out throughout the district would achieve an easier entry to education. • The planners were also vague about other infrastructure issues. This Eastern Relief Road should be part and parcel of these diagrams provided for consultation, so that everyone can see what is actually intended for the future. If the Eastern Relief Road was built, rat runs through the estate to get to shops and school would mean similar congestion at peak times. If Turnstone Road was used as the early access to the new estate, much congestion would arise at busy times for people trying to get off the estate. Perhaps it would need bollards on Turnstone Road to divide old estate from new if there was to be a relief road. Please plan this carefully if Option A is implemented. The huge capital investment of the crossing of the railway line seems to be hidden very carefully, it would be a major construction headache with enormous impact locally. • No provision is made currently for any form of community facility on the estate now the old Youth Club provision has been subsumed into the school. Please consider this in planning any new developments. • Using the language of Wyre Forest District Council Planners there would be an “adverse impact on air

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>quality, the landscape and wildlife,” if that argument can be used to turn down another development, I see it very appropriate here. I moved onto the estate July 1988, the very first day whilst waiting to move into my house I could hear a skylark singing high up in the sky. Each year since then I have delighted in hearing them from my garden and seeing them in the fields. The skylark is a rare bird, so I hope cognisance has been fully taken of that. I was shocked to see, last year, that the farmer had let the productive fields deteriorate but was rewarded by the fabulous show of bright red poppies. I do hope that wasn't an attempt to downgrade what I imagine is high grade agricultural land into land that is only fit to “grow” houses. These fields are the lungs of the estate and need to remain as such for the mental health of the residents of the estate who need the ability to walk away from traffic and fumes.</p> <p>Please reconsider making Option A the prime choice for new development. Don't destroy huge swathes of Green Belt. Take some carefully chosen sites, but not huge swathes of it please!</p>
	LPPO2565	Object	I wish to object to the plans to build on Green Belt area. There are plenty of abandoned factories and land which is vacant and attracting flytippers that could be used for housing without using Green Belt which should be preserved for future generations.
	LPPO2568	Object	<p>I believe the quality of life on Spennells Estate will reduce not increase if the plans go ahead for the new development on the southern edge of the current Spennells Estate.</p> <p>I believe the new development will lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of fields that are used extensively by local people on the estate for recreational purposes • The impact on the wildlife within those fields and hedgerows and surrounding Green Belt area. There are a number of red listed birds within these fields and area such as Skylarks and Linnets • Increased traffic and noise – the Estate can get congested now without hundreds more cars adding to it. The roads that service Spennells will not cope with the extra traffic through Hoobrook onto Worcester as it's too busy now in rush hour. • The internet quality is very poor already and this will add extra pressure to another service that probably isn't scheduled to be upgraded.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be an impact on drainage as the fields offer a soak away • The quality of housing and space allocated for frontages, drives and gardens need to be consistent with the current estate and planners ensure that there are drives on the front of houses not used group parking areas which residents will not use. The housing companies need to make a few less homes and money to ensure that the area is decent. • There seems to be no additional plans for road infrastructure changes or additional public transport services and impact assessments on the increase in population to additional services for GPs, schools, hospital, benefit offices, council services, etc. • Loss of the Green Belt status means an impact on protecting further urban spread, it sets a precedence and is an “easy option” as its cheaper for the builders than insisting the spend extra money preparing derelict or brownfield sites. <p>The plan mentions 10% of the population in the district currently attend swimming or gym and the new leisure centre has not been built to sustain the increase in usage for the next 10 years so already this is a short-sighted approach by a council who knew they would need to expand within the next 15 years. The current site cannot be expanded to take this increase.</p> <p>It would be useful to ensure that the contracts with the building companies who want to buy the land actually put something back into the community by way of renovating something else - be it a building or park space or similar as part of their corporate social responsibility and therefore the council get something extra than just easy money for easy land.</p> <p>The town centre needs to be regenerated otherwise all the money that additional residents will bring will be spent outside of the town because it looks deserted and run down.</p> <p>The land is currently Green Belt and there are plenty of areas in Kidderminster that are rundown or derelict and these areas/buildings could be renewed to make the place more pleasant to live in as a whole not just expand the edges with nice new homes and keep the old all rundown. Kidderminster town has become disjointed from many years of different decision making on development in the centre. Sadly it is more expensive for the builders to</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>renovate and regenerate sites than build on land that doesn't need work and this influences the decisions.</p> <p>I also believe that the houses that are proposed will not help families who need affordable homes as the ones builders now build are 4-5 bedroom and this town needs more apartments for the younger generation and more 2-3 bedroom houses for families.</p> <p>The plans state that the council will build new business parks for new jobs to be created ready for the people who move into these new homes. We have many business areas with buildings empty i.e. Easter Park, ex-boat building site on Worcester Road. We cannot fill these; half of the town has no shops, so where will these people go for jobs - answer "outside Kidderminster".</p> <p>I don't believe that the surrounding infrastructure, roads, schools, shopping areas, supermarkets will be changed enough to managing the increase in population.</p> <p>Finally I object to plan A</p>
	LPP02570	Object	<p>I OBJECT to the planning of Spennells fields and Captains Pool. This will have such a negative impact on the surrounding area where residents use the fields as a community facility to walk dogs etc.</p> <p>There are plenty of other sites within Kidderminster that are derelict that can be used for this and wouldn't have an impact on people's life.</p> <p>It will destroy the approach into Kidderminster if you develop near Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive and also the area close to Captains Pool, a beautiful part of Kidderminster where an ugly housing estate will be placed, I feel this will want to make most residents move on and out of Kidderminster.</p>
	LPP02571	Object	<p>I would like to object to the building of more houses on the greenfield space behind the Spennells Estate. I believe it to be wrong to build on Green Belt land. I object to the proposal of building on this land as I would like it to stay as Green Belt. As one of the many people who benefits from the use of this land for exercise and well being, I would</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>hate to see it being lost to development.</p> <p>I would also wish to put in a concern about the new Eastern Relief Road which is proposed in your expansion plans as I don't believe it will relieve congestion. The Council have already implemented a by-pass to Stourport which has done little to reduce congestion on our roads. Since the implementation of this link-road & the new set of traffic lights there are longer queues on the A449.</p> <p>What other infrastructure improvements are to be created to cope with the influx of circa 3000 vehicles per day to the proposed new homes?</p>
	LPPO2575	Object	<p>I would like to express my concern for proposals to build on Green Belt land near Spennells.</p> <p>This area is important to many local residents. It is used for walking, cycling, jogging but to mention a few and I see it as important for wellbeing.</p> <p>In my opinion brown field sites and sites closer to town will not only preserve our countryside but regenerate our town.</p> <p>Another concern would be the amount of traffic all these homes would generate locally which would be an annoyance as well have another negative impact on our local environment and of course an impact of the wildlife who habitat in these fields.</p> <p>I hope you listen to concerns of all the people these proposals will impact locally.</p>
	LPPO2576	Object	<p>With reference to your proposed building on Green Belt land surrounding the Spennells I seriously ask that you reconsider as this will not only have a dramatic influence on the immediate area but to Kidderminster as a whole.</p> <p>My concerns are :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shops • Doctors surgery • Ambulance • Police • Roads • Fresh air • Food outlets <p>Have you estimated the extra costs and impact this will have on the community?</p> <p>You may conclude that the S.A.F.E march was nimbyism. I can assure you it was more than that; it was a demonstration of a community pulling together.</p>
	LPPO2577	Object	<p>I would like to Object to Option A submitted by the Council and in particular to the proposed development on Green Belt land on the fields behind Spennells Estate and Captains Pool. The Spennells fields form part of the valuable Green Belt land designed to stop the "urban sprawl" from the Spennells Estate which is already sizeable, consisting of some 2000 houses. The fields are a very important part of our countryside and are widely used by residents on Spennells and other surrounding areas. They are a haven for wildlife and offer residents a chance to get out into the fresh air and enjoy our beautiful countryside. With the increasingly stressful lives that people live, it is imperative that we have access to open green spaces in which to exercise, walk etc which greatly helps with mental health and an overall feeling of well being. These fields are priceless to the local residents that use them and to the diverse wildlife that lives there. We are all being told to exercise more to stay healthy. The fields are also utilised as agricultural land and therefore are used to grow Barley etc.</p> <p>The Council has suggested that it will build on brown field sites first. I would suggest that more attention is paid to how new housing can be incorporated in and around the town centre which is in dire need of regeneration. I fail to see why so many houses need to be built around Kidderminster when employment is clearly declining (the loss of the carpet industry) and the population of the town has remained static since 2001 as referred to by a BBC report on the Midlands News. Why do we need so many houses? Our hospital is in special measures and certainly won't be able to cope with an influx of people. Similarly the schools will become oversubscribed as well as Doctors surgeries</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>etc.</p> <p>A relief road is mentioned but there is no detail. Would this road have to go across yet more valuable countryside? Will it be going through much needed woodland or across pools?</p> <p>To finish there are far too many houses proposed to be built on the Spennells fields. I do not agree that they are needed or that this is the best place to put them. I submit that the other brown field development sites, including Lea Castle Hospital should be looked at more closely and the Green Belt land of Spennells fields should be left alone for everyone to have the benefit of enjoying.</p>
	LPPO2578	Object	<p>I write to object to option A of the WFDC local plan.</p> <p>Option A results in the destruction of Green Belt and good quality arable land, the loss of highly used recreational areas that will result in a negative effect on residents’ health both physical and mental, the loss of wildlife habitat, and increased pollution and congestion on the Eastern / South Eastern side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>My objection to option A is not a case of ‘not in my back yard’ as some of the core housing sites are closer to where I live than option A. I do however believe that the destruction of Green Belt land and the negative effect this will have on the Spennells & Stone residents, plus the environmental pressure (traffic air pollution, lack of services etc) that option A combined with the core sites will put on the south-eastern side of Kidderminster, option B should be selected and option A should be scrapped.</p>
	LPPO2579	Object	<p>Why would you want to take away one of the unique things that attracts so many people and wildlife to Kidderminster? I was shocked and appalled to learn the news that you are thinking of building houses on the Green Belt by the Spennells estate.</p> <p>When walking around those fields, you forget that you are less than 10 minutes from the town centre. A town centre, which has continued to decrease in popularity and has so much empty unused space. Why can this (the brownfield sites) not be used for new development? Why are you insistent at choosing the easy option of grabbing</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the Green Belt land instead of developing a policy of urban regeneration?</p> <p>Besides its beauty, lives a hidden world full of nature. Bats, skylarks, badgers to name a few call this land their home. It would be devastating to take these creatures natural habits away from them. Not only this, but this land is used regularly by the residents, who jog, walk and exercise their dogs on this land. What about the standard of living of the residents who already live here?</p> <p>Roads around Kidderminster are already increasingly busy, building a development of new houses and a new road will increase the amount of cars on our roads. This will in turn, increase the pressure on our local services, leading to a poorer quality of care.</p> <p>The Housing and economic land availability assessment 6th March 2014 sums it up in these simple words: 'Housing needs does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.' I hope that you hear these words and come to realise that option B is the more justifiable option and should be the one you take forward.</p>
	LPPO2583	Object	<p>I object to you building on the Spennells fields, Spennells estate is already big enough.</p> <p>You are not building for "people of Kidderminster".</p> <p>Leave the land alone and maybe do up existing council houses that are left empty, hands off Spennells Fields.</p> <p>Instead of taking up precious land, that is full of wildlife - why don't you knock down some of the many council offices and build houses on that.</p>
	LPPO2596	Object	<p>We are very concerned about the large volume of traffic and local amenities due to this increase. There is already a large volume of traffic which uses the Spennells Valley Road each morning creating tailbacks and much congestion.</p> <p>We have a primary school which is already full and a mini supermarket.</p> <p>We understand that increases in housing requirements happen but there are many other sites which could be</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			redeveloped and would save our Green Belt land.
