

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Objection with reference to paragraph 5.4 c Environmental role</p> <p>I object strongly to option A as it is too large a proposal on currently excellent quality agricultural land and too close to the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve. It could not help but impact on the local diversity of the local environment. The fields are necessary to help protect from flooding, Captains Pool would not be able to cope with the drainage and this flows directly into the nature reserve. Extremely rare protected black poplar trees reside in this area, it is the habitat of the great crested newt and at least 3 types of bats roost in the area, which feed and thrive on insects from the local fields and hedgerows. A vast amount of nature will be destroyed, habitats will be lost and a negative impact will affect the local biodiversity which is supposedly protected. You should not take away from Green Belt land, unless it is absolutely necessary, as it was initially designated Green Belt for good reason — why should much of the proposed planning occur on precious land when there are many brownfield and green field sites available and many more that have not been fully considered — for example there is a large field area in Wolverley that has been proven by a local resident to belong to nobody and is not Green Belt and could take much of the housing. There is also the land on the previous Wyre Golf Club and sites already established on plan B. It states on how-to-review-planning-applications that “You must consider whether a proposed development might affect a protected site or area when reviewing a planning application types of protected sites and areas —A locally protected site: local nature reserve” Does option A actually do this? I do not believe this has been taken fully into consideration.</p> <p>I therefore strongly urge you to rethink the current plans and do not agree to support option A. Do not build on Green Belt land and definitely do not opt for a plan which sacrifices the largest area. Sufficient brown and green field sites can be found and a new study to consider exactly how much housing is actually needed must be undertaken. We need to think of the future and protect our natural environment where possible. The current Green Belt land is already used extensively for the well being of the community and is valuable and good quality agricultural land. I therefore do not believe that option A can achieve the outcomes it proposes to do so and would be to the detriment of Kidderminster and the surrounding area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2881</a>	Object	<p>I am not happy with the proposed development of 1735 new homes.</p> <p>My reasons are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Massive increase in traffic &amp; pollution. Heronswood Road gets grid-locked now at peak times in the morning.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Increased pollution will cause more ill-health so putting a strain on our already over-stretched NHS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local schools would not cope with this increase.</li> <li>• Developing on Green Belt land really should be a last resort NOT the easy option!</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2890</a>	Object	Objection against proposed building on the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn lane. The local schools and other services are already stretched to the limit. They do regular exercise on these fields.
	<a href="#">LPPO2892</a>	Object	Objection against proposed building on the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn lane. The local schools and other services are already stretched to the limit. They use these fields for regular exercise.
	<a href="#">LPPO2905</a>	Object	<p>Objection towards the Option A local plan to build houses on the fields at the back of Spennells and Easter Park.</p> <p>So many people use the fields as a form of exercise (bike riding, rambling or dog walking). The lives and wellbeing of so many people would be affected. Not everyone can afford to go to a gym or are elderly therefore the only form of getting out and about and exercising is a gentle walk around the beautiful fields.</p> <p>Facilities on the estate will not be able to cope, the Tesco shop car park is always full as people also use it as parking for the school and other shops by it so how are we going to accommodate more people wishing to use it?</p> <p>The disruption which will be caused to the people who live right by the fields while the building work taking place is going to be huge and will drive down the prices of the houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2923</a>	Object	<p>I do walk my dog through these beautiful fields, and I am appalled at the idea of such a huge chunk of beautiful countryside being covered over with concrete, bricks and tarmac.</p> <p>I think this is too much, and I would be strongly against all 3 fields being allocated.</p> <p>If some land is needed around Spennells then I think the plans should be re-drawn.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2924</a>	Object	There is presently only one road in and out of Spennells and this already causes congestion and on occasion the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>whole estate is gridlocked. An access road for the new houses through an existing road on the estate will add to the congestion and stretch local school and services even more</p> <p>The fields in-between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells are presently farmed and we need to keep Britain farming. The area is home to many rare birds and bats and also provides a valuable flood plain to the area. Severn Trent has had to install preventive measures to the homes in Linnet Rise.</p> <p>The fields and pathways are used on a regular basis as an area for valuable exercise.</p> <p>I feel it unnecessary to build a large development in one area. We should redevelop where possible and keep as much Green Belt as possible.</p> <p>Therefore I am in favour of Development B</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2926</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to houses being built adjacent to Spennells.</li> <li>• The amount of proposed housing is not needed in Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Ratio to proposed housing to local services is too high.</li> <li>• Option B would be a better option following a dispread strategy.</li> <li>• The local school will not cope with such and influx of new pupils.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt - with leaving the EU we will need to produce more food which this land will be needed for.</li> <li>• Many people use the fields for walking, jogging etc. - also contributes to people's health and wellbeing.</li> <li>• Loss of habitats and diminishing wildlife corridors.</li> <li>• We are all putting forward the same arguments but with the sheer amount of opposition, more consideration should be taken for option B.</li> <li>• Our opinions should be valued and considered.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2927</a>	Object	Objection to building upon the fields.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2929</a>	Object	<p>The fields have always been used not only for farming, but for walking and dog exercising. There is no other estate like it locally, there is a sense of community as you'll always meet someone.</p> <p>It's relaxing to walk in such a beautiful and rare open undeveloped space.</p> <p>The local roads would not cope with the extra volume of traffic, even with a relief road built and paid for.</p> <p>Doctors dentists etc only just cope with the population as is. Sometimes I have to wait a week to see a GP, and the local hospital has shut down.</p> <p>Schools again are at capacity!</p> <p>It had been given the status to protect it for our future generations, and is grossly unfair to the point of a breach of human rights to change the status purely for profit.</p> <p>Agricultural land is needed in this county, Brexit or not we need to provide for ourselves, once the land is gone it can't be undeveloped.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2942</a>	Object	<p>Objection towards option A regarding fields between Stanklyn lane and Spennells.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Realistically do we actually need that much extra housing considering how little the population of Kidderminster has actually grown over the last 20 years?</li> <li>2. If no extra amenities such as schools or shops are going to be built as there are none proposed in the plan, where are these new house dwellers going to go? Local schools are already struggling.</li> <li>3. Local doctors can't cope and you practically need to be dying before you actually get to see one. How will this work with all those extra people, not to mention our "local" a &amp; e department. It's nowhere near big enough for the people they have to cater for now. If Redditch a &amp; e gets closed like they want as well it will be a disaster waiting to</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>happen. Worcester hospital already is failing.</p> <p>4. The local infrastructure of roads will be pushed past breaking point and the theory of a relief road is not going to help all the other pressure points in our town.</p> <p>5. Just something to take in to consideration - Kidderminster is not a town people want to live in because it is so horrible for various reasons including our half dead and disjointed town centre. The only plus point we have is all the Green Belt and open space we have. If you build over it, who is going to want to move to live here by choice?</p> <p>6. Develop existing brown site areas first to protect the one commodity this town actually has. Lea castle is a large area and would not impact the Green Belt to the same extent. Converting the closed shops on Worcester street in to housing would make the town centre look much better as well as possibly encouraging restaurants and brand shops to come to town. The site of the old leisure centre could also be used if not sold by then.</p> <p>7. The government want urban sprawl avoided and that is exactly what this plan would be.</p> <p>8. It would lead to a devastating impact on the birds and other wildlife in the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2943</a>	Object	<p>Strongest possible objections to Option A.</p> <p>These objections come under several headings, but my most pressing concern is about the loss of good agricultural land. It is good flexible land which would successfully grow a wide variety of crop, which It has done in the past. In the last month or so, several reports have been published which warn of the rising cost of food, and the difficulties we may have after Brexit.</p> <p>These fields are being well looked after and properly farmed, as opposed to the last couple of years or so. There is a heavy barley crop in these fields now. It is interesting to note that the skylarks have returned this year. Linnets are also to be found here, another rare bird.</p> <p>Closely allied with this point is the increase in all kinds of pollution which will occur. Apart from the effect on our</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>children’s health of all the extra emissions and noise pollution from the extra vehicles, these estate roads are simply not able to cope at rush hours at the moment. Even the slightest hold up, even out on the Worcester or Comberton Roads, cause immense tailbacks.</p> <p>The local primary school would have to be extended, with the loss of amenity and resources that would cause. King Charles School is already running on a split site. Class sizes are getting larger, so why add to the difficulties these two excellent local schools are having. Added to that there are no plans mentioned for any medical facilities in this” new” area, neither dentists or any retail outlets, Green Belt land was set aside for the purpose of stopping urban sprawl and inappropriate and ribbon development. It also provided spaces where people could breathe and exercise away from the smoke and pollution of most towns. These areas are well used for that purpose. I am not just talking about those who live on the estate, this is a popular area for many from within the whole area.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2944</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Strongest possible objections to Option A.</p> <p>These objections come under several headings, but my most pressing concern is about the loss of good agricultural land. It is good flexible land which would successfully grow a wide variety of crop, which It has done in the past. In the last month or so, several reports have been published which warn of the rising cost of food, and the difficulties we may have after Brexit.</p> <p>These fields are being well looked after and properly farmed, as opposed to the last couple of years or so. There is a heavy barley crop in these fields now. It is interesting to note that the skylarks have returned this year. Linnets are also to be found here, another rare bird.</p> <p>Closely allied with this point is the increase in all kinds of pollution which will occur. Apart from the effect on our children’s health of all the extra emissions and noise pollution from the extra vehicles, these estate roads are simply not able to cope at rush hours at the moment. Even the slightest hold up, even out on the Worcester or Comberton Roads, cause immense tailbacks.</p> <p>The local primary school would have to be extended, with the loss of amenity and resources that would cause. King Charles School is already running on a split site. Class sizes are getting larger, so why add to the difficulties these two</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>excellent local schools are having. Added to that there are no plans mentioned for any medical facilities in this" new" area, neither dentists or any retail outlets, Green Belt land was set aside for the purpose of stopping urban sprawl and inappropriate and ribbon development. It also provided spaces where people could breathe and exercise away from the smoke and pollution of most towns. These areas are well used for that purpose. I am not just talking about those who live on the estate, this is a popular area for many from within the whole area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2949</a>	Object	<p>Option A would mean Spennells more than doubling in size with the social consequences that would follow.</p> <p>From West Midlands agricultural land survey, it can be seen that the site of the 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.</p> <p>The proposal to build on 'Green Belt' land would lead loss of habitat for wildlife (no coincidence that the roads of Spennells Estate are named after birds!) and would have a major impact and opportunities for exercise in a District identified with high obesity rates.</p> <p>The very nature of the proposed development on the land locked fields around the Spennells &amp; Stanklyn Lane, together with the additional traffic congestion it would create would require the construction of the proposed relief road as a condition precedent. The planning, approvals &amp; obtaining the necessary finance means it is unlikely to be built, just as the by-pass proposal in 1996 was dropped. Should an attempt be made for access/egress to any new development via the Spennells would be strongly opposed. The layout &amp; width of the existing roads were designed to serve the estate only. Extra traffic would mean longer queues at junctions &amp; the two exits from the estate, increase in the risk of traffic accidents particularly to pedestrians, deter children from walking to school &amp; increase in air pollution.</p> <p>There would be an increased flood risk to the Spennells area. The Victoria Carpets old sports ground is designated a flood plain. Houses around Pintail are said to be built on piled foundations. There would be a major impact on drainage as the fields act as a valuable soakaway. Current primary schools are full and more dwellings will, have a major impact on local schools.</p> <p>Likewise there will be further pressure on our already inadequate &amp; under funded hospitals as well as doctors not to mention the pressure on the already under funded full school &amp; nursery.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that Option A is rejected in its present form and WFDC revisits their options to a proposal that</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>allows dispersal of housing across the whole of the District that genuinely meets the present &amp; future needs of its local population.</p> <p>In achieving this it needs to exclude the use of Green Belt productive land classified as 'very good, &amp; is environmental friendly providing habitat for wildlife &amp; opportunities for exercise. It should also seek to have the minimum effect on traffic not causing major bottlenecks within the District &amp; neighbouring Authorities(i.e. Hagley)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2960</a>	Object	<p>I cannot support either of the preferred options as follows:</p> <p>Impact on Green Belt, local services, environment.</p> <p>No valid argument for the Eastern Relief road</p> <p>Educational needs cannot be met if a majority of the development occurs in one area.</p> <p>The recycling sites struggle to cope</p> <p>Traffic issues</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2964</a>	Object	<p>Aside from the obvious negatives such as destroying our Green Belt, noise pollution, etc., without an extra school, hospital and a general increase in public sector spending, these houses cannot keep being built.</p> <p>With the continual austerity measures being imposed, it seems highly unlikely that further funds will be made available for these vital services we all rely on.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2971</a>	Object	<p>Lack of capacity in:</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>Transport and access</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Leisure facilities</p> <p>Internet/Broadband access</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Loss of green space</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2973</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>To use Option A would put an enormous strain on the infrastructure surrounding the Spennells Area. The only access point to the proposed housing estate is through Turnstone Road which would cause extra congestion in traffic, to the detriment of the people living along that road. Turnstone is quite a narrow road which was not built to carry the amount of traffic that a new housing estate would entail.</p> <p>Consideration has not been given to how public transport would access this estate. Bus services at present run every 30 minutes through Offmore estate to Spennells and back into Kidderminster. Again because of the access to this field, how would the bus service be able to cover the new housing?</p> <p>Nor has consideration been given to entry and exit from Spennells Estate. At present there is one road, with two exits both of which come out on to Spennells Valley Road. Already there are considerable queues, especially in the rush hour with waiting times regularly in the region of 10-15 minutes. If, as sometimes happens, Spennells Valley Road is blocked because of congestion elsewhere, there is no other exit from the estate. Additional traffic will make this considerable worse.</p> <p>If these houses are built, where are the younger children go to school? The local Junior/Infant school is full and because the Council sold off the original land designated for a middle school, there is no room for expansion. The only high School, King Charles, and currently housed on two sites, and extra children would put considerable strain on their resources not to mention the danger to these children who walk to school.</p> <p>Has the Council thought about medical services? There is no doctor or health facilities on the Spennells side of town. Why not? Spennells has always been the poor relation in terms of facilities, yet we are probably one of the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>biggest housing estates in Kidderminster, and now the Council are considering doubling its size without any additional facilities being planned.</p> <p>There is also the suggestion, once again, of a by-pass from the Worcester Road right round to the Birmingham Road with access to the proposed housing estate leading from this road. Apart from the fact that it will be used as a 'rat run', my one question is "How are they going to get over the railway?" The last time this was proposed it would have been 10ft higher than the existing houses. Also, are they planning to put the road in before the houses are built or after?</p> <p>I feel that the Council is showing a considerable lack of vision. They are going for the easiest option of using perfectly good agricultural land to build houses on, when they have only got to walk round the centre of Kidderminster to see the desolation that has taken place over the last 20 years and the amount of available land. If I was considering moving to Kidderminster now, I would seriously think twice. When we came here it was a nice little town, with great shops, a cinema, swimming baths; a place with plenty going for it. Now it is dying on its feet and all the Council can think of is to build more unwanted houses on Green Fields.</p> <p>So much for the forward vision of the Wyre Forest District Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2978</a>	Object	<p>It's such a lovely semi-rural opportunity for children, away from the concrete and brick that consumes Kidderminster.</p> <p>On the estate we have not got the services to supply more homes, schools will be overrun, and can barely cope as it is. Shops and roads are not equipped to serve so many more houses.</p> <p>There must be other sites if more housing is needed, Green Belt is not the answer.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2988</a>	Object	<p>I have read the local Planning review, attended the Drop in Consultation at Heronswood Primary School and have also consulted with friends and neighbours regarding this matter, I have taken great time in considering all of the information and I have come to the following objections why it would be totally wrong and inappropriate to build on the Green Belt fields on Spennells Estate</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>I would like to object to the Option A plan</p> <p>Spennells Estate is more than large enough at present, to build the amount of houses that is being talked about would put too much strain on already existing services/infrastructure in the area, the population of Wyre Forest has not grown vastly in the last few years to warrant this amount of housing nor will it be affordable to the people who really need it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schooling would be oversubscribed.</li> <li>2. GP Practices are already stretched to their limits extra patients would take them to breaking point.</li> <li>3. Kidderminster Hospital is already downgraded which means the extra residents travelling to Worcester/Redditch Hospitals would create a larger volume of traffic.</li> <li>4. Valuable Grade 2 agricultural land would disappear which in turn would mean an increase in traffic to transport the crops from other parts of the country which is damaging to the environment.</li> <li>5. I travel to work each day in a car share with my husband to cut down on volume of traffic on the roads and to cut the amount of pollution to the environment, frequently Spennells Estate is grid locked, the extra homes which are being talked about would only increase this problem 10 fold adding more pollution to the area/environment.</li> <li>6. I am not an expert with regards to rare species, however, I have listened to friends/neighbours who have more knowledge than me and I have seen evidence of rare birds such as Skylarks, Bats, living/nesting in these fields let alone other less rare birds/animals which inhabit the land, if this land is built on they will be gone forever.</li> <li>7. My understanding of Green Belt as explained to me at the drop in consultation is to prevent urban sprawl so as to avoid towns expanding and joining together to make one large town, if Spennells fields are built on then this will most certainly be the case.</li> <li>8. These fields are used prolifically on a daily basis by walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers, horse riding, nature lovers for recreation and exercise to facilitate the wellbeing of mind, body and spirit, this will no longer be available to them if these houses are built on the land, you may say provision will be made for this but I am sure it will not be such a pleasurable alternative to open countryside.</li> <li>9. Where will all these extra people work? There aren't enough jobs in the area for the population at present, I know as I have had to take a job in Dudley after several years of searching for suitable employment in</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Kidderminster of which there was none.