	LPPO2606	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development of the fields around the Spennells estate.</p> <p>The Green Belt area was put in place to control urban growth and to maintain an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail i.e. to keep land open.</p> <p>The local community of Spennells and surrounding areas would be totally devastated because of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of a tremendous amount of Green Belt land. • The loss of wildlife, fields and hedgerows. Under the UK Bio Diversity Action plan, councils have a duty to protect wildlife. The field and surrounding areas are home to badgers, bats. Hedgehogs, skylarks, swallows and a lot more. • The loss of valuable, well used, recreational spaces for all ages - The footpaths around Spennells fields are used daily for walking dogs and keeping fit but also for the views and the wildlife and the many plants that grow there. • Building on the Green Belt land would cause disruption or loss of bridleways and footpaths. • <u>The creation of an ugly urban sprawl, losing natural breaks from other communities.</u> There will be a massive strain on the infrastructure, due to the over capacity, which will be put on schools, doctors and the few shops on Spennells. Kidderminster hospital was downgraded; Worcester hospital is under special measures. Kidderminster hospital would need to be upgraded to a full district hospital if these plans were to go ahead. • There will be vastly more traffic on the roads that at this time are not capable of taking that traffic and which are usually in a poor state of repair. • Loss, on a large scale of food producing fields. The farmer has just harvested a good crop of wheat. <p>As well as the foregoing points, the following must be carefully considered before the implementation of such a proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We urge the council to consider all brownfield sites. Initially this would meet the current demand for housing. Also to consider land around the town centre which is derelict? Kidderminster town centre has so

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>many empty shops and is a real eyesore.</p> <p>I feel that the figures used are totally out of proportion with reality – Kidderminster does not need more housing built on Green Belt land. The proposed housing scheme will not benefit the families of Kidderminster but is aimed at Birmingham and surrounding areas. The houses that would be built if the plans went ahead would not be affordable housing for the people of Kidderminster. Even the proposed new railway station might look good on paper but it is only being built because of the proposed housing schemes and bringing families etc from Birmingham and surrounding areas.</p> <p>There have been, over the last few months, a lot of alternative plans for where to build houses and rejuvenating the town centre. These ideas should be looked at before anything else is considered.</p>
	LPPO2610	Object	<p>I am writing to you to express my concern for the proposed overpowering housing development which has been proposed for Spennells estate expansion into Stanklyn Lane and beyond in Kidderminster.</p> <p>This proposal will swallow up most of the Green Belt agricultural land along the corridor of Stanklyn Lane, where for the last thirty five years that I have been resident in this area has been a haven for wildlife, farming, walking and well being for many people.</p> <p>The idea that this quantity of housing will anyway help the well being of the Kidderminster area is totally absurd. THIS IS A GREEN FIELD LOCATION, and should be kept that way.</p> <p>There are many other options that could be explored and which are already brown field sites.</p> <p>If this goes ahead the strain which will be put upon our already suffering resources would be beyond thinkable.</p> <p>Road congestion, (which since the introduction of the traffic lights on the Worcester road leading to the new large housing estate , which is still being developed, on the defunked Sugar beet premises) now backs, up all along the A449 , which never happened before.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The hospital in Kidderminster is no longer the Hospital that we all knew, and this has put an overload on the Worcester Hospital that we all now have to go to, which shows in the fact, that this is now deemed one of the worst hospitals in the country, not said by me but by the government. I add not the staffs fault, but the fault of the overloading from the closing down of local hospitals, which is another issue, but to add to this by building this many dwelling is ludicrous.</p> <p>Schools are already overcrowded in this area, public transport is so limited, and then we turn to the town centre of Kidderminster.</p> <p>This has also been subject to very limited development for many years, which shows up blatantly when you are walking around the main town centre, it's such a shame. Is this because the funding was lost in the Icelandic Banks scandal? And building this many dwelling is this a method of trying to recoup some of those ill fated funds!</p> <p>I would also add it appears that it is always the East side of Kidderminster that appears to bear the brunt of any excess.....WHY?</p> <p>We are all told that we all need to exercise and look after our well being, to take the strain off the NHS, walking is a good way, and open air country side, is good for the mind and spirit, and also to look after our planet with all its diminishing rare wild life, well this is not the way. Develop the brown field site first. I have grandchildren and would hope that they can still go locally to this area.</p> <p>BE FAIR AND PROPORTIONALLY BUILD.....NOT A MASSIVE ESTATE LIKE THIS.</p>
	<p>LPPO2611</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I strongly object to the above plans on Green Belt fields behind Spennells and bordering Stanklyn lane for the following reasons:</p> <p>I have walked these fields and foot paths for 20 years plus as have many others for my health and pleasure and would be devastated at their loss as they contain much wildlife and are an area of farm land used to grow food by farmers and the loss of this beautiful countryside is beyond belief!</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There is not the infrastructure for such a large housing development, the roads would become gridlocked; we already have problems on the A449 since the erection of traffic lights just past Hoobrook island and the traffic gets extremely backed up especially at peak times and from mid afternoon onwards.</p> <p>There is no provision for Schools, shops, GP surgeries and hospitals, Worcester is the worst in the country already and is in special measures.</p> <p>Commuters would buy this cheaper housing to work in more expensive areas making the roads even busier as there is surely not enough employment in Kidderminster for this new influx of people.</p> <p>The town Centre is almost decimated it is full of empty premises and charity shops so no attraction there!</p> <p>I realize houses need to be built but they should be built around different areas in Kidderminster and not in one place all on the East side punishing the current inhabitants with years of building work and the mess and contractors traffic that will bring. It is too easy to just select one area and take away the natural beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Spennells estate is just a nice size to increase it by 87% is horrendous.</p> <p>You will be sacrificing our happiness for financial gain for Wyre Forest Council to recoup your losses with the Icelandic bank fiasco, split the housing between areas Please!</p> <p>We are encouraged to walk for health benefits, take these fields away where do we go, get in our cars adding to the traffic and create more air pollution does not make sense or help the environment!</p> <p>An unhappy resident of the east side of Kidderminster!</p>
	LPPO2613	Object	<p>The proposed land is being 'actively' farmed and has been, since I have lived here. Evidence that the crops produced are in demand.</p> <p>The fields are surrounded by 'designated ' public rights of way and bridle paths, and with the many 'preservation</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>orders' on hedgerows and trees, ANY development is totally impractical.</p> <p>Access to and from Spennells can become congested, at peak times, particularly when there are roadworks/problems on the main Worcester road.</p> <p>Increasing rather than alleviating traffic and its associated air pollution.</p> <p>All of this, together with the obvious impact on the local, essential services, such as schools, doctors, dentists, recreational facilities, will result in 'social detriment'.</p> <p>The use and development of smaller pockets of brownfield areas (all of which I do not believe have been seriously considered) will mean that adjacent, local services will be more likely to be able to accommodate the increased population.</p>
	<p>LPPO2654</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I feel I must object strongly to the draft proposals to build on the Green Belt in the Wyre Forest, this goes against the Housing Ministers expressed wishes and it goes against the views of hundreds if not thousands of local residents and voters.</p> <p>All the areas mentioned in the draft plan are valuable arable and recreational land. I believe it was stated in the document that this land is only Class 2 arable land, well show me some Class 1 land in the Wyre Forest, there isn't any!</p> <p>Judging by the crop of barley that has just been harvested and the hundreds of tons of carrots that were harvested earlier this year in the fields adjacent to Spennells it seems to be doing OK.</p> <p>The fields to the south of Spennells are used as a recreational area by thousands of people every year enjoying easy access to a valuable green space on their doorstep. This area is home to many species of birds, skylarks, swifts at this time of year, and the very rare and endangered Corn Bunting. The fields are home to Bats, Badgers, rabbits, foxes and many more animals.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>All this would be lost forever if built on.</p> <p>The Spennells area would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic caused by all the extra inhabitants and that is not mentioning the extra stress on the existing infrastructure, schools, doctors, hospital etc. Traffic is horrendous now in the mornings without the increased burden of more traffic. The proposed, so called Relief Road, would simply move the problem somewhere else in the area.</p> <p>New roads very rarely solve traffic problems; they just create more, elsewhere. Because they attract more traffic.</p> <p>We certainly do not want to be part of a greater Birmingham conurbation, we like being surrounded by Green Belt, lets keep it that way, the plan to build on Green Belt should be reconsidered.</p>
	LPPO2662	Object	<p>As per the consultation last year the District should concentrate on the regeneration strategy as outlined in sections 5 and 6 of the aforementioned document. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of re-designating the fields is contrary to core strategy as approved by your electorate.</p> <p>Objections specific to the Copse at N522202 W0021337 and Fields to the rear of (south) Spennells Estate on the basis of Flood Risk, Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2012 government national planning policy framework (NPPF) requires “relevant planning authorities who should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile land.” The fields behind Spennells are good quality and this has not been covered in the Local Plan. • “There are no recorded nature conservation or cultural heritage interests on the site”. There is record of Badgers, Skylarks, Linnets and Bats therefore the definition of LIMITED CONTRIBUTION is wrong. Therefore, the planners have been misled by this independent report and need to review the Local Plan based on this being a SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION and breach of planning guidance. <p>Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on drainage in the area as the fields are a valuable soak away. Already flood defences have had

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>to be installed by Severn Trent on the Spennells estate and as we know the Victoria Carpet's old cricket field is designated flood plain. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of increase flood risk.</p> <p>Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding Spennells, particularly if Turnstone access is opened up as suggested at a “Drop In “meeting will cause extra congestion in traffic exiting from the only two exits onto Spennells Valley Road. Already there are queues at both exits particularly when the schools are operating with waiting times regularly in the region of 10-15minutes. Any further traffic will only add to the air pollution. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of congestion, pollution and health grounds. • Option A will have a detrimental impact on the wildlife that feeds and lives on the fields and surrounding areas. There are Bats and Badgers in the area. In Britain all bat species and their roosts are legally protected, by both domestic and international legislation. Badgers and their setts (tunnels and chambers where they live) are protected by UK law. The skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult skylark, or to take damage or destroy an active nest or its contents. The only exception is legitimate farming practices that cannot be reasonably delayed, although farming methods can often be modified to reduce the impact on the skylarks. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of it being unlawful and not encouraging bio diversity which is one of the objects of the Council via Planning Policy Statement 9. 3. • The current intensive use of the public footpaths within Option A is helping preserve people's health. I therefore object to Option A on health grounds. • The current primary school is full and any more dwellings would have an adverse impact on the local schools and nursery plus the extra buses and traffic will cause increased safety issues for the children. I therefore object to Option A on the grounds of congestion, pollution and safety. <p>Green Belt Review</p> <p>In the Green Belt review some of the assessment is wrong and coalescence will occur if Option A were to be pursued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NPPF requires assessment against the following criteria:

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. ○ Would development of the proposed site appear to result in the merging of towns or compromise the separation of towns physically? ○ Would potential development of the proposed site be a significant step leading towards coalescence of two settlements? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● On page 42 it states LIMITED CONTRIBUTION Development would have no impact on this purpose in this location, although locally the identity of Summerfield would change along its northern extent. ● On page 50 it states LIMITED CONTRIBUTION Development of the site would not lead to the merger of towns, although locally the separate identity of the dwellings strung along Stanklyn Lane which comprise Summerfield would largely disappear (particularly when viewed in combination with additional proposed development to the east). <p>My view is coalescence would occur between Stone, Summerfield, Stanklyn Lane and Spennells if the land to the rear of Spennells is built on therefore the definition of LIMITED CONTRIBUTION is wrong.</p> <p>The fields back onto our boundary with Wychhavon which would mean increased urban sprawl. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of unnecessary urban sprawl which has historically been against policy.</p> <p>Large Urban estates have evidenced increased anti social behaviour and increased crime rates and this appears to be acknowledged in the WFIDP but is not covered in the Local Plan consultation. Therefore, to me doubling the size of Spennells makes no sense whatsoever and is not needed as per my points 1 – 1.3.</p>
	LPPO2663	Object	<p>The Option A site is currently valuable arable farmland and is also a key environmental benefit to the residents of the Spennells estate.</p> <p>It is important as a habitat for many wildlife species, some, like Skylarks, endangered.</p> <p>Residents and others enjoy this space for recreation and it thereby enhances the well-being of local people.</p> <p>The development will only attract 'commuters' to the town as local industry will not provide the types of</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>employment sought by the new home owners. Local services and roads will be ever more crowded and over used.</p> <p>If the 'possible' road development takes place, this will only attract more vehicles and provide additional 'rat-runs' through the area with the increased noise and pollution.</p>
	LPPO2664	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Large numbers of people having to be assimilated into an already crowded estate. 2) Removal of Green Belt fields, which serve not only as good agricultural land, but are used by the current residents for much needed exercise and fresh air. 3) Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of noxious fumes. Creating an environment of more fumes and less opportunity to take exercise is a poor choice. 4) Local services such as schools, pharmacists, doctors put under increased strain. 5) Public transport. Already not satisfactory, another massive housing development would just add to the misery. 6) Loss of wildlife habitat. 7) We have already seen creeping change at Easter Park so we know once we give in on Green Belt land the same thing will happen again.
	LPPO2676	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep the Green Belt 2. Traffic congestion already very bad in the area 3. Protect the countryside people need a place to walk the dogs ect. 4. Wildlife need these spaces

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			5. Build on brownfield sites before Green Belt.
	LPPO2679	Object	<p>I wish to object to the building of houses on land adjacent to the Spennells estate; not on the grounds that it is valuable fertile farmland but because of the state, or lack of, the infrastructure supporting the county of Worcestershire.</p> <p>Taking advantage of Solihull's ploy to pay for a new road network will only encourage more commuters from the Birmingham area which will put a greater strain on the already overstretched resources. In particular the Worcestershire NHS Trust which, according to the national news, is the worst in the whole of the country.</p> <p>I suggest writing to Central Government and tell them that if they insist we provide more housing then we, the tax paying people of Worcestershire, insist that they bring our basic amenities up to at least Third World standards.</p>
	LPPO2680	Object	<p>I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed development of Green Belt land around the Spennells Estate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is Green Belt land and should remain as such 2. There is an abundance of wildlife which will disappear 3. The main objection, in my opinion, is that Spennells is a large enough estate already. The main roads around Spennells are very congested so even with the alleged contribution from Solihull to provide more roads the situation will not improve. My understanding is that should the new houses be built a great many of them will provide housing for Solihull's overspill and the likelihood is that these people will be commuting to Birmingham so will not do anything to improve the economy of the area but they will be using our already overstretched hospitals, doctors' surgeries and schools. Before any further development takes place I think the whole issue of the infrastructure should be addressed and improved.
	LPPO2684	Object	I am writing to you today to object about the proposals of the building of 1,735 new homes on Spennells Green Belt land.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The reasons for my objections are;</p> <p>1) The area is currently used by many residents including myself to walk, jog, cycle, ride horses, dog walk and nature watch. What provisions have been thought of to replace these routes and areas so that we may still be able to enjoy these activities within the Green Belt environment that we are used to? Why should we lose it? Running through a concrete, polluted jungle is just not the same!</p> <p>2) There will be increased traffic, noise and pollution spoiling the current "out of town, in the countryside feel" of the estate. What provisions have been made so that pollution, traffic and noise will be kept to a minimum and how will you be easing the congestion on the current surrounding roads as they will struggle to cope with the extra volume? Especially during rush hour times. Why make it worse? Will you be building a big car park to accommodate the extra school vehicles and where will this be? The school parking is already all the way round to Hawfinch and it causes such a bottleneck with traffic parked on both sides of the road, how will you make sure this doesn't get worse?</p> <p>3) The local schools will need to take in many more pupils and they are already struggling for resources. What provisions have been made to ensure this does not affect the children currently in these schools? If the Spennells estate as it is, fills a primary school easily then doubling the size of the estate will warrant major school expansion and disruption or another primary school being built over the new side of the estate. Is this planned?</p> <p>4) Doubling the size of the estate will cause a knock on effect in the town with more pressure on local doctors, dentists, opticians and hospitals. What provisions have been made so that the positions of current residents, that are already on long waiting lists, will not be made worse?</p> <p>5) The loss of wildlife habitat. There are skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds nesting in these fields. How are you going to protect them? Where are you going to move them to?</p> <p>Increase in crime and anti social behaviour - there are no longer enough police in Kidderminster to cover the area as</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>it is, resources are stretched.</p> <p>There are other brown field sites in Kidderminster that really need regeneration. Can't these houses be built there and leave Spennells alone?</p> <p>I am not against change and growth but you would be spoiling an amazing area of land that serves the people of Spennells completely. Any more growth would ruin the perfect balance we already have between nature and human living spaces.</p>
	<p>LPPO2686</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p><u>I wish to object to Option A in the Draft Local Plan.</u></p> <p>This is the proposed development of the fields between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells estate. These Green Belt fields are designated 'Rear of Spennells & Easter Park AS/10', 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2' and 'Stone Hill South OC/13'.</p> <p><u>Reasons against Option A :</u></p> <p><u>Agriculture and Recreational use:</u> These fields are productive, agricultural land which also serves as a popular recreational and social facility the local community as well as many visitors to the area. They are also well used by local workers during lunch hours for recreation and fresh air, as well as many other visitors and Wyre Forest residents at weekends enjoying the open countryside and visiting the Granary Hotel and local Mare & Colt public house.</p> <p>There are a number of very well-used Public Rights of Way and bridle ways across the fields which are very well used by residents, visitors and many local groups such as the Ramblers Association, astronomy groups, wildlife groups, cyclists, horse riders and children's groups. By using this land to build, this makes a mockery of the Council's desire to combat high rates of obesity in this area. Open views and spaces also give a great sense of health and wellbeing and are a natural stress reliever.</p> <p><u>Wildlife:</u> These fields are home to many red and amber listed protected bird species, and include important nesting</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>sites for Corn Buntings, Larks and Linnets as well as homes for Badger Setts and bats. The rare Tower Mustard Plant also thrives along the lanes adjoining Stanklyn Lane. The proposed new road (the Eastern Relief Road) would totally destroy this environmentally sensitive area with increased air pollution, more noise pollution, light pollution and the destruction of large amounts of natural habitats.</p> <p>Endangered species like the Corn Bunting, Linnets and Skylarks would not nest in green spaces in large housing development as they need large open tracts of land to breed. The Corn Bunting is very endangered and already extinct in Wales and Herefordshire, and removal of this very important breeding ground will only serve to hasten their extinction. Three species of Bats are also in abundance in this area and next in some of the Oak trees on the fields. There are also many of these old trees with TPOs and large hedgerows that contribute significantly to the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p><u>Landscape and urban sprawl:</u> To build houses in these fields would spoil the current vistas and diminish the separation of Summerfield and Stone from Spennells, thus effecting urban sprawl. This is also the boundary of Wyre Forest and Wychavon Council (AS10) and would effectively link both Council areas with no distinguishing boundary. The 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report' published in 2013 recognised that Landscape provides a shared resource which is important in its own right as a 'public good' - something which is very obvious by the current use of peoples as a local amenity on the Public Rights of Way. This Report also emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan takes away.</p> <p><u>Drainage:</u> I have very serious concerns about the proposed developments effect on the drainage in the area. The soil here is typically sandy of nature, and the local habitat (Trees/Hedgerows) combined with the crop fields serve a long way to alleviate the flooding issues. Building here (especially AS/10 which has high flooding probability) will cause a lot of issues. Stanklyn Lane now floods at times of heavy or persistent rain, and I am aware that during the last 20 years, there have been severe flooding issues on Spennells Estate around the Linnet Rise area and recently Severn Trent Water has commenced a project costing £1.5 million.</p> <p>The area around Captains and the Lodge is also extremely marshy and water logged, with various pools and streams. There are also historical drainage ditches in Stanklyn Lane of archaeological importance that should be protected and</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>enhanced. I am very concerned that development of these fields will cause real flooding issues for both Spennells Estate and Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt: The purpose of Green Belt is to check unrestricted urban sprawl. The proposed Option A development would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, whereas development under Option B would have a more dispersed effect and give people a much wider choice of where they wish to live.</p> <p>The area to be developed is disproportionate in size. The Wyre Forest Review states that "The parcel is largely open in character, part of the strong division between the built edge and open countryside." The claim in the LPR that "extending the built edge of Kidderminster south-eastwards would not constitute urban sprawl" is contradicted later in the Report by the need to "reduce the impression of urban sprawl" in the Green Belt evaluation (LPR Appendix C).</p> <p>In conclusion, I hope you take my comments and suggestions into consideration when finalising your plan. To walk through green fields with cloudless skies and listen to the skylarks overhead is heaven. I cannot tell you the immense value this land has for myself, the local community, visitors and many, many others. The wildlife you will destroy will be catastrophic for some species. I therefore ask that you strongly reconsider your need for so many homes, an Eastern Relief Road and building on the fields in Option A.</p>
	LPPO2687	Object	<p>I would like to OBJECT to the proposed development option A.</p> <p>This is due to the following reasons:</p> <p>Wildlife: The area in Option A between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane, is a haven for wildlife. Not only does it hold endangered plants (Tower Mustard), but many species of Red and Amber Listed birds, which are known to breed and nest there. Examples of these are (not exhaustive) Linnets, House Sparrows, Reed Bunting, Yellow Hammer, Skylarks etc, but my main concern is for the declining and near extinct Corn Bunting. This is one of the few areas left where this bird breeds and should be protected at all costs. Leaving 'open' spaces between the housing will not support this bird. They will leave and another bird will be extinct in the West Midlands and nationally declined. Other species that are seen regularly and are protected are Bats (3 species sited), Otters and other small mammals. The area itself has many Tree Preservation Orders on it, and these large trees and hedgerows further enhance the natural bio</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>diversity of the area and the support the wildlife within. Once this land is gone and these birds extinct, we cannot get them back.</p> <p><u>Recreation:</u> The area is used extensively for leisure and recreation, not only by local residents, but by many visitors to the area, and local workers during their lunch breaks. I regularly talk to visitors staying at the local Granary Hotel who are enjoying walking here, and also other Kidderminster residents who come here over the weekends to walk/cycle with their families and enjoy an icecream or coffee at the Mare & Colt. Areas such as this support health and wellbeing relieve stress and anxiety and promote a better lifestyle. Many clubs and societies such as Ramblers, horse riders, cyclists, astronomers, runners etc use these fields for their activities, as well as lots of local children for nature studies. There are many PRoWs, and a Bridle path that are extensively used. Building ‘pathways’ and ‘green spaces’ within a housing estate will not give the vista and feeling of well-being that being in an open rural field with open skies and views would give and would not support the local tourism business at the Granary Hotel & Mare and Colt.</p> <p>As stated in your report, there are ‘<i>High Obesity Levels</i>’ in WFDC. Taking this much used and essential recreational space away will increase this issue.</p> <p><u>Agriculture:</u> The fields along Stanklyn Lane are Grade B prime agricultural fields, where many of the sites in Option B are just grazing land. With the current economic climate regarding Brexit, we should preserving all arable land for future use. These fields provide a varied and quality crop each year, and also support the much needed drainage of the fields as well as supporting local bio diversity.