	<a href="#">LPPO2990</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Plan A.</p> <p>When I first heard of the plans to develop on the Green Belt land I was appalled at what was being proposed and have consequently put much thought and research into other alternatives.</p> <p>Having lived on Spennells estate my whole life I have always considered this to be a strong contender of where I would choose to purchase my own house. It is one of very few areas in Kidderminster I could envision my future-self living in, but this is almost entirely down to the beautiful surroundings of the Green Belt land, without these I would more than likely choose to move away from the area completely. The town has very little to offer me and I know that many other young people like myself share the same view. No one should be ashamed of where they come from, but it is almost disconcerting when meeting new people from other areas to say that I live in Kidderminster due to the many negative connotations associated with it. What was once a busy and productive town has become rundown with a lack of jobs, entertainment facilities, bars/restaurants, shops and the general vitality of a successful town, a single trip into Kidderminster town centre will prove this.</p> <p>On a more positive note, many of my friends and acquaintances from outside of Kidderminster have been so pleasantly surprised when coming to the Spennells area. They are shocked by the beautiful fields, and almost 'countryside feel', it is a breath of fresh air and a welcome sanctuary, in an otherwise run down commuter town. Why destroy one of the few visually appealing, biodiverse areas that Kidderminster has to offer? There are plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed upon, not only would these offer space to build affordable housing but building on these redundant sites would also help in diminishing the neglected and 'grotty' feel of the town centre. I myself would be far more likely to stay in Kidderminster if the heart of the town was developed into the prosperous, busy town that it has the potential to be. Developing housing and facilities closer to the town centre and more to the west of the town would help with this.</p> <p>There is an extreme lack of jobs for professional people who live within the town at present, the majority of which commute back out of town to their place of work, putting a strain on public transport and causing excess congestion</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and pollution from those who travel by car. I feel it is ludicrous to build that amount of housing over the next 17 years which would subsequently bring more people into the area when it is highly unlikely that there will be sufficient employment opportunities to match.</p> <p>Young people are constantly preached to that it is our generation that needs to save the planet for future generations, and change the way we live, yet I can't help but feel it is slightly hypocritical that councils are quick to forget these pleas and aspirations. They are quick to try and destroy Green Belt and agricultural land to build more housing than could possibly be needed. The sheer destruction of agricultural land in itself is detrimental to the environment, add in the amount of extra pollution that 6000 homes over 17 years would bring to the area and you are left with a catastrophic impact on the local environment and wildlife. Being a commuter town, Kidderminster's road system is already severely under strain, especially the roads surrounding Spennells. Whilst in hindsight it would be great if more people were to use public transport, realistically the estate is too far away from the train station for people to walk to on a daily basis, the bus routes are limited and infrequent, meaning that the majority of people are forced to drive to work. Doubling the size of Spennells would mean double the amount of cars on the road and the resulting pollution. If houses were built closer to the town centre, public transport would be much more accessible which would hopefully encourage people to use it rather than having to drive to work.</p> <p>Building on the Green Belt land would also have a negative effect on the physical and mental health of the people who use them. Urbanization affects mental health through the influence of increased stressors and factors such as overcrowding, a polluted environment, higher levels of crime and violence, and reduced access to public services. "The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence" (Government, 2012) The National Planning Policy Framework states that</p> <p>"Green Belt serves five purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</li> <li>• to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</li> <li>• to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</li> <li>• to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</li> </ul>

**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"> <li>• to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land” (Government, 2012)</li> </ul> <p>I feel that Plan A contradicts all of the above points, which may have been understandable if there were no other options but I think it has been shown that there are many other, more viable alternatives.</p> <p>Continuing on the point that destroying the Green Belt would be detrimental to the health of people who use the field; many people find it hard to get enough physical exercise, many people don't like going to the gym and the fields offer a place to walk, exercise and get fresh air in a beautiful, secluded environment. Without them, I fear that people would no longer get the exercise that is crucial to their health and wellbeing, both physically and mentally. Residents use the fields for all of the above reasons, and many more. Disused sites should be used first where it would not negatively impact on people's lives.</p> <p><u>Specific objections</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposed Locations for Development.</li> <li>• The loss of Green Belt/Farmland/Wildlife Areas.</li> <li>• The negative impact on the local wildlife by removing their natural habitat.</li> <li>• The extra pressure that would be put on public services, health and care services, the road and transport systems that would come as a result of an extra 6000 homes.</li> <li>• Removing the recreational space used by residents.</li> <li>• The negative mental impact that building on the fields would have on the current residents of Spennells.</li> </ul> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the social and economic infrastructure of the town centre before encouraging population growth.</li> <li>• The housing that is required should be built on Brownfield sites first; Green Belt should stay protected in order to limit Urban Sprawl.</li> <li>• Housing should be kept closer to the centre of the town to enhance the overall image and increase the</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>prosperity of the town.</p> <p>I am holding on to the hope that this is not already a 'done deal' and I ask you to thoroughly and honestly consider the implications that plan A would result in, and truly think about the alternative suggestions from the many objection letters that you have received.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2991</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I have read the local Planning review, attended the Drop in Consultation at Heronswood Primary School and have also consulted with friends and neighbours regarding this matter, I have taken great time in considering all of the information and I have come to the following objections why it would be totally wrong and inappropriate to build on the Green Belt fields on Spennells Estate</p> <p>I would like to object to the Option A plan</p> <p>Spennells Estate is more than large enough at present, to build the amount of houses that is being talked about would put too much strain on already existing services/infrastructure in the area, the population of Wyre Forest has not grown vastly in the last few years to warrant this amount of housing nor will it be affordable to the people who really need it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Schooling would be oversubscribed.</li> <li>2. GP Practices are already stretched to their limits extra patients would take them to breaking point.</li> <li>3. Kidderminster Hospital is already downgraded which means the extra residents travelling to Worcester/Redditch Hospitals would create a larger volume of traffic.</li> <li>4. Valuable Grade 2 agricultural land would disappear which in turn would mean an increase in traffic to transport the crops from other parts of the country which is damaging to the environment.</li> <li>5. I travel to work each day in a car share with my husband to cut down on volume of traffic on the roads and to cut the amount of pollution to the environment, frequently Spennells Estate is grid locked, the extra homes which are being talked about would only increase this problem 10 fold adding more pollution to the area/environment.</li> <li>6. I am not an expert with regards to rare species, however, I have listened to friends/neighbours who have more knowledge than me and I have seen evidence of rare birds such as Skylarks, Bats, living/nesting in</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>these fields let alone other less rare birds/animals which inhabit the land, if this land is built on they will be gone forever.</p> <p>7. My understanding of Green Belt as explained to me at the drop in consultation is to prevent urban sprawl so as to avoid towns expanding and joining together to make one large town, if Spennells fields are built on then this will most certainly be the case.</p> <p>8. These fields are used prolifically on a daily basis by walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers, horse riding, nature lovers for recreation and exercise to facilitate the wellbeing of mind, body and spirit, this will no longer be available to them if these houses are built on the land, you may say provision will be made for this but I am sure it will not be such a pleasurable alternative to open countryside.</p> <p>9. Where will all these extra people work? There aren't enough jobs in the area for the population at present, I know as I have had to take a job in Dudley after several years of searching for suitable employment in Kidderminster of which there was none.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2992</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Clearly the document tends to lean towards option A in that, amongst other things, it supports the construction of an eastern bypass to reduce town centre traffic congestion and improve traffic volumes in adjacent estates. I do not understand how it will support the construction of this road. If congestion is the problem then I ask the question how will one new short length of road together with a concentration of 100's of new houses do anything other than put extra stress on the surrounding road infrastructure. I also call into question the assumptions on which the projected increase in demand are made. The Report appears to be silent on this issue. The Report also discusses in some length the need to take water management and flood risk management into account in general and refers to the standard practices in dealing with these issues. However, the Report seems to be silent on how these issues affect the parcels of land in each option.</p> <p>My knowledge and interest are in the "Option A" proposals relating to the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park (AS/10)</li> <li>• Land off Stanklyn Lane (WFR/ST/2)</li> <li>• Stone Hill South (OC/13) – Part, the field to the south bounded by Stanklyn Lane, a PRoW to the west, a hedge to the north and a field locally known as "The Gallops" to the east. Carrots are currently being grown</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>in this field.</p> <p>In general terms these areas cover the land between the Spennells estate and Stanklyn Lane. I am not saying that Option A is preferable to Option B or vice versa as I do not have sufficient knowledge of the other areas. I believe I have put forward a convincing argument why it would not be a good idea to develop these sites in Option A.</p> <p>The AMEC report appears to be balanced although some of the detail is questioned. This is not reflected in the in the WFDC Preferred Options Document (POD) which seems to lean towards Option A. 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. (see detailed response LPPO3848)</p> <p>The AMEC Report clearly identifies significant encroachment and impact on the Green Belt, which, it claims, can be dealt with by “Masterplanning”. This is a very vague argument.</p> <p>There is no justification for demand based upon projected population increase as shown in the Worcestershire County Council research.</p> <p>The POD does not mention any constraints caused by the proximity to the Roxel site or National Grid electricity power lines.</p> <p><b><u>Persimmon Homes:</u></b> Persimmon Homes posted “keep out” signs in January this year (2017) alerting me to the possibility that this land might be removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p><b><u>General Comments previously sent to WFDC prior to publication of the Options Report:</u></b> The Spennells development is already huge with respect to the size of Kidderminster and the infrastructure, roads and drainage etc, is only just about coping at the moment. There would be a loss of amenity for the already crowded estate. There would be an adverse visual impact particularly to the residents of the Summerfield hamlet as development encroaches over the natural contours of the land. It would increase noise and air pollution. Currently access to the Spennells estate is via Heronswood Road, which is a crescent with access to Spennells Valley Road. During the rush hour travel times are unacceptable. The Spennells and Offmore Estates are very much dormitory estates for people</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>working in Birmingham and the Black Country. This places stress on the A456 and A449 trunk roads and West Hagley in particular.</p> <p><b>Supporting Documentation:</b> I have read the study commissioned by WFDC - Amec Foster Wheeler dated April 2017 on the Council website which appears to be the basis of the Preferred Options Report. I have also looked at: Level 1 and 2 SFRA Report February 2017 by JBA Consulting (The report appears to be incomplete in that the appendices are missing); WFDC Water Cycle Study final report dated May 2017 by JBA Consulting; Worcestershire County Council web site for population statistics; The Environment Agency Long Term Flood Risk Information Service web site; Draft Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017); Wyre Forest Transport Model – March 2013</p> <p><b>Flood Risk Management:</b> 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. Although there are drainage ditches alongside Stanklyn Lane there is no brook course and we have what looks like a “blind valley” with no natural escape for storm water. This puts considerable constraint on further development.</p> <p>Under 15C of the Options Review the following statement is made: “In line with the NPPF and NPPG the Council will steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding”. It goes on to state that the Council will “Ensure development proposals are located in accordance with the Sequential and Exception Test where appropriate and also have regard to latest versions of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Local Flood Risk Management Strategy”. These documents are silent with respect to the part of option A Being discussed. However, the WFDC Water Cycle Study final report dated May 2017 has a RAG assessment of red for these 3 sites in that there are known network constraints in these areas. Out of the 77 parcels of land in the Review only 6 have a RAG assessment of red. This means there are major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth.</p> <p>Also the high risk of flooding in area AS/10 is shown on the Government’s Long Term Flood Risk Information Service. Additional development has the potential to increase the risk of flooding in the area controlled by Wychavon District Council and the highly sensitive Roxel site. The other areas being discussed drain towards AS/10 so that any development in the other areas would increase the risk.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b><u>Foul Water Drainage:</u></b> Because of the topography of this area as discussed above existing properties have foul water drainage serviced by a STWA pumping station at the intersection of the railway line and Stanklyn Lane. It is my understanding that a substantial new pumping station and works would be required to deal with the increased foul water created by in excess of 550 new homes (this number does not include the portion of OC/13 being considered). As above the RAG assessment is red for these sites.</p> <p><b><u>Amenity Value:</u></b> These areas have significant amenity value helping to achieve the objectives of the POD policy 9, which states that ‘...development should help maximise opportunities to improve quality of life to make it easier for people in Wyre Forest District to lead healthy, active lifestyles’. The AMEC report notes that dog walkers use the footpaths on these fields. The fields are also used by horse riders, ramblers, leisure walkers, runners, off-road cyclists, for walking access to Heronswood Primary school, social facilities, and for walking and bike access for people working in the businesses off the A449 Worcester Road. This supports The WFDC objectives with respect to health and well-being, and transport and accessibility as described in the POG. To develop these fields would have a significant impact on accessibility of the open countryside. There is no access to the countryside to the south of Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p><b><u>Boundaries and Site Character:</u></b> AS/10 may well fall within the HSE Exclusion Zone of the highly sensitive Roxel plant and if so calls into question the use of this land for housing. I am awaiting a response from Roxel as to whether this is the case.</p> <p><b><u>Traffic and Transportation:</u></b> There is no evidence in the report to show that a new access road, which would be essential to gain access to the sites, would relieve town centre traffic.</p> <p><b><u>Previous Proposals for these Fields:</u></b> Having lived in the area for several decades I remember the proposed Hereford and Worcester County Council Green Belt Local Plan - November 1982. There was a proposal in this plan to remove the fields between the Spennells Estate and Stanklyn Lane from the Green Belt around Kidderminster to which WFDC objected and the proposal was thrown out. Under a Freedom of Information request I have asked WFDC to provide copies of any papers relating to the WFDC objection.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2993</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Plan A.</p> <p>I have lived on Spennells estate my whole life and when I heard of the plans to develop on the Green Belt land I was shocked and saddened by the proposals, due to this I have researched and thought about other alternatives.</p> <p>I hope to be able to purchase a home for myself in the near future and have always wanted to be able to stay living on Spennells Estate, because there are many beautiful areas (Green Belt land) and if it was not for these beautiful Green Belt land areas I would probably choose to move away.</p> <p>Kidderminster town itself has very little to offer. The lack of shops, jobs, restaurants, entertainment etc. forces people to travel outside of Kidderminster for these things. Kidderminster in the past few years has gained a reputation and whenever I have to tell people where I am from, I feel ashamed. However, when people have visited me at Spennells they are surprised at how truly beautiful the area is, and again this is due to the Green Belt areas and without these, Spennells will become just another, built up estate in Kidderminster no different to any other area.</p> <p>I regularly use the Green Belt area for exercise, and I enjoy doing so. With the proposal to develop there will be a significant build up of traffic on Spennells and the school would be under strain with there not being enough places for the amount of children that lived on Spennells. What happens then?</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the social and economic infrastructure of the town centre before encouraging population growth.</li> </ul> <p>The housing that is required should be built on brownfield sites first; Green Belt should stay protected in order to limit urban sprawl.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing should be kept closer to the centre of the town to enhance the overall image and increase the</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>prosperity of the town.</p> <p>I still have a little hope that this is not already a 'done deal' and I ask you to thoroughly and honestly consider the implications that Plan A would result in, and truly think about the alternative suggestions from the many objection letters that you have received.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2998</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the possible change from Green Belt to potential building land around Spennells. This is prime agricultural land producing much needed food and supporting many wild birds which I have, over the last thirty years, been lucky to see. The paths around the fields and down towards the lake are a haven of peace after a hard working day.</p> <p>My worry if so many houses are built how Spennells or even Kidderminster is going to cope with so many people. Where will the jobs be? How will the schools and doctors cope? I suspect the vast majority of people will be city workers commuting to Birmingham thus increasing the traffic on the already congested roads. I wonder how the government came to a decision that so many houses could be needed and if enough thought was given to the use of derelict factory land.</p> <p>This is the thin end of a wedge unless people like you seriously consider the impact of loosing our wonderful green fields that make Britain what it is. Future generations will not be able to gambol through the countryside, watch Skylarks, Buzzards, Yellowhammers, Chaffinch to name just a few. The butterflies will be gone so too the wild honeysuckle and all the flowers</p> <p>I realise some houses will be needed but I beg you to look at all the possibilities because once Green Belt is gone it will not come back!</p> <p>Please really consider the legacy and the impact of what you decide.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2999</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to Option A for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Green Belt land is extremely precious not only to birds and wildlife, but to the well being of people, especially</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>around Spennells, where all the foot paths and bridle paths are very much used every day for exercising and walks by a large majority. Green Belt must be preserved as much as possible.</p> <p>The Worcester Road A449 and Bromsgrove Road A448 cannot sustain any further increase in traffic, the A449 often has queues as far back as Hartlebury most of the day and especially peak periods whilst the A448 always has queues at the Mustow Green Island during peak times. Stanklyn Lane is already a rat run and couldn't sustain further traffic either. Even with a relief road being built, the roads on the south east /east of Kidderminster still wont cope as there could be a possibly 1000 plus more cars added to the congestion should another huge estate be built. Any car accidents on the 2 main roads at peak times in the morning already has a detrimental affect on the Spennells Estate as it can be grid locked trying to get off with only 2 exits.</p> <p>I am again advising my objection to Option A and have listed my reasons why.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3016</a>	Object	<p>Object to proposals for Spennells/Cookley area:</p> <p>Use brownfield sites and sites e.g. town centre/Sion Hill School instead</p> <p>Schools, medical services already overstretched and traffic is congested</p> <p>Not enough work for existing population</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3022</a>	Object	<p>The Spennells proposal represents loss of public amenity with related effects on health/wildlife.</p> <p>Develop urban spaces instead but if development goes ahead suggests extending the Spennells Valley LNR to compensate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3023</a>	Object	<p>Development at Spennells would affect wildlife, lead to overcrowding of schools, traffic problems, pollution and policing, spoiling a quiet area. Green areas improve lifestyle and should be kept.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3024</a>	Object	<p>Object Option A: Green Belt is sacrosanct providing recreational opportunities, wildlife habitat and good agricultural</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>land, esp. important as leaving EU.</p> <p>Regenerate brownfield sites e.g. Kidderminster town centre for housing.</p> <p>Kidderminster roads are often gridlocked and there is little public transport. Any increase in traffic would affect health with more pollution.</p> <p>Existing health services are totally inadequate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3025</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells:</p> <p>Loss of local recreational facilities</p> <p>Traffic congestion</p> <p>Use other sites towards Wolverley/Cookley/Bham road which do not support such a large estate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3027</a>	Object	<p>Object to plan A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic/impact on air quality on already congested roads</li> <li>• No objective assessment of future trends inc industries likely to come</li> <li>• Loss of open space/impact on landscape</li> <li>• Affect on wildlife</li> <li>• Building so many properties in a concentrated area on one of the largest housing estates is poorly thought through.</li> <li>• Regenerate brownfield areas instead</li> <li>• The current infrastructure will be unable to cope</li> <li>• The loss of Green Belt land will have a significant impact on the water environment</li> <li>• Support plan B as more dispersed strategy</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3028</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells:</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"> <li>• Loss of precious Green Belt/recreational space</li> <li>• Questions need to build 6000 homes other than for overspill</li> <li>• Use Brownfield site, e.g. Lea Castle/Kidderminster town centre</li> <li>• Would need more doctors surgeries/schools</li> <li>• Can't see justification for Eastern relief road</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3042</a>	Object	<p>I Object to Option A with particular reference to the fields adjacent to the Spennells estate, designated as 'Rear of Spennells and Easter Park AS/10'; 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2' and 'Stone Hill South OC/13'.</p> <p>These fields are beautiful, unpolluted countryside and agricultural land, for walking and appreciating the local flora and fauna. If houses are built around Spennells, the attraction of living in Kidderminster will be gone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The construction of a large housing development to the east and south-east of Kidderminster would be a clear case of urban sprawl; something which the current Green Belt was established to avoid and which the Local Plan acknowledges has been successfully achieved up to this point. There would be urban sprawl clearly visible from both the A449 Worcester trunk road and from the railway as it approaches Kidderminster from the Worcester direction. It is essential that the Green Belt 'cushion' should be maintained to prevent Kidderminster merging towards the West Midlands conurbation.</li> <li>• A development on Spennells Fields as outlined in Option A would have devastating effects upon local wildlife. There are red listed birds nesting in these fields, including skylarks, linnets and the highly-threatened corn buntings, as well as numerous other birds that inhabit and forage there. There are also 3 species of Bats, foxes, rabbits and at least 2 active badger setts. If a road was built to service houses built in these fields, it would cross and totally negate the green corridor which the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and the Hoo River currently provide. A road would also have to cross the water courses linking Stanklyn Pool, Captain's Pool and the Spennells Valley, which would be devastating to local wildlife.</li> <li>• Spennells estate has endured various problems with water runoff from the local fields, particularly lower down the estate, where water naturally drains to. Flood alleviation projects have been undertaken on the estate and, within the past six months, the STWA has had to carry out flood prevention work to deal with excessive runoff during heavy rainfall. This position would certainly be seriously exacerbated if there was</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>further house development on the land adjacent to the Spennells, since much more runoff would be created. This is a position which has not been referred to in the current Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A development around the Spennells estate would cause air, light and noise pollution, harming the physical and mental welfare of all existing residents. This would be totally against the declared intent of WFDC, who indicate that they want to promote healthy living and greater access to walking and cycling activities.</li> <li>• The Public Rights of Way around and across the Spennells Fields are extensively used by local residents for walking, jogging, horse riding and cycling. This would be severely harmed and ‘fly in the face’ of the council’s declared policy of fighting the obesity which the Wyre Forest is already suffering.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3046</a>	Object	<p>I am shocked that such a large amount of Green Belt area is proposed to be used for development, especially as there are so many brownfield sites clearly visible in Kidderminster town centre.</p> <p>I object very strongly to Option A. The fields at Spennells that are threatened by the development are productive, agricultural land which also serve as a popular recreational and social facility for walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders. There are several well-used Public Rights of Way across the fields which allow fast and easy access to open countryside. The area offers a number of different habitats for wildlife, including nesting sites for corn buntings, larks and linnets (all on the red list as endangered birds); badger setts and bats. A new Eastern Relief road would totally destroy this environmentally sensitive area with increased air pollution, more noise pollution and the destruction of large amounts of natural habitats.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review confirms that the Green Belt area around Spennells fulfils its five main functions. Sajid 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% as detailed in Option A. Furthermore, the extension of the Spennells estate into the Green Belt would certainly constitute an area of urban sprawl, clearly visible from the A449 and the railway line. Building 1,735 houses would put a massive strain on the infrastructure and services in the immediate area and Kidderminster itself. This could be avoided by concentrating on improving Kidderminster town centre, developing brownfield sites and other areas that are currently awaiting development, e.g. the site where the Glades was situated and the old Sion Hill school site. Now the Council has been offered some brownfield sites, e.g. the Harriers Football Stadium and the Market Auction at</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Comberton Place, it will be necessary to urgently re-evaluate the need for more housing on the outskirts of the town.</p> <p>WFDC should give serious consideration to the efficient use of brownfield sites within Kidderminster. Currently there are over 40 empty buildings within the town centre and these should be carefully assessed for conversion for residential units <u>before</u> any of the Green Belt is released from its protected status. The current need for affordable housing in Kidderminster (3,000 on the housing list) could be balanced against the 3,000 homes that could be built on Brownfield sites. As the CPRE identified, it is the landowners and housebuilders who will benefit from future Green Belt development, not communities in need of decent, affordable housing.</p> <p>There are several inaccuracies in the LPR pertaining to the fields bordering Spennells estate. They are described as showing “evidence of withdrawal of active land management”. There is continuous use of these fields for arable crops. Last year (2016) was an exception where two of the fields were sown with clover – a nitrogen producing crop to enhance the fertility of the soil. The photos in the report were taken after Harvest so the fields only had scrub vegetation remaining. I would have expected a qualified person to have known this! The report also states that there are no notable nature conservation issues pertaining to these fields. The recent letter to WFDC from the RSPB will have left them in no doubt as to the existence of several endangered birds species nesting here. One must question “How many other inaccuracies are there in these reports?”</p> <p>Option A will increase the size of the Spennells estate by 50%. Apart from the strain of increased demand upon the infrastructure, increased air/noise pollution and other problems of anti-social behaviour associated with large estates, this would result in a number of current residents leaving the area with subsequent reduction in income for the town centre as well as the loss of a large number of volunteers that contribute a lot to the local community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3052</a>	Object	<p>I am writing this letter to express my disgust at the knowledge that you are planning to build on the Green Belt by the Spennells estate. I have spent years of my life enjoying the beauty of these fields and would hate for my children in the future not to be able to enjoy them.</p> <p>They are used for a range of crops and I have spent many a harvest watching the farmer plough the fields. We already have so many British farmers struggling to provide produce for the amount of people in the UK why further</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>jeopardize good quality productive agricultural land?</p> <p>The fields host a whole range of wildlife from skylarks, who use the fields to nest, to badgers who have several burrows hidden around the fields. This plan would be devastating to their natural habitat.</p> <p>It would take this once peaceful and tranquil area and turn it into a busy urban establishment increasing in traffic, noise and higher emissions.</p> <p>With increasing class sizes and reduced budgets, schools are already struggling. Putting this extra strain on the schools in this area could lead to less resources per student and a poorer quality of education.</p> <p>This is an injustice and our fields should not so easily be destroyed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3054</a>	Object	<p>Object - The housing population on Spennells is vast, we do not need more housing here, nice to see fields.</p> <p>Where will the jobs be for people without transport and need local jobs. More pollution from vehicles.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3056</a>	Object	<p>We regularly walk around these fields and my children delight in noticing the seasonal changes and wildlife. At a time when studies tell us that children are more disconnected from nature and the countryside than ever before, I am astonished that the council is proposing to build on this vital area of Green Belt land.</p> <p>The land in question is regularly used by people of all walks of life for walking, cycling, running, horse riding and simply to enjoy the countryside. As childhood obesity is currently on the rise, we should be encouraging children to stay active and healthy by taking regular exercise in the countryside.</p> <p>The land is not sitting idle but is very high quality farmland which is regularly maintained and used to grow crops.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3062</a>	Object	<p>Roads surrounding Spennells cannot cope now with the existing traffic.</p> <p>Infrastructure of local services-inadequate</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Haven for precious wildlife</p> <p>Increases flood risk, we should be cultivating agricultural land not reducing it further.</p> <p>green space we have in Spennells provides many people with a place to escape, provides a safe environment for children to play</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3066</a>	Object	I would like to submit my submission against houses being built on the Green Belt of Spennells.
	<a href="#">LPPO3069</a>	Object	<p>Instead of looking out on countryside we will have houses and the noise that comes with it.</p> <p>We purchased the property because of the current views and location and would never have brought it if we knew houses would back on to it, and obviously the value of my property has already fallen.</p> <p>Have you ever experienced the gridlock on Spennells valley road on certain mornings when there has been a road closed or a traffic accident, it just can't cope with the volume of vehicles on the estate as it is now. Same applies to local schools.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3072</a>	Object	<p>I am absolutely disgusted to hear the development plans that have been made to build on fields behind cardinal drive.</p> <p>Firstly, the views would be ruined if you built houses.</p> <p>It is a peaceful area and if the developments happened this would no longer be the case with constant traffic and disruptions.</p> <p>I feel that there are many areas in Kidderminster much more suitable to built houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3075</a>	Object	It has proximity to the countryside. In particular the location provides easy walkable access to open spaces, green fields and wildlife. Used by Spennells, and other local residents, for their enjoyment and both physical and mental

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>wellbeing.</p> <p>The fields currently have an abundance of crops that will be shortly harvested. The loss of such productive agricultural land should be avoided. It will radically change the rural aspect of the location.</p> <p>The proposal will lead to increased traffic, noise and vehicle emissions. Also, years of ongoing construction work would be subject to construction traffic.</p> <p>A more realistic assessment of future housing needs may actually show that there are sufficient brownfield sites available to meet the actual requirement.</p> <p>Kidderminster will become a commuter town as people will look to better employment opportunities elsewhere. This will result in additional traffic exacerbating the current problems around the Spennells area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3077</a>	Object	<p>It uses valuable agricultural land the fields are also used extensively by local people to walk, cycle, ride horses and walk dogs.</p> <p>Build on the Brownfield sites in Kidderminster. This will help to regenerate the town centre and will reduce car journeys and pollution</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3082</a>	Object	<p>I object to Option A in the core plan. I would like to object to the plan in its entirety but consider that Option A to be the worst offering in what I believe to be a misjudged consultation document.</p> <p>I regularly exercise on the Spennells fields and use it as a means to get to the town centre without the car. I believe the area to be a great asset to Wyre Forest. There are health benefits in taking exercise in this open space.</p> <p>I urge the council to take note of the public objections to the plan, particularly against Option A, and instead take up a position of fulfilling the housing requirements from firstly concentrating on maximising the use of brownfield land in Wyre Forest and then secondly concentrating development on Lea Castle and making it a viable “village” centre.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The level of new housing required as per the plan is flawed. Wyre Forest population has only grown by just over 2%. If we take into account the likely reduction in immigration due to Brexit (and the likely weakening of the economy) then the numbers presented in the plan appear designed to present a highest-population scenario to justify the remainder of the plan (being based on boom years of 2001-2007). In the Council’s own documents you state that the population level has been static yet predict a requirement for nearly 6000 new homes and a raising of the population of Kidderminster by a third. I would argue that the whole plan is predicated on a misassumption and actual houses required would most likely be half that.</p> <p>Given the decline in the traditional industries in Kidderminster, the ageing population, and the relatively lower-cost housing in Wyre Forest, the plan’s estimates on population increase can only be met by offering Kidderminster as a commuter town. By following Option A, the plan “dumps” the east of Kidderminster with most of these new commuters and the plan offers no clarity on how this ½ increase in population can be handled by core services or the transport network.</p> <p>Option A will not increase the wealth or wellbeing of the district but will instead only have negative effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary healthcare provision</li> <li>• Local transport issues</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> </ul> <p>For each of these pressures, Option A concentrates their effect on Stone parish and the Spennells.</p> <p>I can already quantify the effect peak time commuting has on the A448 and A449. The single lane tracks, Barrs Lane/Butts Lane, are already a rat-run for commuters taking a shortcut from the Mustow Green roundabout, and I believe that the “relief road” in the plan will not mitigate the increase in traffic from thousands of new houses. Instead of lumping all the new development in one cluster to the east of Kidderminster, Option B should be followed with a view to make a viable village centre in 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>Option A would overload the local schools and GPs to beyond breaking point, whereas a dispersed plan would layer the extra population across a wider range of supporting services. If development (if required) is then later concentrated in Lea Castle funding for a new school and GP should be easier to achieve, and allow Lea Castle to become more of a “centred” village rather than a sprawl on the outskirts of a town.</p> <p>Stone parish will unfairly take the brunt of the plan from the Core planning to Offmore and I think the loss of the Spennells fields is fundamentally wrong if the land to the north of Mount Segg/Dunclent Lane is also to become housing (Stone Hill North OC/13). Not only will the Wyre Forest lose one of its most pleasant aspects (driving to Kidderminster from the brow of Stone Hill) with the core plan, but given the likely decline of the stability of the weather due to climate change, the plans to develop over sandy fields seems at odds with the issues now facing us and raise the risk of landslip/flooding affecting the all-important railway line, as well as all the pressures on the roads, schools and local NHS services as mentioned above.</p> <p>Also object to losing yet more agricultural land and the destruction of land supporting a diverse range of fauna: but it also seems in complete opposition to one of the key goals of the plan in reducing obesity in the Wyre Forest given the high numbers of people who use that area for exercise.</p> <p>Instead of removing land which is used daily by ramblers, joggers, cyclists, dog-walkers who bathe in its beauty and think “Wyre Forest is a great place to live” Option A in the plan would instead replace the fields with an urban sprawl for commuters. Commuters who, given the distance from fields to the town centre, would not walk into town or to the station, but would drive their cars - either increasing the load on an already busy train station at Kidderminster - or drive to work (most likely in the West Midlands/Birmingham).</p> <p>Despite protests by council members that “there are not enough brownfield sites” to cover housing requirements, I would like to object to the Plan due to the fact the plan does not offer the option to take up brownfield sites in the short-term with a view to review when all these are exhausted. Instead the plan seems intent on taking land out the Green Belt now - possibly to incentivise the relief road development.</p> <p>Unfortunately I think the plan seems a massive missed opportunity. The plan fails to take into account changes to modern living that could reshape Kidderminster town centre for the better by cultivated change of purpose of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>brownfield sites to allow development of modern town dwellings. If some of those brownfield sites could be repurposed for the likely-lower population than the plan suggests then the benefits to the town centre and Wyre Forest as a whole would be far better met than an outmoded attempt to attract retailers to the town. As the growth of online shopping and giants like Amazon are showing, traditional “bricks and mortar” shopping is in retreat. Instead of leaving the shops empty (e.g. Worcester St) and building over Green Belt, could the plan not look to revitalise the town by repurposing those buildings for modern new urban housing to make Kidderminster a better town centre?</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3085</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the development of the whole area of option A. It is shocking to housing concentrated on the Spennells, Offmore and the parish of Stone. This is mostly Green Belt land and would encroach on the countryside surrounding the south east of Kidderminster. The main reasons for objecting the plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important wildlife habitats badly affected</li> <li>• Increased traffic/transport pressures</li> <li>• Increased pressure on healthcare provision</li> <li>• Education issues</li> <li>• Reduction in safe and pleasant areas to exercise</li> </ul> <p>The area is semi-rural, with open fields and many beautiful areas to walk and exercise without having to get in a car. I regularly walk around the local area. This area benefits physical and mental well-being by providing somewhere safe to exercise, and to wind down from the pressures of jobs. If option A goes ahead, this would change the area so dramatically and we would lose the open fields and the traffic would increase.</p> <p>The increased traffic that would follow the development would not only be detrimental to the Spennells and Stanklyn Lane residents, but also to those living in the surrounding areas. Cars regularly use the back lanes as a rat run to avoid the main roads during peak times. Spennells residents struggle to leave the estate in the morning. The addition of an eastern relief road will not help this, I believe it will make traffic worse. Building more roads will also have a detrimental effect on water run-off and could lead to localised flooding.</p> <p>Building on the area in option A would also lead to a loss of valuable agricultural land. Surely a valuable asset and</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>locally grown produce can lead to a reduction in food transport costs and can be beneficial to the environment.</p> <p>There are so many important wildlife habitats in the area such as corn buntings, owls, bats and muntjac deer.</p> <p>The whole argument for the level of new housing required as per the plan to be flawed. Wyre Forest population growth has only grown by just over 2%. Building more houses in one area will lead to increased pressures on healthcare provision and education. Schools are already struggling in the area.</p> <p>The above reasons are why I object to Option A. Again, I stress that this would be detrimental to the area for both humans and nature, leading to a loss of valuable wildlife habitats. Something we cannot lose more of.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3088</a>	Object	<p>I have known the fields and pathways around the edge of the Spennells Estate all of my life. I think it would be a shame to lose this countryside to further housing developments.</p> <p>The Estate is already large enough and the residents are able to access the nearby countryside on various paths.</p> <p>The fields, pools and streams are particularly good for people out for a walk, dog walkers, and young families.</p> <p>Access to the countryside is actually the best thing about the Estate and is something that the whole community can enjoy. The nearby countryside is very attractive.</p> <p>I would wish to object to further development particularly if there are alternative brownfield sites available nearer to the town centre and the railway station. I also think that the large scale of the proposed development would have a significant impact on the existing Estate and surrounding hamlets.</p> <p>A longer term vision to improve the Kidderminster Town Centre is needed. Development of additional town centre housing would help to stimulate the High Street while preserving the attractiveness of the more rural Green Belt areas.</p> <p>Visitors from the West Midlands conurbation and other urban areas are attracted by the countryside in</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Worcestershire and I think that this should be protected. There are plenty of brownfield sites in the West Midlands still to be developed.</p> <p>Most importantly, access to the countryside should be promoted to the residents of the Estate, not to be hindered by extending the Estate. The country lanes and paths are some of the best areas which promote a sense of community. Easy access to the countryside also helps with residents' physical health and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>In everyone's interests I would encourage reconsideration of the proposals based on the current extensive scale and further consideration of alternative options and particularly how housing development may be used to stimulate the Town Centre in a focussed way, rather than contributing to further urban sprawl around the town's perimeter.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3090</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p><b>Object to “Option A”:</b></p> <p><b>Lack of supporting infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>Vehicular Access/traffic</b></p> <p>Loss of Agricultural Ground</p> <p>Strain on Educational Resources</p> <p>The number of dwellings included in the development is well in excess of need</p> <p>The development would require a by-pass</p> <p>Pressure on Health Services</p> <p>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>There are a number of brown field sites in the Kidderminster/Wyre Forest area that would be a more suitable fit.</p> <p>Impact on Wildlife</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3092</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A</p> <p>Loss of Agricultural/recreational land</p> <p>Schools at capacity</p> <p>Increase in pressure on local health services</p> <p>Increase in traffic, noise and pollution</p> <p>Possible bypass</p> <p>Waste Water &amp; Sewage</p> <p>Impact on Natural Habitats</p> <p>Urban Sprawl</p> <p>In Option A there is no indication that new housing would meet local housing needs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3097</a>	Object	<p>Is it not correct that Green Belt land is meant to protect from urban sprawl and also the wildlife?! I feel the impact on building in one particular area will have significant negative effect for many reasons and on many people and local wildlife.</p> <p>I do not feel that the relief road will help with the already rush hour grid lock experience we have as we leave Spennells in the morning for the work and school run and certainly does not outweigh the benefits of the 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>fields! Our experience of our helpful local council planning office is that they have recently caused another nightmare road around the Wildon Island due to the new Worcester road traffic lights causing tailbacks as far as the eyes can see and also adding to the congestion getting off Spennells estate in the mornings.</p> <p>Why ruin masses of beautiful Green Belt when we have depressing, run down and derelict and areas of the community with empty buildings which could be regenerated into lovely residential areas.