</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> When there are periods of prolonged or heavy rain, parts of Stanklyn Lane are flooded and sometimes impassable. Combined with the known issues on Spennells (i.e. Severn Trent having to spend £1.5 million to try and relieve flooding in the past 15 years) and the extremely wet and marshy land around Stanklyn Woods and Captains Pool, then building houses here would only exacerbate this issue. Fields AS/10 are recorded as being high flood risk area due to its topography.</p> <p><u>Green Belt:</u> In essence I oppose Option A as 20% less Green Belt land will need to be removed for this than with Option B. Green Belt land, however small a percentage, should be protected at all costs to enhance our country and</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>environment.</p> <p>The Green Belt review states that this area ‘contributes’ to the Green Belt. I would like to further add that it ‘significantly contributes’ as it stops urban sprawl from Kidderminster and stops the integration of Spennells with the hamlets of Stone, Stanklyn and Summerfield. There are wonderful vistas across this land to local landmarks (e.g. Clent and Clee Hills) and all of this can be viewed from Stanklyn Lane and the main road. Building on this land will further create a massive light and noise pollution issue.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure:</u> The area in Option A is very close to the local Roxel site. There have been a few serious incidents and the wisdom of building residential housing in close proximity to such a volatile site must be questioned. The proposed ‘Eastern Relief Road’ is a nonsense. This will do nothing to alleviate any air quality or congestion in Kidderminster Horsefair and will only serve to increase pollution, noise and congestion in a proposed densely populated area. Trying to get out of Stanklyn Lane now (either end) is very precarious, and there have been many accidents. Building a relief road would make this even worse as a round-a-bout or similar would have to put on the A449 and A448 which would congest the free flowing traffic. Not only would the cost be astronomical for getting said road over 2 x railway lines (money better used regenerating the town), but I would think that Network Rail will impose very strict restrictions on building close to their lines which could run into millions of pounds. That said, I feel the road is not required anyway. Commuters from Worcester currently use the A450 to get to Birmingham, and the proposed relief road would end far too high up the Birmingham Road for anyone from this side of Kidderminster to use, and cause chaos in Blakedown etc. The ‘road’ money should be used to amend the Black Bridge to allow larger vehicles to use the A450, and to make improvements along it if required.</p> <p><u>A compelling place to live:</u> If Option A is chosen, then people will have little option than to live on the periphery of Kidderminster in a mass and soul less housing estate. The scale of this development is too large and will have a very disproportionate effect on the size and feel of Kidderminster. Young people want a nice flat in a town or city location with amenities on the doorstep. They do not want to live 3-4 miles away from a station or a town centre. They are looking to move to the more vibrant towns of Bewdley, Stourport, Bromsgrove or Worcester where such properties can be found in close proximity to a thriving café culture and night life. If Option B is chosen, people will have a more dispersed choice of where they wish to live. It will also disperse the traffic, as many people would have to commute back out of Kidderminster to work in Bewdley, Stourport etc.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2695	Object	<p>Current Job Opportunities: - You're proposing to build a large number of houses, yet where are the jobs to fulfil the people coming here to live? There are very few jobs for those currently living here, hence more vehicles on our already congested and crowded roads, people will be travelling away from where they live to the likes of Birmingham or surrounding areas.</p> <p>Issues of Concern:-</p> <p>Option A or B development: - Have you considered the impact this will have on the wild life within these areas. One must assume the planning Dept. is aware of diversity of wild life within these areas under consideration, such as Bats, Baggers and many types of flora. Many are not convinced that you are.</p> <p>Infrastructure:- The infrastructure such as schooling, drainage, access roads and impact this will have on the environment. Whatever option is taken will have an enormous impact on road congestion, e.g. if 1000 plus houses are built this will generate possibly 2000 more cars in a small cramped area causing more pollution more congestion and more dangerous roads for children to navigate. It's already a nightmare trying to exit Heronswood Road at peak time of the day.</p> <p>It's a well-known fact that developers will hand out sweeteners to local authorities in order to offer financial incentives to help build some of the infrastructures required if they gain planning permission, and we all know that their main concern is to develop clean open green fields sites. What will come first the infrastructure or the houses? We already know – the houses, and what if the developers have financial problems, who will finish up paying for the infrastructure? People already living in the Wyre Forest!</p> <p>I strongly oppose the building and expansion of Spennells, and that Wyre Forest should consider other options, such as redevelop the town and build accommodation within. I appreciate this will not provide the same outcome for developers, as developers will not be too happy to invest, as they like clean green fields, but this will regenerate and attract more people into this deprived and dull town we call home. Hence if they live nearer to the town this would mean possibly less cars and more money spent locally.</p>
	LPPO2699	Object	Spennells estate was built adjacent to a golf course and therefore did not impinge on existing housing. The bolting on

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			of an almost equally sized estate seems to be a lazy option and the worst kind of urban sprawl. The plan lacks imagination and from the local inhabitants point of view has nothing to commend it.
	LPPO2703	Object	<p>Other Reasons to reject the plans to develop the Green Belt</p> <p>a. The projection of population growth is fallacious. The development of Green Belt land could only possibly become a Birmingham overflow. If this overflow is required it should be built near Birmingham as the commute from Kidderminster would be a transport nightmare by car and of course a parking nightmare if attempting to use the train.</p> <p>b. In essence, the council have decided that they want to build an A449 bypass and have then come up with a number of houses which will create a justification for the road. They have then generated a set of statistics to justify that number of houses. The council are refusing to reveal the plans for the road and insisting that such a plan does not exist and we are not entitled to ask because the entire scope of the consultation is about whether to build on Green Belt land. This is a totally underhand attempt to cover up their true intentions until they have received carte blanche permission to destroy Green Belt land.</p> <p>c. If it were to happen that the proposal to build a new road became unfulfillable once Plan A had been agreed (which is more likely than actually building it because of cost factors) then the only access to the new build housing would be via Turnstone Road and presumably Imber Road. These feed onto Captains Pool Road and subsequently Heronswood Road and from there to Spennells Valley Road. The two junctions onto Spennells Valley Road are already stressed and could not cope with a massive increase of traffic. Imber Road was never designed to take traffic and would have to be widened, probably causing the demolition of a house on Egret Court and the removal of a garden (my garden as it happens). Reverting to the proposed Loop Road, if the road did exactly what it is apparently for, taking traffic onto and off the new estate, then it would be feeding onto two very congested roads. The A449 at this point is extremely bad at rush hour with traffic often backing up several miles to Hartlebury. The A456 is the main access from the M5 and is a very busy road. It is already very difficult to access this road from the Husum Way side. On the other hand if the Loop road is more than a restricted access road for the new houses then it will be used by industrial traffic from the Hoo and Hartlebury industrial estates as this cannot pass under the Black Bridge. This will mean that the new road will become a main highway and totally unsuitable to service a new housing estate.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Because of the reference to reducing traffic to the Horsefair (p.42 of the local plan) I believe that the actual route for the new road (if the council weren't hiding it) would be that the road would leave the A449 at Lea Castle and rejoin the A449 at Easter Park. This might in itself be very desirable in terms of relieving traffic through the town it changes from being a loop road for the new housing into being part of a major trunk road, the A449. I cannot imagine anywhere else in the country where a local authority would be secretly planning routing a new trunk road through a housing estate that it was supposed to be part of.</p> <p>d The amenity value of the Green Belt land behind Spennells should not be ignored. The footpaths round the fields are used by hundreds of people every day. This includes walkers, dog walkers. Joggers, cyclists and horse riders. The somewhat bland claim that only 70 % of the Green Belt would be built on and so a larger % of that land than present would be available is totally idiotic. People can walk several miles around the current paths in open country. To imagine that this could be swapped for grass verges, small open spaces, etc and that we should be pleased to have access to walking round a housing estate is preposterous. The access to these fields is important to the health and wellbeing of many hundreds of people and this facility would be totally lost if the land were built on. This land is totally invaluable to the residents of this side of Kidderminster and is irreplaceable. Residents should not be forced to use their cars to go for a walk</p> <p>e. Risk of flooding. The fields are very sandy and can absorb immense quantities of rain very quickly. We are now having more heavy and concentrated storms that dump vast amounts of water very quickly. Whilst the fields largely cope with only occasional flooding, replacing the fields with tarmac ked roads, drives and house roofs will have a very negative effect on the drainage and will result in flooding along Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>f. The Natural Environment. The basic question is whether we can as a human race destroy irreplaceable natural habitat to build homes. This is especially true where the statistical basis for building the homes and destroying the natural habitat is totally flawed. Can we really risk destroying the Green Belt to build houses that aren't absolutely necessary? Once the environment is destroyed it can not be recreated.</p> <p>g. Wildlife. Different people are addressing different areas of wildlife and I am not an expert at these. For example there are 3 species of bats that hunt on the field. In many places the simple presence of bats is seen to be important</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>enough to stop development. Their hunting sites are just as important as their nest sites.</p> <p>We have watched the farmer plough up a badger set already this year and unfortunately nothing was done (photographic evidence available). There are at least two badger sets that will be destroyed by the housing development. It is my understanding that badger sets are protected by law.</p> <p>There are other mammal species on the field including field mice and hedgehogs. Again these are threatened species which will be lost if plan A proceeds.</p> <p>My own area of interest is birds. In the winter we have large populations of redwings and fieldfares which are winter migrants and don't nest here although they rely on feeding on the fields and will be lost if the fields are lost. Far rarer than these are the waxwings which are also winter visitors. We actually get bird spotters from other places coming here looking for our waxwings. There is a very large flock of linnets which I think are all year round residents but flock in the winter. My estimate for the size of the full flock last winter was 500 birds which makes it a very significant population. All the above species are Red Listed and their habitat must not be disturbed.</p> <p>Other birds that I have only observed in the winter include redpolls and stonechats. The skylark population consists of at least 12 pairs on the land included in plan A. This is a red listed species. It is fragile and will be totally lost if the land is built on.</p> <p>In summer we have healthy populations of swallows, swifts and house martins. Again these nest in buildings, not on the field but rely on the insect population of the fields for their survival.</p> <p>There is a massive list of birds that nest or rely on the fields, I have photographed (Red listed bold, amber listed italic):</p> <p>Buzzards, <i>Kestrel</i>, sparrow hawk, Song thrush, mistle thrush, blackbirds, robin, Great Tit, Blue tit. Coal tit, Long tailed tit, Greater spotted woodpecker, green woodpecker, House sparrow, tree sparrow, <i>dunnock</i>, Corn bunting, reed bunting, yellowhammer, meadow pipit, Tree creeper, nuthatch, pied wagtail, Bullfinch, chaffinch, brambling, greenfinch, siskin, blackcap, goldfinch, hawfinch, Heron, Little Egret, Black headed gull, lesser black backed gull,</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Starling, wood pigeon, collared dove, magpie, Chiffchaff, wren, goldcrest, Carrion crow, rook, jay</p> <p>Difficult to say whether the development will destroy habitat at Captains pool but here we have:</p> <p>Coot, moorhen, tufted duck, great crested grebe, mallard, goosander, grey wagtail</p> <p>Already mentioned summer:</p> <p>Skylark, swallow, swift, house martin</p> <p>Winter:</p> <p>Fieldfare, redwing, waxwing, redpoll, stonechat, linnet</p> <p>This means that I have personally counted and photographed 60 species of birds on Spennells. There are very fragile species through to recovering species. There is no question that many of these species will be totally lost to this area if the destruction of greenfield as proposed in Plan A goes through. With red list species like the skylark we simply can not afford to lose anymore habitat.</p>