</p> <p>I am disgusted and disappointed that the council are considering ruining one of the most stunning areas in Kidderminster. I feel that the mental and physical health of local residents will be greatly impacted with the loss of all the fields around Spennells which will in turn put greater pressure on the local health service, GP's and hospitals. By taking away huge amounts of Green Belt land on Spennells people will either have to drive somewhere which is adding to pollution.</p> <p>I would also like to give my concern about the amount of wildlife and nature impacted from particular proposed huge expansion of the east side of Kidderminster and pollution in this one particular area. There are also huge amounts of animals and birds and wildlife which thrive in the Green Belt fields including rare skylarks and bats.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3103</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We 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.</li> <li>• The Green Belt is important as it prevents urban sprawl, the merging of towns and it safeguards the countryside.</li> <li>• Green Belt also provides habitat, biodiversity, prime agricultural land, recreational space and it is essential to protect and promote the character of the countryside.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should not be removed when suitable alternative sites could – and should - be used e.g. further development of the Sugar Beet site, the Lea Castle campus and city centre developments.</li> <li>• Any removal or reduction of Green Belt will increase the urbanization of the area with a consequent increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Increased volumes of traffic will create congestion, exhaust and noise pollution and increase pedestrian and vehicular hazards.</li> <li>• Where will a new road go? Any further junctions on the Worcester Road will create further back up of traffic</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>towards Hartlebury.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites must be prioritised for building on.</li> <li>• The numbers for new houses in the plan are confusing, there are so many assumptions made.</li> <li>• The plan is written with a bias towards Option A.</li> <li>• We urge you not to make use of Green Belt land for the above reasons.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3106</a>	Object	<p>The existing Green Belt is already relatively narrow &amp; any further development would remove the buffer between built up areas.</p> <p>This area is rich in wildlife, is home &amp; foraging for many Badgers &amp; hunting ground for Buzzards &amp; other birds of prey.</p> <p>The A449 to the south of Kidderminster is already non-viable as a means of travel, apart from late at night &amp; early hours of the morning. Adding another road junction to it would be completely insane &amp; would no doubt cause traffic queues reaching towards Ombersley. If you really believe that we can have any effect on climate change, this should not go ahead.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3122</a>	Object	<p>I object to the changing of the land classification from Green Belt as outlined in Option A.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Plan is urban sprawl, which the Green Belt is designed to prevent.</li> <li>• The Government and Health professionals are trying to get us all to walk more in fresh air and enjoy the 'green' space we already have. By building on the land (Option A) this will stop hundreds of residents from enjoying a daily, healthy walk on green land.</li> <li>• This development will also create more traffic as those that use these fields currently will have to drive to alternative areas. More traffic will be created by the residents of these new developments too and hence more pollution.</li> <li>• How are hundreds more children going to be educated locally? They will have to travel by car to a school the other side of town or even further. There is no plan for adequate schools, just aspirations.</li> <li>• The doctors' practices are already full. Worcestershire Acute NHS is in special measures. By encouraging</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more Birmingham workers to reside here the problem will only get worse, traffic wise and health wise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have valuable wildlife in the area outlined, including badgers, <u>hedgehogs</u>, <u>skylarks</u> and <u>corn buntings</u>.</li> <li>• The current Green Belt in Option A is the highest graded agricultural land in the Wyre Forest. It is Grade 2. We need to keep this high quality land for our food production. Every year, apart from the fallow year, good quality barley &amp; oats are produced which are difficult crops to grow, requiring good quality soil.</li> </ul> <p>Please stop this further outspilling of houses and industrial units into our precious Green Belt. There are important events that need explaining. Why did Persimmon Homes take out an option to purchase on one of the fields adjacent to the Spennells? Have other fields adjacent to the proposed Local plan had purchase options taken out? There is also the question of why Stone Parish has no Neighbourhood Plan in place when all the other parishes have one. To me this seems very convenient.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3123</a>	Object	I would like to object to the extension of the Spennells estate onto the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3125</a>	Object	<p>It is affordable housing within walking distance of the Green Belt. This area is a beautiful haven for wildlife, good agricultural land, annually cropped, and the footpaths regularly used for exercise and relaxation.</p> <p>I believe the amount of housing required is overestimated, and find it hard to understand how so many buildings are allowed to stand empty for so long, surely there should be a time limit on buildings left empty when it is detrimental to the area such as seen in and around the town centre.</p> <p>I am also worried that the infrastructure of local roads, schools, doctors and hospital services are not in a position to cope with this exaggerated growth of population in the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3132</a>	Object	<p>The plans to build on Green Belt land is so wrong in so many ways when you can walk round Kidderminster and find countless plots of land, empty buildings, overgrown derelict golf courses and so on.</p> <p>Has anyone from the Planning Committee even tried driving on the crowded roads when going to and from work at peak hours around Spennells? If 1700 new houses with potentially 3400 new vehicles on our already crowded roads</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>this will be impossible.</p> <p>How on earth do you envisage the hospital to cope with up to 5000 new houses being built in the WFDC, if we can't manage now?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3136</a>	Object	<p>I feel it benefits the residents and visitors by being an area to exercise and be close to nature.</p> <p>I hate to think of the extra traffic clogging up the surrounding roads; and the local schools, doctors and shops are not equipped with the space or money to expand to welcome other users without compromising the services they currently offer.</p> <p>We live in a beautiful party of the country and we must not ruin it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3146</a>	Object	<p>Before committing to using that land, it really is essential that you fill up the areas which are crying out for redevelopment.</p> <p>It is a very short sighted approach, of which the past planning committees have been guilty, hence the lopsided effect of the town.</p> <p>The A449 has the old Lea Castle site which would be more practical, to take just one example, than taking away such a valuable piece of recreational land.</p> <p>I walk regularly with my husband over the fields and have many friends who live on or near Spennells who use their recreational time over the proposed development area.</p> <p>I do not know of anyone who spends their recreational time on the Lea Castle Site, but Wolverley, Cookley, Caunsall, Iverley and beyond certainly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3148</a>	Object	<p>This is both un necessary and morally wrong Green Belt is not to be used in this fashion it is for agricultural and recreational use only.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3169</a>	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.</p> <p>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 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3180</a>	Object	<p>I should like to voice my concerns about the use of Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a proposal by Persimmon homes earlier in the year to build 150 homes on land adjacent to the Spennells estate has now been increased by the local council to 1,735 new homes. We have not been told which developers will be spearheading this new proposal but could Persimmon have anything to do with it?</li> <li>• increased traffic will have a major effect on the area and its infrastructure, as the Eastern Relief Road would need to have Government approval before it could go ahead - how long <b>after</b> the houses have been built would this occur?</li> <li>• The loss of prime agricultural land and of wildlife habitat, not to mention the loss of well-being provided for the very many people who use the fields for walking. The Green Belt makes our towns and cities better places to live and it provides quick access to the countryside, therefore, we must protect it for future generations.</li> <li>• The local development plan states that provision for employment will be included. However, with local carpet factories announcing alarming redundancies, I fail to see that new businesses will employ local people</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>with expertise in the carpet industry. Although refuted by the Council, I can envisage Kidderminster becoming a dormitory town, especially as the average price of a house in this town falls well below that in Worcester, Bromsgrove or Redditch. The proposed improved rail links will also add as an incentive to commuters to Birmingham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The director of campaigns and policy at CPRE has said that: "we must not be the generation that sells off precious Green Belt in the belief it will help improve affordability of housing. The only ones set to benefit from future Green-Belt development will be the landowners and the big house-builders, not communities in need of decent, affordable housing."</li> <li>• The government has stated that it is committed to protect the Green Belt and only in exceptional cases may councils alter Green-Belt boundaries. I do not believe that building on fields adjacent to Spennells is an exceptional circumstance but rather an easier option for Wyre Forest District Council and the developers, especially as there are plenty of other available and suitable sites across the district.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3187</a>	Object	<p>It is already very busy getting on and off the estate at busy times. Extra housing would cause extra congestion and fumes on the estate.</p> <p>The fields on Spennells are used by hundreds of people daily to have a happy home life balance by having somewhere to walk to keep healthy.</p> <p>Extra housing will put pressure on the local schools and doctors. You cannot get an appointment at the doctors as it is now.</p> <p>The Green Belt adjacent to Spennells is priceless and should not go. Lots of other areas do not have this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3188</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extra congestion will cause major problems on the estate.</li> <li>• Will mean more pollution.</li> <li>• It will destroy the wildlife living on the fields.</li> <li>• It will have an impact on schools and doctors and dentists which are already oversubscribed.</li> <li>• It will destroy an area not found very often whereby residents can go on walks and keep healthy and fit.</li> </ul>

**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"> <li>• Loss of education of countryside for children.</li> <li>• Why destroy this beautiful area when there are plenty of other sites more suitable.</li> <li>• Use brown land up first before going into the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3189</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Re: Objection to Option A and Option B to develop the Green Belt site on Spennells Fields and Captain’s Pool and The Lodge</u></b></p> <p>I wish to object to the proposals of both Option A and Option B to build housing on the Green Belt area known as Spennells Fields and Captain’s Pool and The Lodge on the following grounds:</p> <p><b><u>Agriculture, Health and Leisure</u></b></p> <p>Spennells Fields are Green Belt and are currently a productive agricultural resource. The fields are not only used by farmers to produce crops, but also by the local population for exercise, cycling, dog walking, leisure and recreation, thus providing health benefits to local residents. In the Council’s documents, it states that obesity amongst the population is a problem. Therefore it does not make sense to remove a resource which is contributing to improving the health and wellbeing of the people. Not everyone can afford to visit the leisure centre or join a gym. Spennells Fields provide free health and leisure benefits to the community and are regularly used by many residents.</p> <p><b><u>Environmental Concerns</u></b></p> <p>Loss of this important Green Belt would, in my opinion, be an irreversible tragedy for both the current population and future generations. The area contains a huge variety of wildlife, some of which would not recover if their habitat were to be destroyed.</p> <p>I believe that corn buntings, which are a red listed bird, nest in these fields and that although they can forage for food elsewhere, they require a 200 hectare exclusion zone to nest and breed successfully.</p> <p>Skylarks have also been seen in Spennells Fields and I understand that they are fully protected under the Wildlife and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>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 odr its contents.</p> <p><b><u>Infrastructure</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Roads:</u></b> Spennells is already one of the largest housing estates in the Wyre Forest area. The roads accessing the estate (Spennells Valley Road and Captain’s Pool Road) are very congested during morning rush hour and it can often take 10-15 minutes just to queue to get off the estate to go to work in the morning. This is frequently exacerbated by traffic jams on the Worcester Road and Chester Road, leading to motorists blocking the traffic islands by Homebase and the McDonald’s island, with tailbacks then preventing residents from leaving Spennells estate.</p> <p>Traffic problems are also a regular occurrence at weekends and even worse on bank holidays, when the entire area seems to be gridlocked. There have not been any firm details of new roads to access the proposed developments and therefore I believe that further expansion of Spennells would lead to even heavier congested roads, queues and pollution of the environment.</p> <p><b><u>Public Transport:</u></b> Kidderminster is a semi-rural town and although there are road links to cities such as Birmingham, Worcester and Wolverhampton, these roads are already very busy. For commuters travelling to work, buses to these cities are not always a cost efficient or convenient means of transport and people prefer to use their cars. The railway station in Kidderminster has limited car parking, which is already used to maximum capacity. There is nowhere to extend the current railway station car park. Therefore if there were to be a large growth in the population, I am concerned about the effects this would have on the roads and public transport.</p> <p><b><u>Schools:</u></b> I am concerned that with such a huge proposed development of 6000 houses, the local primary schools would struggle to cope with the demand for extra places, as would the local secondary school. Worcestershire is already one of the poorest funded local authorities for education and the schools in the area do not have particularly good GCSE or A level exam results when compared to the national picture.</p> <p><b><u>Health Service Provision &amp; Doctors:</u></b> As a resident of Wyre Forest, I know from personal experience how difficult it is to obtain GP appointments, particularly at short notice (and how many people plan their illnesses in advance)? Our</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>hospital in Kidderminster has been downgraded and the hospital in Worcester has been featured on the BBC news only this week as it is struggling to cope with the existing demands on its services.</p> <p>A huge influx of 6000 houses added to the Spennells estate would, in my opinion, only increase the tremendous pressure on our local health services, which are already buckling under the current demand.</p> <p><b><u>Housing Needs and Numbers</u></b></p> <p>I believe that the Council’s projections for the population growth of Wyre Forest in the local plan are unrealistic. Over the last 10 years, the population growth has virtually been static and has only risen by approximately 1000, which is below the national average. Our population is also described as “ageing”. We do not have the industry to attract younger workers to the area.</p> <p>Kidderminster no longer has a thriving carpet factory industry and indeed there have been a number of well publicised redundancies at the remaining carpet factories in recent months. Another major employer in the area, SeaLine, has also closed down in the last couple of years. We do not have the industry, manufacturing or otherwise, to support a growth in the population and there is little to attract young, ambitious people to work in the area outside of retail and tourism jobs. Highly skilled workers and those with advanced qualifications such as degrees, frequently have to go elsewhere to find jobs suited to their requirements as they cannot find them in Wyre Forest.</p> <p>The town centre has a considerable number of empty retail units, some of which have unfortunately been vacant for a number of years. Worcester Street presents a depressing sight with lots of empty shops and “to let” signs.</p> <p>As an alternative, I would prefer that the Council focuses on using existing brownfield sites for housing and development instead of unnecessarily destroying designated Green Belt. I feel that there are a number of opportunities to rid Kidderminster of unsightly and often derelict properties, some of which have been in this condition and blighting the town for years rather than months. For example, the area near Matalan on Park Street has several old, unsafe buildings and also the old timber yard next to Matalan. The old law courts building has also been empty for a long time and I am sure that there are a number of other possibilities. I would also urge the Council to use the land at the former Lea Castle Hospital for housing development instead of Spennells Fields and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The Captain's Pool and The Lodge areas.</p> <p>In summary, I do not think that the numbers projected by the Council are realistic, based on the lack of population growth over the last 10 years and the lack of industry and jobs to attract new people to the area. If these numbers are in dispute, there is no need to build 6000 new homes on Green Belt land. I accept that some new homes will be required, but think that existing brownfield sites and the former Lea Castle Hospital site should be used instead of destroying our beautiful countryside.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3192</a>	Object	<p>It would be a crime to build houses on the green fields of Spennells. You must remember that they do not make Fields now.</p> <p>The Traffic is bad enough now with out adding to it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3197</a>	Object	<p>It contributes to my mental well being and, obviously, increases my physical activity and I would say that goes for a considerable number of walkers.</p> <p>Whilst walking in this area in the summer months, I regularly see and hear skylarks: I have never witnessed these anywhere else in over fifty years of interest in nature. There are also other uncommon birds and insects in the fields.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3198</a>	Object	<p>The building of a further 1700 houses on the east side of Kidderminster will undoubtedly result in total carnage and chaos on local roads.</p> <p>The extra 1700 cars of residents of the proposed new housing trying to leave the estate and access the centre of town, will be catastrophic, and this sort of problem will not be solved by the proposed Eastern bypass.</p> <p>The local schools, hospitals and other medical facilities simply will be unable to cope.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3199</a>	Object	<p>Objection to:</p> <p><b>Preferred Option A</b></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"> <li>• More concentrated, with a significant amount to the east/south east of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Includes the option for an Eastern Relief Road for Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Enable more effective school provision.</li> </ul> <p>The grounds against this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on residents losing more of their Green Belt land. Negative impact on wildlife including bats, grass snakes, adders, hedgehogs skylarks, linnets, buzzards and owls. Red listed birds use these habitats we have to preserve and protect them. Risk of losing existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Many use these fields for exercise, impact on health would have possible negative impact on health services.</li> <li>• Roads and junctions already heavily congested. A new Eastern road will not resolve the problem. Increase in pollution effect on health and environmental.</li> <li>• Pressure on schools, hospitals, doctors, dentists and opticians.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Build on brownfield sites, within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre. Alternatively use Preferred Option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3200</a>	Object	<p>The open green space is enjoyed by people for dog walking, bird watching, exercise, learning about nature, the trees and flowers. All this can be done without using a car (so very environmentally friendly). Trees will have to be cut down, so ruining the natural habitat of the area. Where will the birds and other wild life go? Children have lots of opportunities to learn about nature on their door step. We are all trying to encourage more exercise to help with obesity, fresh air for healthy life styles and time to enjoy outside life.</p> <p>If people are going to be encouraged to live in Kidderminster and work in Birmingham, the roads will be awful. It is very busy now driving through Hagley at several times of the day. Again it is not good for the environment and very time consuming.</p> <p>If people are going to be encouraged to use the trains, the Kidderminster Station car park is full most days now.</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 no trains to Wolverhampton and very crowded at peak times to Birmingham and Solihull.</p> <p>What about schooling, doctors and dentists (most now private in Kidderminster)? What about Leisure facilities now there is one out of town centre, with not enough parking spaces, and no easy access without a car?</p> <p>I also understand that the Hurcott area is to be developed. This is such a wonderful natural area that people come from a distance to enjoy.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3206</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Resident on Spennells since 1987. Comments regarding Spennells</p> <p><b>Proposed Housing Development:</b> Difficult to see how WFDC can justify the building of some 6000 homes in the area when the level of population growth is very low and there is no justification as to the need for some 6000 new houses. Much is placed on the ability to attract industry to the area following a decline in the core industries. Much of the new employment is a result of small businesses, why should a large manufacturing company for example consider Wyre Forest as a desirable place to develop their business when the transport infrastructure is very poor.</p> <p>The expansion of Spennells would have a negative impact on the quality of life of the existing residents. The majority of the current privately owned properties are spacious 3 or 4 bedroom plots. Current building practices have changed to maximise the number of properties for a given area. The review states that new builds of more than 10 dwellings are to be mixed to include rented and affordable housing, which will be out of character especially in the Captains &amp; the Lodge, Stone Hill South and Stanklyn Lane developments. Personally I have never understood the logic behind this as it is supposed to aid integration when the opposite is likely to occur.</p> <p>The review makes reference that the proposed Spennells expansion there will be a narrow Green Belt between the existing properties and the new development and that access to the proposed extension will be via a new road linking the A449 and A448 although neither of these are illustrated on the plans. Certainly it would be totally impractical to link the proposed development with existing access roads.</p> <p><b>Environmental Issues:</b> There are reasonable opportunities to walk around the Spennells area and enjoy the wild life and open space. With the proposed expansion of Spennells this amenity would be lost forever. Captains Pool would</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>be surrounded by houses thereby destroying the natural habitat for wild life around the pool which would eventually die.</p> <p>The area to the east of the Spennells is on higher ground than much of the existing development which will result in increased rain water runoff eventually finding its way into Hoo Brook thereby increasing the flood risk particularly the properties surrounding Mallard Avenue which are located on a defined flood plain and has been known to flood.</p> <p>The government has decreed that only electric based cars will be available for sale from 2040. While this announcement was made after the review was published consideration will need to be taken to increase the number of charging points throughout the district.</p> <p><u>Road Infrastructure:</u> The whole of Wyre Forest has issues with traffic congestion and not necessarily just at peak times. Concentrating the main housing development in Kidderminster will certainly not improve matters. When travelling from Worcester to Kidderminster the A449 often comes to a standstill on the dual carriageway at Hartlebury and then crawls the rest of the way. On this route the majority of traffic continues along the Worcester Road towards the town centre which an Eastern Relief Road would have no impact. The new link road between Worcester Road and Stourport Road has produced a benefit for those wishing to travel to Stourport or access Stourport Road, however as the traffic lights that control this junction are relatively close to the A449 roundabout traffic soon backs up blocking the island causing queues along the A449 which was predictable.</p> <p><u>Local Bus Services:</u> The review admits that the local services are not good and points at traffic congestion being the cause. This I could perhaps understand at peak times but at other times the service from Spennells is still poor as a result of punctuality or even non appearance. Equally the quality of the vehicles used leaves much to be desired.</p> <p><b>Anti-Social Behaviour and Law Enforcement:</b> The proposals defined as "core" and "option A" with mixed accommodation will, in my opinion, have a negative impact on the whole area with this regard.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> The current lack of housing across the country can be attributed to successive governments policy on immigration and now the respective District Councils are tasked with solving not just the housing problem but other issues that arise as a result of lack of control and forward planning. The plans proposed by WFDC include core</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>developments and two options A &amp; B. Option A is I believe to be totally inappropriate as the expansion will concentrate the majority of the development in Kidderminster to the detriment of existing residents in terms of congestion, and services. If there is a real need for such development then spreading the burden across the District as proposed in Option B should be the preferred option. Equally before any Green Belt expansion is implemented all brownfield sites and derelict or unused buildings should be developed first to establish the real need.</p> <p>The majority of the comments within this document were highlighted and supported by the many participants in the organised protest march held on 4th August. Mark Garnier and representatives from other political parties address the participants of the march and all showed their support to the concerns raised by the SAFE group. It is hoped that WFDC will take heed of the concerns raised.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3207</a>	Object	<p>I object to the current plans to build houses on the Spennells fields. I believe that the increased pollution and traffic will effect my children's health. They enjoy walking the dog on those fields and learning about nature, and the changing of the seasons through observations of the changes in plant life.</p> <p>I have lived in Spennells for the last 11 years, and enjoyed running and walking my dog around the fields because of the fresh country air and scenery, so the fields are important for my own personal exercise and health. This will be greatly diminished if houses were to be built on this ground.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3209</a>	Object	<p>It would seem to me that the Stanklyn Lane project would <u>not</u> be the better option considering the points outlined below, therefore, I would like to object to option A and support option B.</p> <p>Option B takes a substantial amount less of Green Belt land (circa 20%) than Option A. The Green Belt has a very important part to play in protecting the sprawl of towns into the open countryside, and your proposals (Option A) disproportionately focuses all housing on the eastern edge of Kidderminster, which would then merge it with the hamlets of Summerfield and Stone. This would also mean that many new home buyers would have 'no choice' of where they wish to live. Option B is more dispersed and gives buyers options to live close to family, friends, work and the area they choose to live.</p> <p>The Stanklyn Lane corridor in particular, plays a very important role in providing habitats for wildlife and recreation.</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 a large number of red and amber listed breeding birds in this area, particularly the Corn Bunting which is in national decline and near extinction. There are also many old trees and hedgerows. We cannot allow the decline of these vital elements when better alternatives exist. There are also many public rights of ways and footpaths across the Spennells / Stanklyn Lane fields, and these provide recreational facilities for very many people such as walking, riding, cycling, rambling etc. Removing this land for a housing development would not support the Councils policy of trying to combat high obesity in the area. Putting 'green spaces' into housing developments would not give the same sense of wellbeing as open spaces, open skies and long distance vistas such as this area gives. Access to open countryside relieves stress and helps peoples sense of wellbeing. Given that Worcestershire Hospital trust is in a poor state (in remediation) at present, any reduction in stress or obesity related conditions can only support them. Many of the areas in Option B do not have the same very high recreational usage or designated rights of way as Option A.</p> <p>The proposed building on the land in option A will substantially increase the traffic and cause enormous congestion on and around Stanklyn Lane and Spennells estate. There will be increased exhaust, light and noise pollution as a result. If a new 'relief road' is built, then this will further increase pedestrian safety, increase vehicle accidents and decrease air quality, thus impacting on the health of what could be a highly populated area. Any new road in this area will cause traffic congestion and any junctions on the A449 will cause chaos on the Worcester Road both ways, and any junctions on the A448 will cause even further delays on the A448 to Mustow Green Island. No one going towards Birmingham will use a relief road onto the A456, as this comes out too far up, and the much quicker alternative route will always be the road through Harvington. Use money allocated for the proposed relief road to improve the Black Bridge height and the road via Harvington rather than running an additional unneeded road in parallel.</p> <p>The numbers of houses required in your plan are very high. The calculations are very confusing and seem to contradict the expert opinion that 'there is no population growth' and 'no in-migration'. I would urge the Council to revisit and justify these figures. The document also has a major bias to selecting option A which again I would call the Council to review.</p> <p>The area in option A around Stanklyn Lane is prime grade B and well used agricultural land that must be preserved. This not only supports the economy, but helps with the natural drainage of the very sandy soil in this area. There are</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>many instances of flooding roads in Stanklyn lane and on Spennells estate during persistent or heavy rainfall. Developing this land and removing the mature trees (which have TPOs on) and hedgerows will only compound this problem.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3210</a>	Object	<p>I would like to write a letter of objection to the building of Spennells fields. I have lived on Spennells for all of my life (36 years). I have used and currently use the fields to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- walk my dog, most of which comes by walking on pathways through fields.</li> <li>- teaching my three sons about the varying wildlife and landscapes, visiting the fields during different seasons to observe changes and the enjoyment of taking photographs.</li> </ul> <p>I am very concerned about the increase of traffic in the area for my children and the pollution and safety issues this will cause. Two of my children attend the local school, one of which was in a huge class last year and I can't imagine that the school's physical building will be able to withstand more than an intake of 60!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3213</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to both Option A and Option B and opt for the use of Brownfield sites and town centre rejuvenation.</p> <p>I oppose the proposed development of the fields adjacent to the Spennells estate, packaged as option A in the Draft Local Plan. These Green Belt fields are designated as 'Rear of Spennells and Easter Park AS/10, Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2 and Stone Hill South OC/13.</p> <p>Although the plan states that Brownfield sites have been included, there are more that should be added for Core Housing sites. There are two disused school sites in the Kidderminster area alone, that should be considered; as well as the Lea Castle site and the rejuvenation of the Kidderminster town centre sites such as Bromsgrove Street, the old Law Courts (that have been empty for several years) and of course Crown House, to name just a few. Surely it makes more sense to develop all Brownfield sites to maximum capacity first and only then should Green Belt areas be considered as a last resort.</p> <p>The plan also states that a relief road would be built. There are two roads that already address this, the M5 and the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>A38 and neither option direct traffic through Kidderminster Town Centre.</p> <p>Whilst I support the need to ensure there is enough housing for the future, I do feel that the proposed number of properties is excessive and that the Green Belt should only be considered as an absolute last resort.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3222</a>	Object	<p>With so much emphasis on healthy living, clean air and ample exercise in the fresh air being the aim of National Government, Local Government and Globally too, we are at a complete loss to comprehend your plan to deprive the residents of Spennells of their fields and Green Belt Land! How cruel!</p> <p>Many of the residents enjoy the lovely local environment. They do not need to drive (saving pollution as well as the need for car parking), in order to witness beautiful wildlife, changing scenery with the seasons.</p> <p>Anyone driving into Kidderminster from Stourbridge, via The Rose Theatre junction, must feel instantly depressed, it looks so awful!</p> <p>Just re-vitalise the awful areas within and around Kidderminster town centre and make the residents of Kidderminster, proud of all areas of our town and the impression which it gives to visitors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3223</a>	Object	<p>Objection to option A, area of land fronting the A448 Spennells Island to Stone village, this would mean changing good agricultural Green Belt land and turning Stone Village to an urban Sprawl, coursing more traffic on an already very busy accident prone road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3225</a>	Object	<p>Objection to option A area of land fronting the A448 Spennells island to Stone village as this would be changing good agricultural Green Belt land turning Stone Village into an urban Sprawl and adding to the volume of traffic already to great.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3228</a>	Object	<p>We can appreciate the concerns of people living near Spennells.</p> <p>Extra large-scale development compromises the health and welfare of existing residents - due to increased traffic, less places in schools, doctors, dentists, etc. - not to mention the impact on roads</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			We have no A&E, our hospital in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO3229</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to register my objection to your proposed development of the fields adjacent to Spennells, Kidderminster, known in the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review as Option A.</p> <p>Whilst I realise that lack of housing is an issue for the local area and beyond, I do not understand how you feel that you can justify the proposal of developing Green Belt land only, when there is an abundance of brownfield land available.</p> <p>The council should prioritise the development of brownfield land such as the rest of the Silverwoods estate, the old Sladen School site and Sion Hill School, to meet the shortfall in housing which is provided as the reason for the proposal.</p> <p>Green Belt land should be protected for use now, by future generations and also to safeguard the wildlife on the Option A site which does not seem to have been correctly considered in the plan.</p> <p>Concentrating all development on one area will have a dramatically negative impact on the local area, putting strain on the local educational establishments, the local health services and the infrastructure.</p> <p>By reluctantly supporting Option B, I feel that the development will be equally supported across the local area, with economic benefit to all of the Wyre Forest without putting strain on one area alone.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3240</a>	Object	<p>Traffic getting off the estate in rush hour is extremely difficult and the school traffic and parking for the school causes many problems. The school would not cope with extra children with the extra houses build on the fields.</p> <p>The fields home many wild and rare animals and birds such as the badger, foxes, muntjac deer, the little owl which nests each year in the trees and buzzards which again nest in the trees. Skylarks are becoming rare and nest in both fields and have done for many years.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Many residents enjoy walking the public footpaths around and through the fields.</p> <p>Lea castle has been empty for many years and already has roadways and plenty of ground to build on. Traffic here should not be such a problem as the proposals for extra houses on Spennells.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3241</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of fields</li> <li>• Impact on the wildlife</li> <li>• Increased traffic and noise</li> <li>• Internet quality is very poor</li> <li>• Impact on drainage as the fields offer a soak away</li> <li>• Seems to be no additional plans for road infrastructure changes</li> <li>• Loss of the Green Belt status means an impact on protecting further urban spread</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3248</a>	Object	<p>My objections are based around a number of reasons.</p> <p>1) I do not believe Kidderminster requires the number of houses proposed in the plan. The OAHN report which has been used to arrive at this figure cites the census as the source of the calculation. Why is it then that in order to arrive at our total that the Census figures are being disregarded? It strikes me that the use of other figures has been used to support the decision which has in effect already been decided anyone regardless of the local evidence. Kidderminster's population is largely static. I can somewhat understand a drive to increase housing stock when based on sound figures, but destroying our Green Belt on figures which are not even localised is scandalous.</p> <p>2) I've been amazed at the sense of community which has built up around this area. The fields off Spennells encourage walking, cycling and playing for a vast percentage of the local residents. It has become a place for people isolated to meet. Furthermore, it's an area local children gather and play in. Whilst I don't expect decisions to be made with the heart, I must also tell you that the idea of losing them terrifies me.</p> <p>3) I cannot understand the drive to build houses on Green Belt in a Town (and in particular Town Centre) which has been crumbling now for many years. Our Town is full of charity shops, betting shops and low quality takeaways, with</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>empty buildings in the centre of town. Surely a real effort to transform this Town Centre should be the priority, including turning some part of this into residential building which will inject life into an area which is, in effect, dying.</p> <p>4) I struggle to understand the seeming willingness to displace or destroy valuable wildlife by building a large number of houses on it. This is particularly so given the supposed local authority support for agriculture and the drives to lower or limit obesity. By signing off on the building of houses on this land are we are effectively dismissing these issues as unimportant? To do this with the intention of becoming a commuter town for largely outside residents is in effect depriving us of our sanctuary and wellbeing.</p> <p>5) My one current gripe with Spennells is the sheer volume of traffic found at rush hour. Spennells sits on the edge of Kidderminster and is the gateway to both the roads to Worcester/Droitwich and to Bromsgrove. Whilst I appreciate the plans for a relief road the bottleneck of rush hour commuters is surely going to increase regardless or whatever road is put in place?</p> <p>My objections here are of course in relation to Option A at its most basic level, but also to Option B and the flawed way in which the figure of houses required has been arrived at. I am in favour of utilising the use of Green Belt only as a last resort. I feel we are far from a last resort and that this area just does not require a volume which cannot be met by utilising brownfield sites both identified already and also ignored.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3255</a>	Object	<p>I do not believe that Kidderminster requires the amount of new homes that are stated on the plan.</p> <p>Also this would create even more congestion in the area which the roads would not be able to cope with.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3258</a>	Object	<p>The actual building of these hundreds of new homes is only one issue. What is also an issue is the need for these homes in the first place.</p> <p>The optimistic belief that increasing the population of our Wyre Forest District will somehow magically rejuvenate our fading Kidderminster town centre.</p> <p>The Infrastructure, in my opinion, is CRITICAL to <u>any</u> development and, as the economy experiences more difficult</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>times.</p> <p>Funds from anywhere will be even less available for a better transport system.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3259</a>	Object	<p>Used the fields round Spennells in the past for showing the children the wildlife and plant life, for walking me in and the dog. A much more pleasurable way to get some fresh air and exercise than spending time in a sweaty gym. I often meet people jogging and cycling and usually get a good morning/afternoon. This contributes to the general well-being of residents.</p> <p>There is limited space for such a high number of houses without spoiling the things that make it a pleasant place to live including flora and fauna and public walkways.</p> <p>There is a constant battle with keeping services going at Kidderminster Hospital along with waits for GP appointments.</p> <p>There is a need for providing affordable housing but not large executive homes. However, there is no point in building large numbers of houses if there are no employment opportunities.</p> <p>With the traditional carpet industry all but disappeared now, the Council should attract a large organisation/industry to fill that gap and to attract other companies.</p> <p>I urge the Council to build on Brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre and protect our countryside.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3262</a>	Object	<p>Children have learnt to cycle on the paths around the field, they have played in the snow, walked the dog, collected chestnuts, jogged and so on. I believe that children and adults need to be able to have access to wide open spaces...there are allsorts use the field; families, lonely people who rely on seeing a friendly face, people who just want a chat, youngsters walking with their friends.</p> <p>The result will be a small town and as such will need infrastructure such as a school, medical facilities, a police</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>station, shops.</p> <p>It will have to be an extremely well thought out road as there are fears that it may cause even more gridlocked roads than we already have. The existing High School does not have the room to expand so are the children going to be bussed to the other schools?</p> <p>I know there are many more arguments against the proposed building such as wildlife</p> <p>I understand that Kidderminster has not grown over the last few years so these houses are not going to be for local people but for commuters from Birmingham...how does this work?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3267</a>	Object	<p>By building on the land Option A this will stop hundreds of residents from enjoying a daily, healthy walk on green land.</p> <p>This development will also create more traffic due to the current dog walkers having to drive out to find suitable safe areas for their dogs to run off lead. Of course, more traffic will be created by the residents of these new developments too.</p> <p>How are hundreds more children going to be educated locally? The answer obviously is to ferry them in cars to a school the other side of town or even further.</p> <p>The doctors' practices are already full, with difficulty getting an appointment as it is.</p> <p>We have valuable wildlife in the area outlined, including badgers, hedgehogs &amp; skylarks.</p> <p>We need to keep this high quality land for our food production. Every year, apart from the fallow year, good quality barley &amp; oats are produced which are difficult crops to grow, requiring good quality soil.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3297</a>	Object	<p>While I realise that more housing is needed for one reason and another it should not be focused in just one area and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>especially on Green Belt.</p> <p>It will just make an already very busy area far more congested and populated, and of course huge concerns regarding schools, doctors, hospitals which are already over stretched.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3301</a>	Object	<p>I understand that you wish to enhance the infrastructure for Kidderminster however why use Green Belt? This is a beautiful peaceful and tranquil area that all generations enjoy! By continuing with option a, you are robbing future generations of having the opportunity of enjoying the beauty available on their doorstep? This not only would be damaging to the health and wellbeing of local residents who use and enjoy this area but there is a loss of wildlife to consider. Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes will result in increased risk to health. Building higher density homes in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution.</p> <p>Having this within walking distance is truly a blessing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3305</a>	Object	<p>The village of Stone just outside Kidderminster will be almost connected to the town by this expansion and lose its own identity.</p> <p>Kidderminster and the district already lack the facilities and public infrastructure for the existing population: Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded forcing patients to Worcester, and Spennells parents have had their children been given school places outside Spennells instead of at Heronswood Primary School in Spennells, such as Birchen Coppice on the other side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>The build behind Spennells would take place over enough years that no single year would have enough new houses (1000) for the Council to be required to provide new schools. Even more children would be competing for school spaces in Spennells and the rest of Kidderminster when the current situation isn't satisfactory. Dentists, doctors, opticians and so on would also be put under more pressure.</p> <p>The new estate will mean younger people, when Spennells is already experiencing a growth of new families. Pressure on schools is going up even without new houses. Worcestershire County Council likely won't have the money for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>new schools, leading to the need being put to tender and perhaps not built.</p> <p>The land behind Spennells has footpaths which may be removed and would certainly be ruined as leisure routes if the build behind Spennells goes ahead. The area is used for walkers, joggers, runners, dog owners, horse riders, cyclists and bird watchers in Spennells and visiting from elsewhere in the district. It contributes to the mental and physical health of the district's residents. Public rights of way should be protected.</p> <p>The area behind Spennells including the Green Belt 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>
	<a href="#">LPPO3313</a>	Object	<p>Regarding the transport and access logistics affecting the Spennells area, to more than double the size of populated area, will create enormous traffic and other problems which the area is strained to contain satisfactorily at the present time.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3359</a>	Object	<p>I feel these plans have not given any thought at all to the impact on the lives of people living in close proximity to the proposed plans and also the totally detrimental effect it will have on the local wildlife which is rife within both the fields.</p> <p>Spennells prides itself on being a beautiful and diverse place to live even the roads are named after birds and I feel any future building works will drive them out of the area.</p> <p>People choose to live on Spennells because it has something for everyone it has the fields for exercise and enjoyment and local amenities i.e. local shop, school nursery which are already stretched to their limits and an increase in the amount of people wanting to use them will only make this worse.</p> <p>The local roads around the area are already chaotic enough during rush hours so again more people equal more traffic onto already over busy roads that no amount of poorly thought out relief roads will solve.</p> <p>I really don't see the need for any extra houses no matter how you try to make the figures look so please do not</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			alienate the people who willingly want to live in our town and drive them away as well by ruining the place they call home.