	LPPO2714	Object	<p>I object to the local plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of breeding habitat for many varieties of birds. Loss of habitat for many mammals, including fox and badger. Loss of waterways, streams, lakes etc will have a severe detrimental effect on wildlife in the area.</p> <p>Increase in school student numbers, particularly in the Comberton Road area will severely affect road safety.</p> <p>Air pollution due to the large increase in traffic emissions will be significant. We already have emissions from Hartlebury, any more will just add to the problem.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2717	Object	<p>I am opposed to both of the options that Wyre Forest District council have proposed for the following reason:</p> <p>Removal of the fields will greatly reduce the spaces local people can go walking, jogging cycling, walking dogs etc.</p> <p>There has been no thought to the immense increase there will be in traffic. There is already severe congestion around Heronswood Road, adding 1700 extra properties is going to greatly add to this, not to mention the extra noise and fuel emission pollution that will be created.</p> <p>Where are all the extra schools going to be built, along with the extra dentists, doctors and other facilities that will be needed? Is there a plan to incorporate these into either of the options?</p> <p>I believe there are around 1200 empty houses in Kidderminster. Why are these not being utilised along with the empty buildings that there are in the Kidderminster town centre? I would have thought some of these empty buildings would be ripe for conversion into flats. This would cut down on people needing to use cars and thereby reduce pollution. There are already around 300 houses being built on the new Silverwoods development (ex British Sugar Factory). Does this not take off the pressure for the need of another 1700 homes?</p> <p>This area on the map, is referred to as Captains & the Lodge WFR/ST/1 and is described as a core housing site. At present we have been advised this area will have 135 houses built on it.</p> <p>I am most dismayed to hear this and would like to list a few of the birds and other wildlife that can be found in this area. – Please see separate page –</p> <p>First of all the Lleyandii hedge: If the land is used I would like to keep the hedge and existing fence. At present this hedge houses many types of birds and other wildlife. I am not just referring to the Spring/Summer breeding season. This has been home to all manner of wildlife for many years now and to lose this hedge would be a disaster environmentally.</p> <p>Secondly, Captains Pool itself. I presume the lake itself is being sold. Currently Phoenix Fishing Club tell us that they</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>have a lease on this pool/pond for another 3 years. Under the terms of their lease they have to maintain this area and also maintain the water to a high standard, which is I believe inspected every 12 months. Please advise how this is going to be maintained and who will be responsible for it?</p> <p>Amongst the mammals listed on the other page are badgers. There is currently a Badgers Sett on the far side of the lake. How is this going to be looked after?</p> <p>We also have a few types of bats that are often seen flying around on many evenings. I hope the site will be carefully checked to make sure their nesting areas are protected and not disturbed.</p> <p>There is a boat shed on this site. There is a lot of wildlife that goes in and out of this boat shed despite doors on the front. Will this be checked to make sure this is not a nesting area?</p> <p>The construction of any new housing on the Spennells area anywhere near the lake will be catastrophic to the environment from which it will be difficult to recover and these lovely creatures will never return.</p> <p>Where does the urban sprawl end and how much more of the countryside do we need to lose before the damage caused is irreversible?</p> <p><u>BIRDS OF CAPTAINS POOL AND AREA WFR/ST/1</u></p> <p><u>Breeding Residents</u>: Coot, Mallard, Moorhen, Canada Goose, Great Crested Grebe, Finches, Tits, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Treecreeper, Nuthatch, Starlings, Song Thrush, Mistlethrush, Blackbird, Yellowhammer, Sparrow Hawk, House Sparrow, Hedge Sparrow, Pigeons, Doves & Corvids.</p> <p><u>Winter Visitors (Oct-April)</u>: Goosander, Siskin, Redpoll, Blackcap, European Starlings, Fieldfare, Redwing, Brambling, Goldcrest, Teal.</p> <p>Other birds seen are Grey Heron, Gulls, Shoveler, Pochard, Kingfisher, Tufted Duck, Mute Swan, Wagtails- Pied & Grey, Little Egret, Tawny Owl and Buzzards.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><u>MAMMALS</u></p> <p>Hedgehogs, Moles, Common Shrew, Water Shrew, Field Vole, Yellow Necked Mouse, Wood Mouse, House Mouse, Brown Rat, Grey Squirrel, Rabbit, Fox, Badger, Pipistrelle Bats, Soprano Bats & Daubenton’s Bats.</p> <p>There are around 20 butterfly species and around 75-85 species of bird resident, breeding and passing through that can be seen at Captains Pool. The above list is just a few.</p>
	LPPO2718	Object	<p>Highways planners have made a big mistake on Worcester Rd Kidderminster by moving a traffic island hold up from one place to another. This side of the town is currently virtually gridlocked at busy times so building more houses on Spennells will add to the congestion and more importantly the pollution that goes with it. No houses to be build on the Green Belt land the Spennells side of town for these reasons.</p>
	LPPO2720	Object	<p>With reference to the proposed development on the Green Belt fields adjacent to Spennells Valley estate. We strongly object to Option A as it will have a massive impact on the residents of Spennells in terms of losing fields that are currently used for leisure and interaction, as well as impacting on the wild life in the area.</p> <p>Anyone who travels to work from Spennells knows how congested Heronswood Road and Spennells Valley Road are during peak times, without additional residents from up to 2000 houses. It is already hazardous around the school and shops area, and an increase in traffic will undoubtedly cause a safety issue for children and the elderly.</p> <p>Having attended a Consultation meeting and a previous informal meeting and studied all the available information, we strongly object to Option A.</p>
	LPPO2735	Object	<p>I have found the surrounding fields of particular benefit for exercising and observing wild life.</p> <p>Traffic around Kidderminster is already very heavy and further housing would create gridlock and higher exhaust fume emissions.</p> <p>Pressure on all local services - schools, hospitals and GP surgeries would be immense</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2737	Object	<p>I wish to enter my objections to the proposed housing schemes around Spennells Valley.</p> <p>We recently moved here because of the immediate access to country side for walking and cycling.</p> <p>Your proposed housing scheme will create havoc with this area, causing heavily increased traffic flow and reduced access to the country side.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to your proposed scheme.</p>
	LPPO2739	Object	<p>Objection to the unnecessary expansion of Spinals option A leading to the erosion of Green Belt, and loss of services.</p>
	LPPO2740	Object	<p>Object to Option A to develop a significant number of houses to the east/south of Kidderminster and on the Green Belt land to the rear of Spennells. We do not understand why such beautiful Green Belt land has to be destroyed when there are many brownfield sites around Kidderminster that still have not been built on. There are many empty houses and apartments that have been built but are still empty so we do not see your need to have to use Green Belt land to develop even further. We believe that any additional development would be better more widely spread around the district and not wholly on the fields at the back of Spennells. Kidderminster is meant to be a small carpet town and not a large over crowded suburb. The fields at the back of Spennells are a haven away from busy town life. Many residents who chose to live on this estate to be close to the countryside.</p> <p>Spennells Estate is already a very large estate. Development in this area and destroying such beautiful land is going to cause many issues and even more problems with roads becoming even more congested than they already are. Getting off the Estate in rush hour is already a nightmare, Doctors, Hospitals and Schools are already strained and jobs are hard to come by already. By increasing the houses in this area, it is going to make living in Kidderminster a very chaotic and stressful place.</p> <p>The removal of the fields would diminish the health and wellbeing of local people who have lived in this area for years. It is regularly used by people who enjoy walking, jogging or walking their dogs. Children love the freedom, the trees and the wildlife and how something so beautiful could be destroyed for bricks and roads we shall never</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>understand! There will be increased traffic noises, exhaust fumes causing issues to health and making life a nightmare to live in this area.</p> <p>As well as health and wellbeing it is also the very sad thought that the beautiful wildlife that habitat in the Green Belt land will lose their homes and be destroyed. There are skylarks, linnets and lots of other red-listed birds who nest there as well as lots of other different wildlife. I thought the idea of Green Belt was that it is protected and to prevent urban sprawl so why is this even being considered? There are many brownfield sites and areas of Kidderminster which could be built on to include the very large Lea Castle site, old Sladen School, old Glades leisure centre, old Magistrates Courts as well as many empty shops and the development of Stour Valley hasn't even finished yet which is a massive development in itself. Across the district I am sure there are many other sites that could be considered before even thinking of destroying such beautiful countryside.</p> <p>We do not agree that any Green Belt land should be destroyed but if this has to be the case we suggest this is not wholly in one area like Spennells fields and that other areas are considered to prevent destroying something so beautiful for so many residents. We have all chose to live here for the beautiful countryside on our doorstep and you are going to destroy this for us and our future generations.</p> <p>We want future generations to have a good quality of life and enjoy the natural countryside and wildlife and not be brought up in a mini city full of pollution and houses! We want to protect our wildlife, give our children and families the freedom to lead an active and healthy life. You are going to take this away from us and please accept this letter as our complete objection to your Option A.</p>
	LPPO2743	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to put forward my objections to the proposed expansion of Spennells: • Traffic is already congested at Spennells Valley Road, Worcester Road, Wilden Lane. The new relief road has caused more problems for Spennells and additional traffic from the new development will worsen the situation. • Increase in pollution with additional cars on the road from the new development as bus services are poor. • The land is in agricultural use, loss of this will mean produce has to be imported to the area causing more pollution. • The land is used by people walking dogs, joggers, horse riders, cyclists and people just walking generally to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>keep active in a non polluted atmosphere.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spennells School is already full. • More doctors’ surgeries required. • Development is proposed between rocket factory and an incinerator site. • Loss of wildlife habitat. • Public transport – bus service is inadequate and the train station parking is insufficient as it is full of commuter parking. • Kidderminster seems to be losing jobs rather than creating new opportunities. We have many empty units e.g. Easter Park on the Worcester Road where only a few units are actually taken. • There are many buildings in Kidderminster town centre and just add to the run down look of the town centre. Businesses cannot afford to stay and operate here. A new bypass will just ensure that drivers will do just that - BYPASS Kidderminster and any other towns which the bypass passes It also means that people will drive past Kidderminster and not go into the town to do shopping - thereby depriving the town of much needed revenue and trade.
	<p>LPPO2749</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I am objecting to the Draft Local Plan A concerning the fields adjacent to Spennells and Plan A and B concerning the Core Housing Site on the area referred to as Captains and the Lodge.</p> <p>It would be wicked to see the peaceful surrounding countryside smothered with houses. The fields adjacent to the Spennells are used not only by dog walkers but people who walk or jog for their health and mental wellbeing. We really appreciate having the opportunity to stroll along the fields and watch the variety of birds who flit about, some nesting in the fields, and listen to the skylarks as they swoop in the sky. What a shame it would be for them to lose their habitats along with other wildlife that lives here. We’ve also had a wonderful field of poppies here, photographed by hundreds of people, which would never be seen again.</p> <p>Building more houses would mean pressure on hospitals, doctors, schools, transport and so on. How would the schools cope and where would the extra resources come from? Add on to this the overload on drainage and sewers.</p> <p>There is enough traffic on the estate already with congestion on the roads in and around the Spennells being</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>especially bad in the mornings. We do not want increased traffic with more traffic noise and exhaust fumes which are a risk to health.</p> <p>With reference to the Core Housing site this backs on to a peaceful cul-de-sac and residents are very concerned about access to the houses and the noise problems.</p>
	<p>LPPO2754</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Fields at Spennells are Green Belt. Green Belt is sacrosanct and not for building on.</p> <p>These fields are used by the population of Wyre Forest not just by Spennells residents for dog walking, improve both physical and mental health. It is recognised that the green environment is essential for the health and wellbeing of the resident population.</p> <p>These fields in are home to the following red listed birds, which means that they are in extreme danger of extinction:</p> <p>Sky larks, Field fares, Red wings Linnets, Corn bunting, Yellow hammer, Starling, Song thrush Mistle thrush, House sparrows, Tree sparrows.</p> <p>Yellow listed birds: Dunnocks, Swifts (I have seen these return after almost 15 years) Kestrel, House martins</p> <p>Also: Wrens, Flocks of swallows, A family of buzzards, Green wood peckers.</p> <p>Plants</p> <p>The English bluebell</p> <p>Once these species lose their habitat we would lose them forever.</p> <p>The soil in the fields behind Spennells is very sandy and the run off water collects at the bottom of the fields close to Stanklyn Lane. Once this valuable drainage is covered in concrete and tarmac the risk of flooding is considerable. Yet</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>there has been no mention of this risk in the proposed plan.</p> <p>Once the fields are gone, we will never have them again.</p> <p>We should be taking care of flora and fauna, not building on it.</p>
	LPPO2756	Object	<p>Objection to Plan A plus area described as Captains and the Lodge i.e. WFR/ST/2, WFR/ST1, AS/10, OC/13</p> <p>I wish to object based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effect of the planned development would create loss of Green Belt which should protect our countryside from Urban Sprawl and even though existing Rights of Way are supposedly protected there is a great danger that these areas will be eradicated by housing development. The benefits to mental health and physical well being are at serious risk as the development will eradicate the fields used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle etc. This on top of the effect on the wild life habitat which is continually being eroded. • The planned development which will nearly double the size of Spennells would have a dramatic effect on the ability of local schools and medical centres to cater for the increased requirements of the increased population which cannot even cope with the existing residents. <p>The Council must re-evaluate their plans and concentrate on building on brownfield sites which will have the added benefit on regenerating the existing Town Centre.</p>
	LPPO2766	Object	<p>I am writing regarding the above local plan and wish to object to Plan A basically on the grounds that this plan will I think take out too much of the Green Belt land in one go so as to allow a large urban sprawl to the east and to the south of the town.</p> <p>I live on the Spennells estate and I feel that the fields provide an important recreational space for residents. It is one of the few areas where the skylark, a now threatened species, can still be heard.</p> <p>With regard to the so called Eastern Relief Road I think that it's only use will be to provide access to the</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>developments by linking the A449, A448 and the A456. It will not ease the through traffic within Kidderminster town itself unless such a road is continued to link the A451, the A449 on the north side of the town and last but by no means least the A442. Are there plans to do this?</p> <p>A relief road would in my opinion create noise pollution to the existing Spennells estate particularly as the prevailing winds are more usually from the south west. If the Green Belt was spared a road across that area would not be needed in the same way as Captains Pool Road would not have been needed if Spennells had not been built.</p> <p>At the present time there is a south and Eastern route which is the A450 which provides a direct route for through traffic approaching from the south going from Torton to Birmingham and Stourbridge via Hagley. It does require some upgrading however particularly at the Mustow Green island due to poor visibility on the approaches to it.</p> <p>I would therefore support a more dispersed development as outlined in Option B.</p>
	LPPO2767	Object	<p>We wish to object to Option A, as it does not achieve the Objectives set out in WFDC Local Plan. These include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To encourage the long term sustainable development of Wyre Forest and its communities. <i>Impact of removing the Green Belt behind Spennells would be significantly adverse.</i> 2. To address the key challenges facing the District especially in terms of housing, employment and transport. <i>Housing; population growth within the Wyre Forest has been 1,000 over a 15 year period. Developing all the brownfield sites within the WF could accommodate 3,000 people, which at the current rate of expansion would last 45 years. Employment; significant scope for employment by redeveloping all the available redundant brownfield sites, where the infrastructure is already in place. Transport; 3 routes serve the SE side of Kidderminster – the inner ring road, Spennells Valley road and the A450. The region does not need a 4th parallel road.</i> 3. To address housing needs in order that existing and future residents’ requirements are met and the economic development of the area is supported. <i>As per 2. Above.</i> 4. To recognise the changing nature of employment, encourage economic diversification and make sufficient high quality employment sites available. <i>As per 2. Above.</i> 5. To maximise the use of previously developed land in order to ensure the best use is made of available land

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>both within and beyond the main towns. <i>As per 2. above</i></p> <p>6. To protect and support the role of the Green Belt through a strategic review and to identify limited strategic Green Belt release to enable the delivery of the plan whilst reinforcing the role and integrity of the Green Belt for future Plan periods. <i>The proposals for 6000 people + RR do not ‘protect and support the role of the Green Belt’, nor would they reinforce the integrity for future Plan periods. The opposite of this would be the result.</i></p> <p>7. To help resolve the traffic issues in Kidderminster by the provision of an alternative route for through-traffic and to enhance the availability and versatility of rail-based services. <i>A number of measures would help resolve the traffic issues. Firstly, the better use of public transport, including the option of park and rides, as well as the enhancement of cycle routes. Improvements to the A450, which is already a high standard route, which would provide the bypass for A449 to A456 traffic. The Black Bridge, near the A449/A450 junction has been a constraint on the A450 improvements due to the sub-standard headroom. There have been discussions with WCC to jack up the bridge (using weekend closures) to allow for improvements to the junction and further upgrades to this route. Spennells Valley Road is also a high standard road which ties into the A448 roundabout. Further relief of Kidderminster town centre could be provided by providing a link from this roundabout behind Offmore, onto the A456. The relief road is therefore not warranted, and cannot be justified on traffic figure as none are available – no figures were in the public domain according to the staff who attended the public exhibition. If these are available, then why are they being withheld?</i></p> <p>8. To maximise opportunities for the inclusion of green infrastructure and heritage assets into high quality development in order to provide a good quality of life and maximise the benefits of walking and cycling. <i>Building on the Green Belt behind Spennells does not maximise the inclusion of green infrastructure and heritage assets. This is a contradiction on terms, since urban sprawl, at the expense of a redundant town centre, goes against all the principals of sustainability. Preservation of the existing heritage within the town centre would be better served by investing in the town centre, and not creating further assets that have to be maintained on the periphery of the town.</i></p>
	LPPO2769	Object	I want to object to the option A which I understand is the review of the Green Belt at the rear of the Spennells

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>estate, and for this land to be used for building houses.</p> <p>These are my reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The houses will destroy the local environment. • The houses will affect the local wildlife. • There will need to be a greater road network to support the houses. • The existing road network is struggling to cope.