	<a href="#">LPPO3360</a>	Object	<p>The proposal for the sheer size of the development to be concentrated in one place leaves prospective homebuyers and tenants little choice of where they want to live.</p> <p>There do not appear to be any proposals for extra schools, shops etc to accommodate the extra need of a large influx of people in one place.</p> <p>Access to main roads morning and evening can be time consuming and lead to extra emissions from vehicles waiting in traffic jams and again I have seen no proposals for any new roads connecting with either the Worcester road or the Bromsgrove roads.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3362</a>	Object	<p>This is prime agricultural land which must be preserved especially as we are leaving Europe and we need to be much more self sufficient in food as prices of imported food will rise.</p> <p>Traffic management and pressure on educational resources have not been considered seriously enough.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3364</a>	Object	<p>They are mentally a benefit for people of all ages. Some people who live alone regularly walk around these fields allowing them interaction with the outside world, people and wildlife.</p> <p>These fields offer so many benefits for nature and people, families or alone. I have used all these fields regularly for walking my dogs. My children learned to ride their bikes over there. It's such a pleasure and educational having these fields within walking distance.</p> <p>Having these fields built on will take all this away, only having detrimental effects bringing more pollution and traffic congestion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3434</a>	Object	I am writing to object to plan A the building of houses on Green Belt land at the rear of Spennells Estate.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>If this plan is approved it will be a disaster for this side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>The Hoo Road is a narrow road used as a ‘rat run’ for drivers trying to avoid the Worcester Road since the link road has been built and the traffic lights have been put so close to the island. Hundreds of drivers are using the narrow Hoo Road to get into town.</p> <p>The majority of residents on Spennells use this way also. How is Hoo Road going to take thousands more cars? The roads on this side of town can not take any more congestion.</p> <p>My other main concern is the loss of precious Green Belt land. It is not only Spennells residents who use this area, my family have used and enjoyed these fields for over 20 years.</p> <p>There are plenty of brownfield sites if this number of houses is to be built, though how the rest of Kidderminster would cope with extra traffic I don’t know.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3463</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I am dismayed and upset by the plans proposed to build on Green Belt land next to the Spennells estate.</p> <p>The fields are a valuable local resource which have a positive effect on both the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents, improving standards of life for the many people who enjoy walking the numerous rights of way that cross them. The negative effects on everyone living nearby in terms of noise, pollution, loss of value in housing, strain on local services and roads will be quite out of proportion to any supposed benefits.</p> <p>There is substantial wildlife presence on the fields including bats (protected), sky larks (endangered), hedgehogs (declining in numbers), numerous butterflies and moths. This is not even considering the impact on the pools which are a haven for all sorts of aquatic life. It is absolutely unjustifiable to consider devastating the local area in this way.</p> <p>This proposed development will put a considerable strain on local services and jobs while taking away valuable Green Belt land, damaging health and wellbeing for local residents. It is not a proposal I support and I will continue to make all necessary objections via all means available.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3469</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt: Green Belt status protects our countryside from urban sprawl.</li> <li>2. Loss of good quality agricultural land</li> <li>3. Pollution</li> <li>4. Infrastructure: Hospitals, doctors, dentists etc. already struggle to cope.</li> <li>5. Health and wellbeing: the loss of these fields could diminish people’s mental/physical health.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3474</a>	Object	<p>It will lead to large housing and employment development in Green Belt land to the eastern side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>This will create more traffic, noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Will put a huge strain on local doctors, dentists, schools and other facilities on the eastern side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>The only secondary school on this side of town is on a split site, this causes problems for teachers and students during the school day.</p> <p>Will lead to a huge loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be used before the large amount of Green Belt land in option A or option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3476</a>	Object	<p>The eastern by-pass would require a new railway bridge that no private development would pay for.</p> <p>It would impact on protected wildlife species, and require tree screening as a buffer against traffic noise for housing.</p> <p>It would create undue pressure on the estates facilities i.e. schools that are already full.</p> <p>More disruption than option B.</p> <p>Higher cost.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3483</a>	Object	<p>Stanklyn Lane is only a narrow lane. It cannot tolerate large amounts of traffic.</p> <p>It would also take away the fields that are used to grow grain.</p> <p>We are on the limit of use of land now and traffic amounts are getting larger. The building of these houses is a step too far. It would spoil our views and therefore will reduce the value of our home.</p> <p>There are plenty of brownfield sites in and around Kidderminster yet to be used without encroaching on the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3486</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object strongly to both options A &amp; 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> <p><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.</p> <p><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.</p> <p>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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><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.</p> <p><u>Loss of use of fields &amp; 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> <p>I object to both Options A &amp; B for these reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3493</a>	Object	<p>I object to these proposals as it will spoil this lovely estate. We have lovely trees and plenty of wildlife living here.</p> <p>This will cause devastation to nature and pollution.</p> <p>We do not have enough infrastructure to support the heavy flow of traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3496</a>	Object	<p>I am whole heartedly objecting to Option A and also to any core housing around the Captains and the Lodge.</p> <p>There's nothing better than to walk the fields or take the children for a long bike ride. The tranquil surroundings, nature and friendly people we pass all add to amazing, safe and stress free well being.</p> <p>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 this will be marred with obscene buildings and light pollution. Not what I want my children to then be deprived of.</p> <p>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.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>
	<a href="#">LPPO3505</a>	Object	<p>I am unsure how the council would propose to deal with possible drainage issues caused by further housing.</p> <p>Consider the impact on local wildlife - There are a number of rare birds, rare bats and badgers amongst other animals.</p> <p>The fields are used extensively by; joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, bird watchers, cyclists, photographers.</p> <p>This is grade 2 agricultural land, the best quality land Wyre Forest has to offer, with an uncertain future thanks to Brexit we would be foolish to lose this land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3522</a>	Object	<p>Traffic is already a major problem in this area, with regular queues not only to leave Spennells estate, but also traffic backing up on all the nearby main roads. If several hundred extra households are also trying to leave for work or</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>school it will cause chaos, even if a new exit is built. Pollution from the extra traffic will impact negatively on health.</p> <p>The fields are a vital area for outdoor exercise and enjoyment. Hundreds of people walk or run the fields everyday, improving their health and fitness, and mental well-being. To enjoy such lovely scenery and have a chat with fellow walkers is the highlight of some people's lives, keeping the lonely in touch with others. It is a safe place for dog-walking and for children to play. If this area is built on we will lose a vital commodity that cannot be replaced.</p> <p>Local schools are already over-subscribed so new schools will need to be built to cater for the hundreds of extra children, or these extra children will be crammed into classes that are already too large.</p> <p>Our local GP surgeries are already so full that it is incredibly difficult to obtain an appointment. How will this happen if it's already so hard to see a doctor? Likewise, how do the people find a dentist? I still haven't been able to find an NHS dentist locally.</p> <p>The fields provide a safe-haven for Skylarks, Woodpeckers, Finches and many other species. The Green Belt is vital for their survival.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3523</a>	Object	<p>This area is classified as Green Belt and is legally protected. The fields are a local and national treasure and have an on going history of heritage that belongs to and should remain solely within the boundaries of public domain.</p> <p>Please accept this as a justifiable rationale for keeping the fields protected, safe and intact for the greater good of Kidderminster, its citizens and the natural wildlife that inhabits the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3544</a>	Object	<p>I must object in the strongest terms to the application to build housing on Green Belt land on the fields at the back of Spennells</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3554</a>	Object	<p>Obviously this is Green Belt land</p> <p>Why would you build on Spennells? It's too big with housing already.</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 a large wildlife population needed to be considered</p> <p>Access is bad now – on and off Spennells. Access off Stanklyn Lane is dangerous now.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3556</a>	Object	<p>The new proposal will impact on an area which already has a lot of homes and traffic.</p> <p>People want to live close to country.</p> <p>Already the new relief road by the leisure centre is getting busier and the houses etc there aren't finished. A lot of parents drive to school at the moment, that probably would not change so easier school provision would not be a benefit.</p> <p>Please re think and keep our Green Belt as it is so it can be enjoyed by everyone now and in the future.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3575</a>	Object	<p>I have enjoyed the walks and seeing all the wild life that live there, such as deer, badgers, buzzards, hedgehogs which are already on the verge of extinction, skylarks which nest in the fields.</p> <p>If these fields are built on where is the food for future generation going to be grown???</p> <p>The surrounding infrastructure would not be able to cope with the increase of cars and people.</p> <p>Worcestershire hospitals are already in great difficulty and local schools are struggling with not enough classroom space and green space for out door activities.</p> <p>Sometimes you have to wait 2 weeks or more to see a doctor.</p> <p>Building these homes will cause even longer waiting lists for doctors and hospitals.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3581</a>	Object	<p>The loss of Green Belt areas, protects our countryside from Urban Sprawls, Threatening the existing Public Right of Way.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Increased Traffic, Noise and Higher Emissions. This will create a bottle neck in the Kidderminster Roads.</p> <p>Local Schools having Larger Classes</p> <p>Increased Pressure on Our Hospitals, Doctors, Dentists.</p> <p>The loss of the Field, Which we use for Walks, and the Fields are Extensively used by local residents to walk, Jog and Cycle, Walk Dogs</p> <p>Loss of Wildlife Habitat.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3584</a>	Object	<p>I would like to point out that the future generations of Kidderminster would be robbed of land which has and is being used for their valuable education.</p> <p>Children have been able to see crops growing and learn where healthy food comes from through the seasons by walking with their teachers and seeing this on their doorstep without having to take a coach drive polluting the atmosphere to experience it.</p> <p>It also educates them for choices to take in leading a healthy lifestyle both now and in the future therefore giving less strain on our local hospital The Royal, Worcester which, as we are well aware, cannot cope now with the number of patients.</p> <p>How could it cope with the residents of another 6,000 homes needing medical treatment due to the lack of education through the local environment on healthy living which will be denied if these Green Belt fields are built upon!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3609</a>	Object	<p>Options A - Objections:</p> <p>Our objection to access provided via Turnstone, is that the present road infrastructure cannot maintain present levels of traffic safely. Any increases would risk further serious incidents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Present roadside car parking makes this road dangerous, hence no further traffic increase can be sustained.</p> <p>Increased residential numbers on Spennells has lead to pupil increase at the local school. At peak times, car parking access on Heronswood Road, leads to limited access and since no traffic calming is in place, increased housing would only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Recent years, we have witnessed total gridlock of traffic attempting to exit Spennells estate. Option A can only be a viable option, if alternative road infrastructure is implemented. Traffic wishing to continue south toward Worcester, would encounter high volumes of traffic approaching the Black Bridge junction, severely restricting already congested traffic flow. Likewise, traffic heading north into Kidderminster, is restricted by single carriageway approaching the Viaduct roundabouts, again severely restricting already congested traffic flow.</p> <p>Objections: Expansion of Easter Park.                      We object to any use of the present road access to the rear of Easter Park, since this is of limited design and not suitable for large volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Proposal: Mixture of Option 'A'/'B'                      Providing good access to Bromsgrove, Dudley and South Staff, with employment links towards Birmingham, consideration be given to a link road between A456 and A448.</p> <p>As Spennells is the largest estate in the Wyre Forest, development supported by the 'core' link road, would not impact on the present estate traffic, facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggestion that Easter Park expansion consider smaller business office units. Larger units are not used, hence wasted opportunity to attract new business to the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3620</a>	Object	<p>I want to draw issues to the environmental damage that will be caused when building core housing by Spennells 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 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.</p> <p>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 <b>TREE</b> as its emblem. Should that not now change to a <b>HOUSE</b> if the LP goes ahead?</p> <p>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>
	<a href="#">LPPO3624</a>	Object	<p>I regularly use those fields to run around and relax walking my dog, its a lovely area and as its just a short walk from my house its nice to be over there in the peace and quiet away from the hustle and bustle of everyday life. I also feel that the burden on the local services especially the roads around the area will be very disruptive making commuting to and from work more time consuming.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3686</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Spennells fields serve as a health benefit. 100s of residents across Kidderminster use them for dog walking, open space (parks have a strong link to crime in Kidderminster) and health benefits by reducing obesity. Therefore Option A should not be taken as this will have an adverse impact on obesity levels</li> <li>• Cyclists use - Another reason to maintain the field and not take Option A.</li> <li>• The bus network is unreliable very slow and completely unsatisfactory for the number of extra residents who may use it. It would need to be a service which is much more comprehensive, runs more frequently and to</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be impact on the water supply and on the landscape and ground. The region in Spennells is served by underground water supply. There will be a huge pull on this resource which will impact on the land leading to deterioration of the soil and ground.</li> <li>• Removal of trees in Spennells fields will increase flood risk. What measures will be taken to combat this. There is no evidence in your proposals.</li> <li>• The impact on drainage in the area as the fields is a valuable soak away. Already flood defences have had to be installed by Severn Trent on the estate and the Victoria Carpet's old cricket field is designated flood plain. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of increase flood risk.</li> <li>• If Option A is chosen then new playing fields and green space is required at this end of Kidderminster as there will be insufficient facilities and open green space for the numerous residents of Spennells which will form a new town. You have not fully explained how these additional needs will be met.</li> <li>• Option A fields fall under this Green Belt protection. There is insufficient evidence to indicate that they are greenfield. The same principles and characteristics apply to fields as to the Green Belt description advised in Government policy</li> <li>• You do not provide enough evidence to suggest that the design will be safe, and as you describe. By doubling the size of estate all characteristics and distinctiveness will be lost as Kidderminster becomes another soulless commuter town</li> <li>• Spennells fields fall under agricultural land. Option A should not be considered as Spennells fields satisfy the requirements for good agricultural land under the NPFF</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3744</a>	Object	<p>The field was an important part of family life from dog walking, bike riding to essential thinking time.</p> <p>Much has been said about the planning issues but I just want to say that green space is needed in our lives. We need clean air and sky to keep healthy in body and mind.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3784</a>	Object	<p><b><u>OBJECTION TO 'OPTION A' AND REMOVAL OF LAND FROM GREEN BELT STATUS</u></b></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b><u>My grounds for objection to option A are: -</u></b></p> <p><u>Social issues</u></p> <p>The proposed Option A has a disproportionate negative impact on the residents of Spennells. LPR Option A, if enforced, will increase the size of Spennells by 87%. Option A will encourage localized sprawl, and the merging of Spennells to Offmore &amp; 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.</p> <p>Street walking with small children and a dog 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> <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. Having had cancer, I personally walk the fields twice a day with my dog. Walking recommended by my oncologist to improve joint pain and prevent weight gain. Walking helps me to keep a clear perspective on my condition and help reduce possible recurrence. I know many other people who use the fields for exercise to help with medical conditions. This is a free resource, one that is costing the NHS <b>nothing</b>.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter town on the Southern flank of Kidderminster will be divisive for the town, as</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>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 the bright lights of 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 bunkered approach will lead to a rise in tension within the community, which is already evident on social media.</p> <p><b><u>Environmental Impact</u></b></p> <p>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. Whilst talking food we must also look at food miles and carbon footprint.</p> <p>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 Bypass is an unnecessary expense with two other routes already linking the A449 to Birmingham and motorways. Both of which could be significantly improved with lesser funding and impact on the local environment. 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. LTP4 identifies the need for WFDC to address public transport issues and support the use of cycle lanes. The air quality on Spennells is not always good especially on a dank day. The nature of its position within the valley and the heavily trafficked Spennells Valley Road plays a large part in this. It would be questionable then to add a relief road to the rear of Spennells and not consider AQI levels for residents.</p> <p>Green Belt space provides the lungs of the planet — climate change makes the value of Green Belt even higher. It is</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>an important factor in the storing of carbon; <b>prevention of flooding</b> and soil protection.</p> <p>The fields to the rear of Spennells play host to a plethora of wild life <b>Bats, Badgers</b> — 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 photographed. My list could be endless and is supported by Worcestershire Biological Records Centre.</p> <p><b><u>Economic impact</u></b></p> <p>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-ifiT’ Worcestersh ire Acute Hospital Trust, which has just been named one of the worst trusts in the country for A&amp;E waiting times. This alongside the down grading of Kidderminster Hospital has now put existing residents’ 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 Silverwood’s 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? GCSE results in Wyre Forest are lower than national average, standards in schools need raising not diluting by increased</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>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 bunkered 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 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. 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>
	<a href="#">LPPO3785</a>	Object	<p>Very good planning, good preparation, decent accommodation from first time homes to bungalows for our elderly residents. It works, so why spoil it?</p> <p>We only have to take a walk round Kidderminster town centre to see ugly deserted and empty shops, attracting graffiti and unwanted trash.</p> <p>It IS much easier to 'decorate' an area of land where housing can be developed at speed but it would seem to many people that we need to see a genuine developmental achievement such as we have witnessed on the Sugar Beet land, or the new Tesco in Stourport, now they are areas for the planners and developers to be proud of.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3825</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Spennells Local Plan Review</u></b></p> <p>With regards to the above we would state that we feel the proposals are not appropriate for the current Kidderminster population. The area surrounding the existing housing planned are to crop and I understand this is a categorised Green Belt, grade 2 agriculture, this must surely be protected?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Many jobs are due for imminent loss plus closures of retail outlets. Traffic movement especially the Stone Hill to Bromsgrove A road which is the only direct link from Spennells to the M5, M42 and M40 thus making Kidderminster a commuter town. How do commuters supposed to get through Hagley as it is a bottle neck now! Mustow Green is horrendous.</p> <p>Any development will increase pressure on our NHS, making it near breaking point resulting in long delays already in A&amp;E!</p> <p>Schools we know, are oversubscribed, pressure on existing services and how would all this be policed?</p> <p>Heavy goods vehicles, noise, traffic and disturbance not to mention the seriousness of losing our wildlife. Pollution and emissions would seriously affect our wellbeing. These fields are for residents to enjoy, with dog walkers, resident walkers, families enjoying the open space, this is what the Wyre Forest is about!</p> <p>We know there are protected areas for wildlife, Skylarks and Field Mice have been seen on these fields. We have bats residing in the conifers which run alongside the bridal path next to The Lodge and Captains Pool.</p> <p>It is imperative that our ancient hedgerows, running a long side our A roads i.e. Stone Hill are protected. This area is a very prime location with a protected forest and the Captains Pool which is full of wildlife. Stone Hill has our resident buzzards nesting. Herons are also seen regularly. There are protected species of Shrews and Newts also seen in and around Captains Pool.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre is already unable to cope with the influx of traffic, resulting in car parks full to overflowing.</p> <p>In closing we feel unable to support either proposals for ourselves and the future generation.</p> <p>We hope our elected Councillors understand our utter dismay of the proposals for we are not alone in our conclusions.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3865</a>	Object	<p>I object strongly to the proposed development on existing Green Belt land in Spennells, Captains and the Lodge, and surrounding areas.</p> <p>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 several years and those that we do can be accommodated in existing Brown Field sites without laying waste to valuable Green Belt.</p> <p>This is without even mentioning the impact on traffic volumes of all these houses in one place plus the extra demands on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Once gone these valuable green areas are gone forever, therefore every effort should be made to utilise land that is laying derelict and unused first. Many of which are an eyesore and attract criminal behaviour.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Therefore I strongly suggest that the existing Housing Plan should be scrapped and a better environmental solution considered.