	LPPO2770	Object	<p>We use these fields to walk, ride bikes, geocaching and nature spotting.</p> <p>The roads around this plot are already full and usually have large traffic jams. Even if you add just another 100 cars, the pollution they would cause would have a detrimental affect on everyone.</p> <p>This plot is very close to the Summerfield rocket testing station - I have known several times when the houses surrounding have had to be evacuated.</p> <p>The schools could not cope with the extra demand.</p> <p>The doctors' surgeries and hospital would not cope with the extra demand.</p> <p>Even the local community groups such as the scouts and guides wouldn't have enough space for extra children.</p> <p>The new leisure centre couldn't cope with the influx of users either, it can only just cope now.</p>
	LPPO2778	Object	<p>I object to Option A as the loss to the Green Belt will be unacceptable. There would be a huge detrimental impact upon the wildlife.</p> <p>The Draft LP indicates that only 50% of the Green Belt land on Option A would be developed, however this has only</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>been done to facilitate the construction of a relief road. Public Open Spaces are an unacceptable replacement for the existing Green Belt.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells, not only provide space for walking and exercise for the local population, but are a valuable asset for the flora and fauna. NB rare species are also found, for example the corn bunting, an endangered species.</p> <p>Any attempt to remove this section will be challenged vigorously, not only by all the concerned residents, but by the RSPB.</p>
	<p>LPPO2780</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>There should be no further development of the Spennells Estate and of the core areas proposed in Option A and Option B; thus preserving the Green Belt and in doing so safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>On the Spennells site alone, where there are already around 2000 houses, the proposed increase of 930 dwellings will lead to an increase in the number of cars on the roads (car ownership currently averaging 2- per household) with a resulting increase in traffic using the local roads which are already very congested at times. There will also be additional households, some with children, requiring an increased need for educational, medical and social facilities and the provision of utilities. Drainage and sewerage problems, already existing on Spennells, will be exacerbated.</p> <p>When the fields behind the current Spennells estate are destroyed by this housing/road development a valuable area for walking and exercising and enjoying peace and quiet, as enjoyed by a wide variety of local people, will be lost forever. Currently the 3 fields mentioned are productively farmed, a valuable commodity in the post-Brexit era. With development of these fields, this area will become contaminated by concrete, built —up houses, probably tightly packed together with small land footprints, by traffic noise and loss of air quality.</p> <p>In the plan it is stated that it is necessary to get people walking and cycling for health reasons. Destroying this land will have a detrimental effect on this objective. Once Green Belt land is lost it cannot be restored and is therefore lost to future generations of people and wildlife. The danger is that once the go-ahead is given for this proposed road/housing development on current Green Belt land, it will become all too easy to extend the boundaries further, leading ultimately to coalescence of the smaller settlements of Stone, Summerfield. Stanklyn and other outlying</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>settlements to the East of Kidderminster.</p> <p>There is clearly neither a requirement to develop the Green Belt Fields abutting the Spennells Estate, for which an allocation of 930 dwellings, under site references OC/13S. WFR/ST/2 and AS/10 has been proposed. Nor a requirement to develop the core area in Option A to the East of Kidderminster.</p> <p>Leaving a corridor of undeveloped land to respect the need for the separation of settlements is admirable but outside of these corridors the extensive development outlined in this Plan will still result in urban sprawl to an unpalatable degree, not to mention the unsociable behaviour and crime that tends to be a feature of large housing estates these days, with all the problems this can produce. National Policy states that Green Belt land is specifically supposed to prevent this, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, alongside maintaining large tracts of land for productive farming, protecting wildlife habitat and providing an open, pleasant environment for people to enjoy, be it walking, cycling or just enjoying the views and breathing in fresh air, unpolluted by traffic noise and pollution. This policy seems to have been ignored.</p>
	<p>LPPO2796</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Question: Do you think the benefits of allowing easier delivery of school provision and the option of an Eastern Relief Road outweigh the disadvantage caused by the large-scale of expansion to the east of Kidderminster that would be needed?</p> <p>No. Easier delivery of a solution can often bring greater disadvantage because problems are overlooked due to the ease of such a delivery. I wish to object to a number of your proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To help resolve the traffic issues in Kidderminster by the provision of an alternative route for through-traffic - I attended a drop in session at Heronswood First School and discussed with a council representative the benefits the easier option A would deliver. She was unsure about the Eastern Relief Road saying it was most likely going to be a single track estate road which was <u>probably</u> not going to run through the Spennells estate. This in itself would congest traffic on the east of Kidderminster bringing further travel problems. The A449 backs up to Hartlebury during evening rush hour and onto Spennells in the morning already and that is without all the houses being occupied on the new estate on the old Sugar Beet site. With even more people on the east of Kidderminster this route would be very unsatisfactory, practically unmovable.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To maximise the benefits of walking and cycling - Your proposal that people will walk or cycle or train to work is far-fetched. From Spennells it is a 40 minute walk to the railway station and 50 minutes into town. The fields behind would add another ten minutes to such a journey. This is too far to walk with heavy work bags or shopping. Your proposal that young people will settle if we improve retail by offering more retail jobs is at odds with the amount of disposable income people have in such low income work. People with low income jobs can be better served closer to town centres. There they can save money on car journeys. • Kidderminster Enterprise Park is the main focus for employment. People with higher incomes in Kidderminster mainly commute to work which means travel by car on the whole because jobs are often on various trading estates outside town centres now and not served by public transport. New people moving into the area would also want to travel by car to work. • To prevent urban sprawl - You talk about the three towns of the district remaining separate but already Stourport is linked to Kidderminster through the development of the Sugar Beet land and the canal areas. I agree to build sheltered housing for older people and retirement homes but these should not be near the Spennells pool for such vulnerable people. The pool hangs in mist and ice in winter and it is not healthy causing respiration difficulties in this vulnerable group. I cannot believe such short-sighted thinking. Bats roost near the pool and urban sprawl would destroy their habitat. • High costs of providing healthcare for an ageing population with high obesity. You speak of wanting to improve health and obesity but removing the benefit of open space and big skies for the dog walkers and children conker hunting, instead of 'green space' for walkers to trek through more housing with more traffic will lead to a greater problem for our hard pushed health service already under pressure with over 4000 contacts per month.
	LPPO2799	Object	<p>My objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads local to Spennells are already gridlocked due to the new relief road being open. Traffic is now queuing from Easter Park most of the day and Wilden Lane is queuing sometimes from as far back as The Wash House. Traffic is not being able to access the Worcester Road Roundabout due to cars blocking it. Accidents are very likely on the Worcester Road Roundabout. • Getting off Spennells at times is already a problem and adding another 1000 plus houses is just going to

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>exacerbate the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Then there is also the problem of air pollution as the traffic will be queuing. • The fields behind Spennells are well used by walkers, joggers, dog walkers, families with children going for walks. Cyclists and horse riders also use the fields. • The fields also used for essential crop growing. • The local bus service is not adequate or dependable. <p>All in all, I am thoroughly against this plan.</p>
	<p>LPPO2800</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Question: Do you think the benefits of allowing easier delivery of school provision and the option of an Eastern Relief Road outweigh the disadvantage caused by the large-scale of expansion to the east of Kidderminster that would be needed?</p> <p>No. Easier delivery of a solution can often bring greater disadvantage because problems are overlooked due to the ease of such a delivery. I wish to object to a number of your proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To help resolve the traffic issues in Kidderminster by the provision of an alternative route for through-traffic - I attended a drop in session at Heronswood First School and discussed with a council representative the benefits the easier option A would deliver. She was unsure about the Eastern Relief Road saying it was most likely going to be a single track estate road which was <u>probably</u> not going to run through the Spennells estate. This in itself would congest traffic on the east of Kidderminster bringing further travel problems. The A449 backs up to Hartlebury during evening rush hour and onto Spennells in the morning already and that is without all the houses being occupied on the new estate on the old Sugar Beet site. With even more people on the east of Kidderminster this route would be very unsatisfactory, practically unmovable. Traffic is consistently backed up at Mustow Green or Belbroughton which are both to the east of Kidderminster. • To maximise the benefits of walking and cycling - Your proposal that people will walk or cycle or train to work is far-fetched. From Spennells it is a 40 minute walk to the railway station and 50 minutes into town. The fields behind would add another ten minutes to such a journey. This is too far to walk with heavy work bags or shopping. Your proposal that young people will settle if we improve retail by offering more retail jobs is at odds with the amount of disposable income people have in such low income work. People with low

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>income jobs can be better served closer to town centres. There they can save money on car journeys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kidderminster Enterprise Park is the main focus for employment. People with higher incomes in Kidderminster mainly commute to work which means travel by car on the whole because jobs are often on various trading estates outside town centres now and not served by public transport. New people moving into the area would also want to travel by car to work. • To prevent urban sprawl - You talk about the three towns of the district remaining separate but already Stourport is linked to Kidderminster through the development of the Sugar Beet land and the canal areas. I agree to build sheltered housing for older people and retirement homes but these should not be near the Spennells pool for such vulnerable people. The pool hangs in mist and ice in winter and it is not healthy causing respiration difficulties in this vulnerable group. I cannot believe such short-sighted thinking. Bats roost near the pool and urban sprawl would destroy their habitat. • High costs of providing healthcare for an ageing population with high obesity. You speak of wanting to improve health and obesity but removing the benefit of open space and big skies for the dog walkers and children conker hunting, instead of 'green space' for walkers to trek through more housing with more traffic will lead to a greater problem for our hard pushed health service already under pressure with over 4000 contacts per month.
	LPPO2803	Object	<p>The Spennells area of Kidderminster already has a large built up area and the fields proposed for building provide an amenity used extensively by the local population for all manner of outdoor pursuits and activities and general.</p> <p>Should not to turn this area into a larger urban sprawl.</p> <p>Morning traffic leaving Spennells endures jams and holdups due to current volume.</p> <p>The Council appears to favour plan "A" as they believe it would enhance their objective for the construction of the proposed (twice rejected) Eastern Link Road.</p>
	LPPO2804	Object	<p>I am writing to object to "Option A" - the proposed development of houses on the Spennells fields.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These fields are used extensively by the Spennells community for dog walking and recreation. It encourages love of nature and provides a healthy and fun environment for children to play. If this were taken away then residents would have to travel to access similar open spaces. • The fields seem to be very fertile for farming • There is an abundance of wildlife. There would be extensive loss of habitat for the wildlife that flourishes on these fields. I would therefore like to see a full review of the wildlife in the area before any final decisions were made. • Kidderminster is struggling for Green Belt land so as Option B provides more housing with less loss of Green Belt it seems to be the better choice. This would therefore be my preferred option.
	LPPO2810	Object	<p>Objects to building new houses on land next to the Spennells estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary building of dwellings on Green Belt land • Impact on local habitats of flora and fauna • Increase in traffic in the localised area • Increase in air and noise pollution • Increase in the demand of places in local primary and high schools. The schools will need to increase in size but with tight budgets they cannot do this. • Decreasing the lack to open space for children, dog walkers etc to walk and play
	LPPO2820	Object	<p>Strongly opposed to OPTION A</p> <p>1. LOSS OF GREEN BELT.</p> <p>Result in urban sprawl and be in total opposition to the purpose of GREEN BELT POLICY.</p> <p>2. SCHOOLS AND SURGERIES.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Development would IMPACT DRASTICALLY on both the above.</p> <p>Heronswood school has in 2016, been extended and is ALREADY FULL, is another extension even possible?</p> <p>SURGERIES will also be put UNDER considerable PRESSURE, in ADDITION TO their PRESENT RESTRAINTS, caused by families living in an EXTRA 1,700 dwellings.</p> <p>3. TRAFFIC.</p> <p>Development will require major road access at very high cost causing POLLUTION and CONGESTION with inevitable HEALTH RISKS. Brown field sites already have sufficient road access. The council is considering a bypass from Birmingham Road to A449. Proposed development of Spennells should not be an inducement for a developer who might offer assistance in construction of a bypass.</p> <p>Indications that people from Birmingham and Solihull could be encouraged to this development and as businesses in Kidderminster seem to be downsizing or closing this will result in more commuter traffic from Kidderminster to work in other areas, with all the problems of more pollution and congestion.</p> <p>Forecasts show a DECLINE IN HOUSING REQUIREMENTS IN KIDDERMINSTER. Requirements could possibly be met by developing brown field sites, including smaller ones. EXISTING EMPTY BUILDINGS could be CONVERTED to provide AFFORDABLE flats and apartments which would meet the following needs;</p> <p>Nearby shops and amenities, entertainments, surgeries etc. with the HEALTH ASPECTS of walking and lowering pollution levels.</p> <p>Down sizing, therefore releasing family size housing.</p> <p>Encouraging greater RANGE OF VIABLE SHOPS (more visits per week, good for business.)</p> <p>Taking PRESSURE OFF AN ALREADY UNRELIABLE BUS SERVICE.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			EASING PARKING PROBLEMS IN TOWN.
	LPPO2824	Object	Object to plan A as follows: It is Green Belt/productive farmland. Will result traffic issues/bus service already poor Effect on wildlife/recreational use Use brownfield sites first
	LPPO2828	Object	Objects to proposal at Spennells. Spennells estate is surrounded by beautiful countryside, is used by dog walkers and is a great place to bring up children into the future. There are areas of Kidderminster Town Centre that are in desperate need of reinvestment and housing would be a fantastic option.
	LPPO2830	Object	Object to Option A as follows: Loss of recreational land Increase in traffic/exhaust fumes whereas building higher density homes in town centre will reduce these. Loss of Green Belt /threat to existing Rights of way Loss of wildlife. Regenerate on Brownfield sites in Kidderminster
	LPPO2832	Object	Object to Option A and development of Green Belt before all brown field sites have been used. The proposed development at Option A would result in urban sprawl, significant traffic issues/pollution/loss of recreational land.

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	LPPO2836	Object	<p>Object to proposed extension of Spennells. Irreplaceable loss of habitat for wildlife, breathing space for Kidderminster.</p> <p>Developers are reluctant to use brownfield sites, follow the example of Wolverhampton, and built homes in the town. Incentivise businesses with affordable rates to expand their businesses and have an innovation space, even a science park.</p> <p>Proposing to build on a flood plain, which is a highly dangerous strategy</p>
	LPPO2837	Object	<p>I object to the use of the fields around the Spennells estate for building. These fields provide a wonderful place to walk, ride, exercise and enjoy the countryside on our doorstep. Local services are already stretched to the limit.</p>
	LPPO2838	Object	<p>I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:</p> <p>Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/Traffic emissions</p> <p>Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools.</p> <p>Affect tourism/wildlife/possible flooding.</p> <p>Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings before Green Belt.</p>
	LPPO2842	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO SPENNELLS:</p> <p>The inability of Kidderminster’s infrastructure/public services to cope with extra residents.</p> <p>Noise and pollution concerns</p> <p>The loss of Green Belt, wildlife and valuable agricultural land.</p>
	LPPO2845	Object	<p>We do not support Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • undermines reason for Green Belt:

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accuracy of the Assessment of Housing Need • negative impact on the biodiversity/wildlife • increased traffic • Spennells estate already has social issues • infrastructure esp. medical/schooling • is relief road proposed as it can attract capital funding • gypsy/traveller site impractical in narrow lane • Fly tipping could increase. • Lack of job creation would encourage commuting • Negative impact upon local amenities, health and wellbeing, community identity <p>Support option B/greater brown field development</p>
	LPPO2847	Object	<p>Objects to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exacerbate existing traffic congestion/increase risks to pedestrians • pressures on healthcare/school capacities • negative impact on nature/attraction of area • Focus on use of brownfield sites/more balanced across the district.
	LPPO2851	Object	<p>Object to Spennells: Loss of recreational land/wildlife Roads already congested; schools/doctors/hospitals already busy</p> <p>Once Green Belt is gone it is gone forever</p>
	LPPO2866	Object	<p>I would like to see a semi- rural location which, benefits the local community with low pollution which ensures a good life style, maintained for the population of Kidderminster.</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>I object to option A of the Local development plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kidderminster’s historic carpet and market industry has almost completely disappeared with an unattractive town centre, full of empty properties and few shops that will encourage people to the area. The town appears to encourage charity shops, hairdressers and coffee shops. • It appears that the consultation process has not been particularly open or helpful with few details being shared. It amazed me to hear that originally the Council did not think it necessary to provide Spennells with a local drop in session, when in fact under option A they were probably the most affected. I also do not understand why the out-lying areas of Wyre Forest do not have to be included within this discussion. In my opinion all of Wyre Forest should be included with all building taking place within the existing boundary. • There are a number of empty buildings and run down areas, which could actually be utilized without the need for further building on any Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be used for food production, something which over the next few years will be more important as we exit Europe. • I also feel that before any housing is considered on the Green Belt land all available brownfield sites are developed, including those which already have been granted planning permission but are not being developed. The Council need to ensure that developers have to develop the land within a certain length of time. I also question that the figures you have stated for population growth are accurate especially regarding my earlier statement. Any people wishing to move into the area are commuters, bringing very little into the community. WFDC need to improve job prospects, shopping and other amenities within the towns first. • Under Option A I do not believe that the infrastructure is good enough. Every road from Kidderminster needs improvements. There is already congestion towards, Birmingham, Worcester and Bromsgrove to use the Motorways. The hospital, schools and other medical depts. e.g. Doctors, Dentists need improving as they are unable to cope with the present population. • I am also aware that the drainage system on Spennells is already inadequate, over the year’s houses there have flooded when drains are not able to deal with the surface water. With more building this would be further exacerbated. • The fields behind Spennells offer local people a place to enjoy the countryside through walking, cycling, bird watching on the doorstep. This is something the Government are keen to encourage to ensure the health and wellbeing of the population does not cause a further drain on the health services. <p>Under option B the development would stay within the existing boundary and not cause further urban</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>sprawl as Option A would to Summerfield, Stone and Stanklyn.</p> <p>I believe Option B is the best option for Wyre Forest, however if Option A does take you should ensure residents do not have a lower quality of life. Measures such as low level lighting on the proposed road with a quiet road surface as standard; speed restrictions to avoid air pollution and; access denied to heavy vehicles should be enforced. Noise, Air and Light pollution must be minimal. The Council must ensure that adequate green areas are designated and maintained along with the current tree preservation orders which are present on Spennells. I do wonder if the Council have considered building on the Golf course and giving them the opportunity to move to one of the Green Belt areas to ensure the boundary does not extend.</p> <p>Above all I oppose option A as I believe that the whole of Wyre Forest should share the development needs and keep the existing boundary for all.</p>
	LPPO2869	Object	<p>While we understand the need to provide housing, we wish to state our objections to Option A on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that Kittiwake Drive could provide access for the proposed development, becoming busier and making a rat-run. This road is narrow and unsuitable for more traffic; it is also well used by children going to and from school and to the play area on Heronswood Road. • Spennells has a small shopping area catering for residents: it is often difficult now to access the car park, especially when school children are arriving and leaving. • Spennells Primary School would be too small to cater for the proposed numbers of families. • King Charles School is already on two sites, so would be unlikely to take many more pupils. • Spreading development over the wider area will use brownfield sites (identified in the document) and encroach less on Green Belt and greenfield sites. • The stated number of new homes needed has been exaggerated and the proposal for up to 6000 more is unrealistic; employment opportunities will not provide jobs on such a scale. Looking at the number of unoccupied business units in the area (e.g. Easter Park), we question the need to provide so many new ones. • Building companies are required to provide a certain number of housing association homes at a ratio of 30% in order to win contracts. They should be required to redevelop brownfield sites first. • Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust is already in special measures, unable to cope with demand. We have a

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Minor Injuries Unit. Is the Council prepared to negotiate with the NHS for an upgrade to KGH to meet the needs of more people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kidderminster traffic flow is slow. The possible eastern bypass will only help commuters to reach Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham, and those who live on the west and north will not benefit greatly. • More traffic means more pollution and road maintenance is already poor, so increased traffic will exacerbate the situation. • Public transport is unreliable for the Spennells area with buses often late or not arriving at all. Current provision would therefore be inadequate for additional passengers, and would encourage more frequent use of cars, adding to air pollution and congestion in the town area. • Local people value and use the existing fields and footpaths around Spennells for leisure and exercise, improving health in a holistic way, and with a potentially positive impact on health services. <p>It would seem more appropriate to develop brownfield areas and make as little impact as possible on our precious Green Belt sites. We have no objection to developing the Lea Castle site, as it already has some infrastructure, but stands derelict now, and would be an excellent setting for a new estate area.</p>
	LPPO2873	Object	<p>Green Belt Land should not be built on lightly and plan B uses 20% less. If it is possible to protect this land, it should be done so at all costs. The 2015 Conservative Manifesto states that “Ministers attach great importance to the Green Belt and will maintain existing areas of protection” - how can Option A be considered when this removes the largest area of Green Belt? Also, it states “Green Belt’s primary purpose is to prevent urban sprawl A huge proportion of it has considerable environmental value . . .” The proposal for option A would be doing exactly that, by building an extremely large proportion of housing in one massive area it will take away value from the local environment and create an urban sprawl, which is why I am firmly opposed to it. There is sufficient space for 3000 houses on current brownfield sites I do not understand why the destruction of Green Belt land is being considered.</p> <p>Current plans to link Spennells estate through Turnstone Road would also cause severe disruption to the currently quiet cul-de-sac. The current residents would have increased noise and air pollution and road safety issues, which would undoubtedly lead to a drop in house price. The current access at the two points of entry onto the estate are extremely busy and traffic heading towards town is likely to cut through thus creating further traffic chaos.</p> <p>If option A provides better school provision, how is this going to be made? There is currently no funding and there are no definite plans for a new school. If such a large population growth is going to take place, this needs forward</p>

LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>planning and funding. Will families move in with vast numbers of children after or before a school is built? The current schools could not cope with such a dramatic rise in numbers, particularly after having recently been through the three tier to two tier school system reorganisation, where the existing primary schools have already had to make substantial growth to accommodate two extra year groups.</p> <p>Objection with reference to paragraph 5.4b:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“b. A social role — supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities in Wyre Forest by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations. ii. Creating a high-quality built environment, with accessible local services and infrastructure that reflect a community’s needs and support its health and social and cultural well-being. I iii. Creating a strong sense of place by strengthening the distinctive and cultural qualities of towns and villages. iv. Creating safe and accessible environments where crime, disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.” <p>I fail to see how these objectives will be met under the proposed plans. Existing residents have no local doctor or youth facilities and no plans have been given in Option A to include these. The local community’s needs have not been considered, nor has support for its health and social needs.</p> <p>There is already an element of anti-social behaviour on the estate and if further expansion were to be made, this would impact greatly on the surrounding area. There used to be a youth club, but this was not replaced when Heronswood school was expanded, due to the Wyre Forest School shake up. I believe such an area of new development would cause an increase in the level of anti-social behaviour in the local area.</p> <p>The local hospital struggles to cope with the existing population and doctors’ surgeries are stretched to bursting. No plans have been proposed to suggest how the local community will cope with such basic and necessary needs. Aside from this, it will be severely detrimental to the health and well-being of the local community. Obesity has been recognised by the nation and local Council as a growing and worrying problem. The fields are used by walkers, joggers, wildlife enthusiasts, photographers, horse riders and local residents to maintain fitness. Not only does this help physical fitness, but exercise in rural countryside has massive benefits for mental health, yet another escalating problem within our community. Studies have also proven such an environment helps promote creativity. The impact locally would be massive and this is why residents chose to live here.</p>