	<a href="#">LPPO3940</a>	Object	<p>On page 50 of the Green Belt Review it states ‘Limited Contribution Development of the site would not lead to the merger of towns, although 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> <p>It would appear that coalescence would occur between Stone, Summerfield, Stanklyn Lane and Spennells if the Green Belt land to the rear of Spennells is built on.</p> <p>On page 38 and 48, it states ‘there are no recorded nature conservation or cultural heritage interests on the site’ There are records of badgers, skylarks, linnets and bats and therefore the definition of limited contribution is not correct.</p> <p>I believe the planners have been misinformed by the Amion independent report and that there is therefore a further need to review the Local Plan based on this being a significant contribution and could substantiate a breach of planning guidance.</p> <p><u>Biodiversity, Congestion, Pollution, Health, Education</u></p> <p>Urban expansion to the extent of concentrating the extensive building of dwellings to the east of Kidderminster, i.e. approximately 1700 dwellings beyond the existing Spennells estate will result in increased congestion from the only 2 exits on to Spennells Valley Road. Queues at both exits, particularly during term time, result in waiting times of 10-15mins. It was suggested at a ‘drop in’ that access to any new dwellings built on the fields would be via Turnstone Drive. Increased traffic movement to and from this area of the estate would lead to further congestion at the 2 exits on Spennells Valley Road.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst Wyre Forest District Council makes reference to the desire for improving air quality in the Horsefair area of the town, condensing the bulk of dwellings, seemingly required to the east and south east of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster, would significantly impact on both air and light pollution, and adversely affect air quality in this area.</p> <p>It is to be hoped that WFDC would pay equal attention to attempts to reduce pollution and safeguard air quality in all areas of the District, particularly in light of the recent Government’s Clean Air Plan, published July2017.</p> <p>Option A will, undoubtedly, have a detrimental impact on the wildlife that feed and lives on the field bordering the Spennells Estate and surrounding areas. Bat species and their roosts, in the UK are protected by both domestic and international legislation. Badgers and their setts are protected by UK law. The skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>Given the above legislation, it would appear unlawful to proceed with the selection of Option A, as the preferred option. It equally does not concur with the Council’s Planning Policy Statement, 9.3.</p> <p>There is extensive use made of the footpaths around the fields bordering Spennells and also within Option A. Easy access to the footpaths is aiding the health and fitness of Wyre Forest residents. Obesity levels within the Wyre Forest are higher than other areas of Worcestershire. This is particularly significant when considering the data reporting on obesity levels of 5yr old and 11yr children. The Draft Local Plan makes reference to its aim to reduce these levels. In addition, at the ‘drop ins’, one poster stated as one of the aims of the Local Plan was to encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p>The National Trust recently reported that more than 80% of adults stated that today’s children have significantly reduced freedoms to explore and play outdoors, compared to their own childhood.</p> <p>If our cars are further needed in future years to access the outdoors for both exercise and recreation, (assisted by selecting Option A) we will additionally contribute to increasing carbon emissions and therefore adversely affect our environment.</p> <p>I fail to comprehend how reducing opportunities for accessible, affordable, use of outdoor space for children and adults, which would otherwise contribute to their physical and mental wellbeing, can be compromised by trading Green Belt land for unknown, unchallenged, alleged dwelling need.</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 Primary School on Spennells is currently full. The effect of considerable housing increase would add pressure on existing local school accommodation. Given that the Wyre Forest Draft Local Plan makes reference to improving educational attainment in the area, exceeding the school’s pupil admission limit, would likely result in marginalising children’s’ learning outcomes and thereby deflating attainment.</p> <p>6.55 states ‘Option A will enable more effective school provision’</p> <p>This is merely an unqualified value judgement. No further elaboration of this issue has been available and is surely open to challenge.</p> <p>6.56 states ‘The absence of this additional infrastructure will impact on future traffic congestion, air quality and educational provision’</p> <p>From favourably conveyed messages by planners, at the drop ins, regarding Option A, should this option be selected, it would attract significant infrastructure improvements, for example a school, medical services, a relief road. However, clarification of this infrastructure package was distinctly lacking. No clear information was available regarding the location of the Eastern Relief Road. In the meantime, children present and in-migration related increased child population are merely expected to accept present, not improved, levels of educational provision for an indefinite number of years.</p> <p>It would be interesting to collect data from Worcestershire’s records of where urban expansion has taken place, of Droitwich, and whether infrastructure packages, including schools have been developed accordingly.</p> <p>The fields that border Spennells back onto the boundary with Wychavon District Council. Would housing development in this area not constitute urban sprawl, which has historically been against policy?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3971</a>	Object	<p>Kidderminster Hospital is on the opposite side of the town centre, so there are issues immediately issues with travel time but is also part of Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust is struggling and is one of the worst performing trusts in the country. With such a large increase in population with these new houses, the hospital will continue to</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>struggle.</p> <p>Existing local schools are nearly full. Yet the impression that the council are giving is that using option A around Spennells will ‘Enable more effective school provision’ would surely still demand the need for a new school to cope with increase in numbers. Significant funds will not be able to support schools or create a new school for either option A or Option B.</p> <p>Spreading the housing out across the district would help spread number of children needing schools although a primary school should be made for either option and would be needed for the Lea Castle area. More importantly reducing the number of houses needed would mean less Green Belt is used in option B as more brownfield land is used. Something the council should push for harder.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3992</a>	Object	<p>I would like to lodge an objection to Option A of the Development Strategy as it affects the Green Belt land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane and bounded by the A448 (marked on the options map as Rear of Spennells and Easter park AS/10, Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2 and Stone Hill South/OC/13.</p> <p>The basis for my objection is that the proposed removal of the Green Belt land in this area for housing development will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the available green space for those who view and access the land.</li> <li>• Create more congestion on the already heavily congested A449 and A448, leading to increased pollution.</li> <li>• Not support the creation of an Eastern Relief Road.</li> <li>• Has questionable wealth and social advantages.</li> </ul> <p>This part of the Local Plan Review proposal will not support “Policy 9 Health and Well Being -</p> <p>9. Contributing to a high quality, attractive and safe public realm to encourage social interaction and walking and cycling</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>10. Providing opportunities for formal and informal physical activity, exercise, recreation and play</p> <p>11. Improving air quality and reducing pollution through the encouragement of more active lifestyles and reducing car dependency”</p> <p>Converting the valuable agricultural Green Belt land in this location for housing development would reduce the available green space for those who view and access the land, which in turn would adversely affect the health and wellbeing of those that access the land at this time, numbering in the order of 200 visits per day. The area is a constant provision of opportunity for exercise and social reinforcement for those that access it, this is combined with the immeasurable benefit of them being able to walk and view clear open countryside. This has been an essential facility for over 25 years and has helped those young and old to maximise their health and wellbeing, the benefits of which will have been seen in reduced need for access to NHS and social services provision.</p> <p>One of the arguments in favour of Option A is that would support the provision of the Eastern ‘Relief’ Road. My objection asserts that contrary to this the provision of a large housing development in this area would negate any use of such a road as a relief road. A relief road should enable the fast and efficient flow of through traffic between the A449 and A448. A housing development that potentially sits alongside/and or straddles the proposed road would lead to many vehicles needing to access the road from the housing development, and the addition of junctions and road island. All of this will lead to greatly reduced traffic flow, standing vehicles and increased vehicle emissions/fuel use. It is not difficult to imagine that it would not take long for residents in the new development to lobby for traffic calming and speed restriction, further exacerbating the problem. All of which would mean that it would be stretching the truth to call the road a relief road. The road would quickly decline into a service road for the housing development, favouring mainly those that lived on it and enabling them to exit to the main roads and commute to where they work – outside Kidderminster. Large scale congestion is also likely to be created and add to that which is already experience on the A449 and A448 where the ‘relief’ road joins these main roads and the substantial traffic that uses them.</p> <p>As is the case now, very little traffic that wishes to travel from Worcester (A449) to either A448 or A456 would come toward Kidderminster and down this ‘relief’ road, preferring to follow the A450. Only a small amount of traffic travels from the south along the A449 (Chester Road) and takes the route along the A456, rarely would a vehicle</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>follow this route and take the A448. Which means that this road will not provide the relief stated. The proposed development therefore does not support the provision of the 'relief' road, indeed it is questionable that such a road would do anything more than assist with local traffic flow, rather than "Enable S-NE traffic to by-pass Kidderminster altogether en route to M5 motorway and Birmingham" as set out in the proposal, particularly as it is likely to be a single carriageway travelling through a very built up area.</p> <p>The location of the proposed development would also not support "Policy 13 - Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest</p> <p>Managing Travel Demand</p> <p>A. Proposals must demonstrate that:</p> <p>i. the location and layout of development will minimise the demand for travel;"</p> <p>This is because the proximity of the housing on the extreme edge of Kidderminster would create an enclave of residents that the dominant means of transport to schools, work and amenities would be by car. It is further likely that many of the residents would be commuters taking advantage of the location and ability to readily exit from Kidderminster.</p> <p>In addition, there is a significant risk that the proximity of this development is likely to lead to isolation and disassociation from Kidderminster, with questionable wealth and social advantages.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4007</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans to build further houses on the Spennells Valley housing estate. I feel that this is not a viable option for a number of reasons.</p> <p>The estate was previously much smaller and has gone through many expansions and the change of the school system from a 3 tier to a 2 tier system. This has meant that the school is now small for the amount of children attending. There are a number of cars leaving the estate at rush hour time leading to congestion so further houses would make</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>this worse. There are local shops on the estate but the car park is regularly full so further congestion here too.</p> <p>I feel the estate has already expanded way past the size it was ever meant to be and it would be a shame to make the estate any bigger and cause issues for the local community.</p> <p>I object specifically to the Spennells expansion but generally in Kidderminster am concerned about further houses being built as I feel the infrastructure is struggling. I have lived in Kidderminster for most of my life but can not get an NHS place at a dentist in town so have to travel out of town. Would you expect this for all newcomers to the town?</p> <p>I currently have a doctor in town which has recently moved to a new surgery yet is still struggling as you can rarely get an appointment and need to know in advance when you will be ill. Again where will newcomers to the town attend for doctors facilities?</p> <p>The hospital was downgraded a number of years ago with A&amp;E services at Worcester Royal Hospital which is struggling to cope. Yet Worcester and other towns covered by the hospital are being expanded so how will it cope with further pulls to its already struggling resources. Ambulance services are being stretched due to long wait times at A&amp;E after a long transfer to Worcester so how will they cope with more people requiring their services.</p> <p>The police force is not expanding and is struggling with demand yet further houses will only increase this demand for service.</p> <p>The fire station has been threatened with closure previously and I wonder how the expansion will affect them. I am also concerned that the new houses being built in many locations do not have driveways/garages for the amount of cars people now have. The new developments have narrow roads without parking facilities which means blockages when people park causing issues for the emergency services.</p> <p>Possibility of providing A&amp;E resources back in Kidderminster should be considerations before building more houses. People need to be attracted to Kidderminster as a place to live work and shop rather than using it as a dormitory town meaning the town will continue to decompose with rotting empty buildings.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4014</a>	Object	<p>1) Increase traffic congestion in and around the Spennells area especially Turnstone Road and Captains Pool Road.</p> <p>2) put extra burdens on the health and education systems</p> <p>3) decrease the farmland used by the residents for recreational purposes and also depopulate the wildlife especially the nesting birds</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4024</a>	Object	<p>I was horrified to read that you are biased towards Option A (Spennells fields), which consists of destroying our beautiful Green Belt areas and Green spaces. It is almost incomprehensible that you are almost encouraging building on the countryside. As well as proposing to build on Green Belt, Option A also includes proposed core development on the eastern side of Kidderminster. The Spennells is already a large estate, further building will double the estate in size, which will lead to high volume of traffic and pollution, an increase in crime and drug abuse, pressure on local nurseries and schools as well as hospitals. You state you want to encourage people to walk instead of using cars, however, there is no evidence to prove this to be true, as building houses here is too far from the train station or to town for people to walk.</p> <p>Option A also proposes the building of the Eastern relief road from the A449 near Easter Park linking to the A456 Birmingham road. Why build another road across our beautiful countryside? The A448 already bypass Kidderminster from Worcestershire leading to Birmingham or Bromsgrove, although this road is unable to be used by HGVs vehicles due the low black bridge, the bridge could be altered maybe by lowering the road underneath. This will be much cheaper and less disruptive than building a brand new road with a fly over bridge.</p> <p>I cannot believe you are considering building a relief road not only through Green Belt land but also through a proposed new housing estate, which is adjacent to an exciting housing estate. You have total disregard to the health and safety of the residents in this area as well as the wildlife living in the beautiful fields. These fields are home to red listed birds such as Corn Buntings and Skylarks, and I understand that the RSPCB have wrote a letter to the council regarding the need for 200 hectare exclusion zone, for them to continue to nest as they are depleting in numbers. The field is also home to badgers and bats.</p> <p>Furthermore, according to the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Development Plan (WFIDP), large estates typically</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>experience higher levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. Therefore, expanding Spennells further would see a rise in crime rates, causing further strain on police. However, this was not taken into account in your plan.</p> <p>The fields to the rear/south of Spennells serve as a soak away, building on these would increase the risk of flooding on Stanklyn Lane. Furthermore, there have already been flood defences installed by the Severn Trent on Spennells.</p> <p>Option A is also less cost effective as it requires building a relief road over the railway as opposed to option B which doesn't need anywhere near as much roadwork. The WDFIP states 'the county council judges that there will be a transport funding gap, as has been consistently identified in the previous version of the WFIDP back in September 2012 and in the IDPs of other districts in Worcestershire' the report states this would save £17.5 million. In addition, the rail network would require any potential development work to carry out extensive building work to ensure that their tracks cannot be affected by subsidence or flooding.</p> <p>Expanding Spennells further would also cause greater strain on the only two exits from the Spennells. Since Spennells would be too far to use the train station, this would lead people to utilise the roads more, despite your plan suggesting that the opposite would happen. Already, we experience queues as long as 10-15 minutes during the start of school and more traffic will increase the amount of pollution.</p> <p>Spennells fields is home to many protected species including Skylarks whom have a 200m protection order as well as badgers and bats all of which I have seen on the field. In Britain, all bats species and domestic and international law legally protect their roosts, this is also the case for badgers and their habitats. Skylarks are protected under the wildlife and countryside act 1981; it is illegal to kill or injure a skylark or destroy an active nest. Option A will be detrimental to the impact on wildlife.</p> <p>The soil was described by the WFDC as 'low quality' soil, however, this is also applicable to the majority of soil within the Wyre Forest and Spennells field is considered one of the best in the area which is evident in the crops being harvested annually.</p> <p>Urban Sprawl between Stone, Stanklyn Lane, Summerfield and Spennells would also as Green Belt land is often used</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>to prevent areas merging together. Therefore, Option A would contradict the purpose of designated Green Belt land.</p> <p>Furthermore, obesity was also mentioned in your plan as a key issue, building on these beautiful fields will have an effect on fitness and peoples mental health as the fields are often used for leisure/ sporting activities such as horse riding, dog walking, jogging and other family activities, therefore, building on Spennells fields would limit residents exercise opportunities and as a result be counterproductive in tackling the obesity crisis.</p> <p>If Wyre Forest District Council plans to destroy the beautiful countryside and have no plans for job opportunities or affordable housing then I, and many others of a similar age, will be moving out to areas with greater job opportunities. This has been evident in the past 30-40 years with the average wage being just £18,000 (national average £28,000). You need to be thinking how can we make Kidderminster a more attractive place to live in order to maintain the current population and attract ambitious, intelligent youngsters</p> <p>Taking all of this into account, I object the building of option A on the basis of increased crime rate, the physical and mental impacts on the resident, increased congestion and pollution, destruction to wildlife habitats as well as being inefficient economically and of no benefit to the development of Kidderminster.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4040</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to submit my objection to Option A Housing Sites WFR/ST/2, AS/10 and OC/13 between the rear of Spennells and Stanklyn Lane and across through Stone to build a further 1700 residential homes.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Option A Housing Sites WFR/ST/2, AS/10 and OC/13</u></b></p> <p>I should like to register my opposition and rejection to the proposed plans you have outlined to use Green Belt land at the rear of Spennells and Stanklyn to build an estimated 1700 residential homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there are badgers setts on this site, skylarks and dormice also live here</li> <li>• This is an area enjoyed my many walkers, exercisers, birdwatchers &amp; nature photographers. The area attracts a wide variety of species and wildlife, I believe some rarer birds may nest within the area too. Destroying this Green Belt space will have a devastating affect on the existing community and the natural wildlife that exists within it</li> </ul>

**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"> <li>• I cannot see the justification in placing such a large proportion of the new homes required in this area alone and on this Green Belt land. You have an option B, which almost provides the same housing yet is more evenly distributed throughout Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Adding this number of houses in one area will put huge pressures on already overly subscribed services like local schools, Doctors, and local hospitals which are currently under "Special Measures". How will this be addressed if we are adding 1700 new homes in this one area alone</li> <li>• the development will create heavy traffic and extra pollution</li> <li>• Green Belt land is surely in place to stop urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with</li> <li>• what regulations exist for building next to / under electricity pylons and supply lines</li> <li>• Coalescence of two or more settlements namely Summerfield, Stanklyn and Stone with Spennells</li> <li>• development here 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</li> <li>• "The development would result in a substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to enhance this valuable landscape." A quote from a very recent much smaller planning site rejection in Stourport</li> </ul> <p>I object strongly to this Option A and believe the additional houses required would be better spread out over Wyre Forest and therefore have smaller impact.</p> <p>If you don't accept a reduction in the housing demand numbers, then I still object to Spennells / Stone Fields being in the draft Local Plan, for the reasons stated above</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4077</a>	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.</p> <p>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 is Sion Hill School and the site of Sladen School, land ripe for being used for new properties.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The infrastructure of Kidderminster is not adequate to cope the development of these sites.</p> <p>We are at a lose 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>
	<a href="#">LPPO4083</a>	Object	<p>Regularly walking along the fields, observing the agricultural activities and sharing and observing the environment of the abundant wildlife.</p> <p>Why is this beautiful Green Belt area being considered, when there are many brown areas, which could be developed?</p> <p>Who has considered the extra amount of traffic which will be present around Spennells, not to mention the need for a school or medical provision, bus services, etc for the expanding population? There are great problems as it as, as we all know!</p> <p>Use the empty shops to bring the town back to life, for it is a dead hole at the moment. Too much time is spent thinking about making the canal attractive, but actions should be taken to make Kidderminster an interesting place to live.</p> <p>A new road will bring noise and pollution, which will affect the wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4084</a>	Object	<p>The whole point of having a 'Green Belt' is so it is protected from development, why even have it if it's disregarded at the first opportunity. All brownfield sites within Kidderminster MUST be developed first before looking to Green Belt land.</p> <p>The new road to Stourport has already gridlocked the Wilden Lane roundabout - I see little evidence that more housing, even with a so-called 'relief road' will help this.</p> <p>I have constantly looked for work in or near the town. There is nothing. What will be done to provide people with</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>local jobs? The public transport services to Birmingham are already at breaking point.</p> <p>If the fields are gone the dog walkers, joggers, cyclists and others will be heading into their cars to drive to countryside which is currently on their front door step. This serves to pollute the environment further and add to the already gridlocked roads.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4087</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I do not feel this should go ahead as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Traffic at rush hour around Spennells valley road, Chester Road South and Worcester Road is a nightmare. Add more cars from these houses it will be mayhem. The new link road at Silverwoods is fantastic at present and has a lot of high hopes but adding more houses for the eastern side of Kidderminster will put pressure on this road. I hope you will put traffic lights on Worcester Road/Wilden Lane island as this is disgusting now let alone if this planning application goes through.</li> <li>2) We have 1 primary school already on Spennells and adding more houses where will children go to school. I doubt Baxter College and King Charles will cope with the extra demand.</li> <li>3) Hospitals. Worcester hospital is already bursting at the seams, where will people from these houses go to Hospital? The current budget cuts mean the hospital and the ambulance service is already under pressure. Adding more houses will create more demand on our hospitals.</li> <li>4) Wildlife. Will there be any reviews done for birds and badgers?</li> <li>5) Water. Is the water supply that serves Spennells sufficient for the increase of houses?</li> <li>6) By removing this Green Belt will there be an increase in flooding and if so what provisions will be put in place.</li> <li>7) Police. Will the police cope with the extra amount of houses planning to be built?</li> <li>8) Fire Brigade. Will the fire service be able to keep up with the extra demand considering he plan to be a centralised</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			hub just off Stourport Road and closing Bewdley & Stourport?
	<a href="#">LPPO4103</a>	Object	The space, wildlife, the sense of well being that walking your dog with the family right on the doorstep, it brings so much to our family, these beautiful fields gives us space to walk, think, talk, exercise, family time, wildlife, farming, breathe. Don't take these simple pleasures away!
	<a href="#">LPPO4106</a>	Object	<p>Loss of this important piece of Green Belt would deprive many potential home owners of one of the attractions of living on Spennells - proximity to a beautiful area of countryside.</p> <p>The proposed enormous development would place massive strain on local amenities.</p> <p>Additional traffic from 2 car families.</p> <p>Aside from the potential loss of productive agricultural land, loss of Green Belt status and building work would inevitably cause loss of wildlife habitat.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4107</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to development proposals on Green Belt land on the edge of the Spennells housing estate.</p> <p>Local campaigners have highlighted concerns over how changes to this land would lead to radical alterations to the area. These concerns, such as how increased pressure on local facilities (shops, hospitals, schools) via an expansion to the urban area would impact upon the area's infrastructure, are important and must be registered by the District Council.</p> <p>I wish to underline the importance of this Green Belt land to both local wildlife and residents of Kidderminster.</p> <p>The primary uses of Green Belt is to "prevent urban sprawl", to "safeguard countryside from encroachment", and "to assist in urban regeneration", the opposite of what the proposed plan to build on the Spennells fields would achieve.</p> <p>NPPF states "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>damaged and derelict land." These recommendations would be disregarded if the area was to be built on.</p> <p>As regards to "retaining and enhancing landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity", the land in question is refuge for wild flowers, badgers are known to live on the site, it forms a consistent corridor of edge habitat perfect for daubenton's and pipistrelle bats, and is in close proximity to the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve – a protected area home to black poplars.</p> <p>As regards the beneficial use of Green Belt, there is significant and growing amounts of peer-reviewed evidence on the physical and mental health benefits of green spaces – highlighted not only by ecological, health, and policy professionals, but also by government and policy workers</p> <p>I am saddened by what appears to be the continued decline of the town centre, and would imagine brownfield re-development a boost to rejuvenating the area. Furthermore, rather than building over this area, the local authority should be promoting the use of the area, advertising it in order to increase social cohesion in the area and reducing health inequality across Kidderminster's demographic range.</p> <p>I hope these comments are of some use to you, and that any decisions concerning this protected area are informed and balanced.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4118</a>	Object	<p>My objection is firstly, only once all non Green Belt land has been utilised within the Wyre Forest only then should Green Belt land be considered to be built on for extra housing. It's very easy, convenient and cost effective for developers to build on an untouched greenfield and tap into the nearby infrastructure of the existing Spennells estate.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead there may be more antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>The road system needs improving. The two exits from the main estate are congested at rush hours.</p> <p>Traffic from Spennells via Homebase to Hoobrook island: You need to make Hoobrook island, from all 4 exits, 3 lanes. The newly opened link road has created much greater traffic problems into Kidderminster causing traffic to back up</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>down Spennells Valley Road and also backlogs up Chester Road South. Some years ago now you blocked off the right hand lane on Worcester Road heading from Hoobrook island to the Severn Valley Railway bridge. You find traffic on the whole only using the left hand lane at the new lights heading on to the bridge even though you have opened up a second lane, which causes issues for traffic wanting to turn left at these lights to get onto the new relief road causing big tailbacks onto Hoobrook island and beyond. You need to get rid of those white lines between the two petrol stations and make it two lanes right up to the SVR bridge and at some point replace that bridge with a new one that can accommodate two lanes in either direction instead of the current situation whereby two lanes converge into one in both directions in order to accommodate a greater flow of traffic.</p> <p>Now let's look at the same island and the traffic direction from Spennells to Hoobrook island turning left up Worcester Road past Hoo Farm Industrial estate to Black Bridge. From Hoobrook island to Black Bridge you need to make a dual carriageway in both directions. It's crying out for it and has done for years. Ok, it will cost a lot of money and you will have to make some compulsory purchases but it needs to be done sooner rather than later.</p> <p>Next, let's look at the traffic direction from Spennells to Comberton Island and turning left up to the lights at Chester Road / Comberton Hill. It is single lane up to these lights. You need to make the approach to these lights from King Charles two lanes - one for left and straight over and the other for turning right onto Chester Road North, so you need to buy some of the King Charles land and some of the land from those flats on the left as you drive straight on onto Comberton Hill (as you could also do with two lanes as you approach the lights at the junction with Chester Road North coming up Comberton Hill.</p> <p>Now let's look at the flow of traffic leaving Spennells and turning right at Comberton island towards Mustow Green island. Mustow Green island needs to be made a lot bigger with two lanes on all four approaches. It is nowhere near big enough to cater for existing traffic, let alone if you build additional hundreds of houses just down the road.</p> <p>Also, you will get increased traffic using the rabbit warren network of Stanklyn Lane, Butts Lane and Heath Lane as a rat run. These lanes aren't built for significant traffic levels.</p> <p>What about infrastructure. Heronswood Primary School is operating from antiquated mobile classrooms. Are you going to plough significant funding into updating and extending the school, replacing these mobile classrooms with</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>proper brick built classrooms? Also, is the current 'Hickory Dickory Dock' nursery big enough to cater for a big influx of new pre-school aged children from hundreds of new houses being built nearby or would the new development have its own nursery?</p> <p>What about shops. Will the proposed new extended Spennells estate have its own shops or will the residents have to use the current Tesco Express which is neither big enough nor has enough staff / tills to cater for hundreds of new residents. It's bad enough trying to get served in there at present as it is.</p> <p>If you are going to extend the Spennells estate further then surely it will need its own medical and dental practices.</p> <p>Only once you address all these traffic and infrastructure problems and issues should you be looking to further extend the Spennells Valley estate. Until or unless you are prepared to invest in all this, then the proposal to extend the Spennells estate any further at the present time should be thrown out.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4121</a>	Object	<p>The seriousness of Green Belt loss together with the numerous benefits Green Belt provides to humans, animals and countless other creatures 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.</p> <p>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>
	<a href="#">LPPO4143</a>	Object	<p>I object to Option A (in particular, the fields west and south of Spennells):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The true housing need does not need to the use Green Belt or greenfield.</li> <li>• An extension would potentially double the size of Spennells, resulting in a HUGE housing estate.</li> <li>• Wyre Forest Infrastructure Development Plan (WFIDP) has acknowledged that large urban estates have</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>evidenced increases of anti-social behaviour and increased crime rates, for some reason, this is not covered in your Local Plan review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fields to the rear/south of Spennells serve as a soak away, building on these fields would increase the risk of flooding on Stanklyn Lane.</li> <li>• Option A would require the building of a relief road (OVER the railway). Option B does not require any where near as many roadworks. In addition to the costs in the WFIDP, the railway network would require extensive building work to ensure that their tracks will not be affected by subsidence or flooding. The cost of this would have to be met by the development and is not covered in your report.</li> <li>• The current estate could not cope with any additional traffic. There are only two entrances / exits to Spennells, it can already take 10-15 minutes to exit the estate at certain times of the day, this would then add to the existing problems on southern part of the A449 (this has been made worse by the Stourport Silverwoods relief road).</li> <li>• Housing in this location, is not within reasonable walking distance to and from the train station, forcing additional cars onto the road network. It has also been confirmed that there is no possibility of extending the car park at the train station. Any new housing that is developed in or near the town centre will need be within reasonable walking distance to the station.</li> <li>• The fields are used by people who enjoy nature and walking. The health benefits have a direct effect on people's social interaction with others and physical fitness, including weight control and mental well being. Doubling the size of the estate will also double the demand for recreational space and healthy exercise and yet remove this recreational space, so there will be no place to enjoy the nature and walking that everyone needs.</li> <li>• The fields around Spennells are home to protected species including bats, badgers and skylarks. These are fully protected by UK law, and it is an offense to kill or injure them, also it's an offense to destroy or damage their roosts, sets or nests.</li> <li>• The fields have been described by WFDC as 'low quality' agricultural land. This is completely wrong and it is actually the best quality graded land throughout the WFDC area, this is confirmed by the beautiful crop that has just been harvested. It would be a tragedy to destroy this and replace it with concrete.</li> <li>• Green Belt land is allocated as such to prevent urban sprawl between neighbourhoods. If Option A was chosen, areas including Stone, Summerfield, Stanklyn Lane and Spennells would effectively merge into one another. I object to Option A on the grounds that contradicts the very of purpose of Green Belt designated</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			land.
	<a href="#">LPPO4237</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A - fields adjacent to Spennells.</p> <p>Object to plan A and B (core housing) particularly with respect to Captains and the Lodge.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>They will also place more pressure on infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sewers in Spennells can barely cope already</li> <li>2. There will be insufficient school places and doctors</li> <li>3. Traffic on Spennells is already a nightmare at peak times- this will make it even worse!</li> </ol> <p>We are going to be directly affected by noise, traffic fumes (increasing risk to health) and access.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4392</a>	Object	<p>I use the fields daily playing with my friends and going on walks with my family. This gets me out in the fresh air keeping healthy and fit mentally and physically.</p> <p>There are so many other areas that could be redeveloped instead of here which would not have such a profound effect.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4394</a>	Object	<p>I use the fields daily to play and walk our dogs. Family time keeping healthy and fit would be lost.</p> <p>There are lots of other places that could be built on rather than spoil such a wonderful area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4396</a>	Object	Wyre Forest is an area that consists of rural, semi-rural and urban areas which contribute some job prospects,



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>farming, limited retail opportunities and some tourism.</p> <p>It developed on having 3 market towns and the carpet industry which has now largely closed down.</p> <p>The town centre in Kidderminster needs a complete overhaul to encourage multi national chains to locate to ensure a vibrant local shopping experience, something the council appears unable to do although both Droitwich and Bromsgrove appear to have been able to attract new business both employment and retail. Until this is available I do not believe that any more housing is required.</p> <p>Under option A the fields around Spennells would be developed to almost double the size of the area leading to urban sprawl engulfing Stanklyn, Stone and Summerfield which is against your current planning policy.</p> <p>The infrastructure at the moment is unable to cope so this would be further exacerbated by more development. Currently Linnet Rise has had to have massive tanks installed to collect the drainage to prevent flooding, but I am sure this would be inadequate if further development were allowed. This knowingly puts risks onto the properties in the surrounding areas. Avocet Drive has over the years also flooded due to lack of drainage.</p> <p>The Hospital, Doctors, Dentists and Rail systems are not able to cope with the demands of our population along with the roads that would be required to take the new incoming commuting population to their employment often using the motorways accessed at Worcester, Bromsgrove or Halesowen or commuting to Birmingham.</p> <p>Heronswood School is unable to increase in size as it has no available land around.</p> <p>The government are encouraging us to look after our Health and mental well-being, something which residents and non -residents currently do by using the fields that are adjacent to the estate for walking, horse riding, bird watching etc. If this were to be lost many residents would not exercise or would use their cars to go elsewhere further adding to the noise and air pollution and congestion on our roads. Boarding the Spennells estate are Badger Setts, Bats and a variety of wildlife which are protected by both British and European Law along with many old trees all covered by</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Tree Preservation Orders.</p> <p>I also believe that the road which they propose to build to access the new developments would be detrimental to the area as pollution would increase and quality of life would diminish. A flyover would be required to get over the railway line by Easter Park which would cause more pollution both noise, air and light.</p> <p>For my reasons given I oppose option A and favour option B.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4437</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I strongly disagree with both options A and B.</p> <p>There is no need for 6,000 new houses in Kidderminster. As in the Council's own report the population of Kidderminster has remained static. Therefore I do not believe there are "exceptional circumstances" in Kidderminster that require the removal of protection of Green Belt land to build so many houses. A new, fair independent report should be completed as the existing one is obviously biased.</p> <p>I have heard that as Kidderminster doesn't need so many new houses they are actually intended for people working in Birmingham to attract them to the area. If this is true it is simply adding to more unsustainable commuting and they should not be built in Kidderminster.</p> <p>I think the Council has vastly underestimated the importance of green areas to the people of Spennells. Our fields are used constantly by people to enjoy their leisure time with their friends, children and dogs, they are vital for exercise and mental well being. They are the reason many of us chose to live here. We need to protect it for future generations to enjoy.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion will be worse if Spennells fields are built on, air quality and noise here will be worse. Many people come from all over Kidderminster to jog, cycle, walk, enjoy the scenery, the peace and quiet and the fresh air.</p> <p>I believe you need to look at developments which cause improvements and would benefit the whole population of Kidderminster, rather than taking away so much Green Belt land which will be detrimental.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			I really hope you do not build on Spennells beautiful countryside areas, there aren't many in Kidderminster and it will be really sad if you take them away from us.
	<a href="#">LPPO4463</a>	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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• “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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on drainage in the area as the fields are a valuable soak away. Already flood defences have had 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the basis of congestion, pollution and health grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Green Belt Review</b></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"> <li>• The NPPF requires assessment against the following criteria:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</li> <li>○ Would development of the proposed site appear to result in the merging of towns or compromise the separation of towns physically?</li> <li>○ Would potential development of the proposed site be a significant step leading towards coalescence of two settlements?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Summerfield would largely disappear (particularly when viewed in combination with additional proposed development to the east).</p> <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>Doubling the size of Spennells makes no sense whatsoever and is not needed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4507</a>	Object	<p>Appreciate need but with insufficient employment in the area would it be for Birmingham overspill?</p> <p>Traffic ,noise and exhaust pollution would increase</p> <p>Infrastructure, i.e. schools/hospitals/doctors/dentists needed</p> <p>Ecological harm - loss of wildlife/agricultural land</p> <p>Loss of recreational land/health benefits</p> <p>Regenerate Brownfield sites in Kidderminster first</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4552</a>	Object	<p>I object to the development of land south of the A448 for housing as identified as OC/13 Stone Hill South, WFR/ST/2 Land off Stanklyn Lane and AS/10 Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park on the Kidderminster East map in Appendix A.</p> <p>This area has a number of public footpaths and is widely and extensively used for recreation and pleasure purposes by the current residents of Spennells and others, many of whom like myself walk or run these paths on a daily basis. If this area is developed for housing and a major road then these facilities will be effectively denied to local residents and there will be a significant increase in air pollution with a direct negative impact on the health and wellbeing of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>both the local population and wildlife in direct contravention of the stated development objectives in Table 3.0.1 para ix. This area currently has a diversity of wildlife including herons and bats which are unlikely to survive the development. Given the scale of the proposed development it is not credible that it will be possible to provide an “adequate natural green buffer” as an adequate buffer would not leave sufficient space for the number of homes and road proposed. The area to the south of Stanklyn Lane does not provide an alternative because there is no public access.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4713</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I do not approve of any development of the Green Belt and it is government policy to protect the Green Belt except in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Plan A relates to land between the A449 Worcester Road and A448 Bromsgrove Road. Previously there was significant development to the north of this leading to a self-contained housing development with a shopping and service centre and primary school. Option A involves significantly expanding the housing in this area, detrimentally affecting the inhabitants of the Spennells and Stanklyn Lane. It is, indeed a large scale expansion and an extension of the Spennells estate in all but name.</p> <p>There are a number of objections to be made, both environmental and social objections being extremely strong. The fields are crossed by a bridleway and a number of interconnecting footpaths which are used on a daily basis, improving the fitness and health of the local population. Activities include cycling, walking with or without dogs, and horse riding. Such activities are participated in by local people, not only from the Spennells, but from Aggborough, Comberton, Stanklyn Lane and the wider local area.</p> <p>At the moment this area is also a haven for wildlife, with its mature hedgerows, green lanes, copses and isolated trees, giving a wide variety of habitats. Larks are abundant, whilst buzzards are frequently seen above the fields or even perched on mature trees. In the summer swallows and martins perform their aerial manoeuvres. Butterflies such as tortoiseshell, red admiral and gate keeper are seen in summer and bees feast on the ivy flowers.</p> <p>This option would also involve the removal of high quality agricultural land, producing barley, wheat and vegetables, which will be increasingly important after Brexit, as it will contribute to food production when we leave the EU.</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 not marginal Green Belt land.</p> <p>In conclusion I would beg the Wyre Forest Council to preserve the high quality Green Belt for environmental and recreational reasons and I maintain that the land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane fits into this category.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4880</a>	Object	<p>I believed Green Belt land was sacrosanct: too important for a whole raft of reasons to be changed or destroyed. I was thus horrified to learn that this proposed plan encourages building on the Green Belt. These fields at the back of the already huge Spennells estate are an essential lung for all the community here. Access is good, people walk to it, and it is heavily used by dog walkers, keep fit enthusiasts, nature lovers and children regularly. It is a haven for wild life and birds. I trust you will look at all options in a constructive way. Nobody is against a development plan, but council members should focus on our town's core strengths, build on them, protect what we have, and not destroy it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4956</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal to build to the rear of Offmore, Comberton, Baldwin Rd and also Spennells.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5092</a>	Object	<p>I would not like to see this housing development go forward as there is already a traffic problem getting off the estate a school times. Also the local school could not cater for rise in places needed. Our Green Belt is much loved and a haven for wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO249</a>	Support	<p>I believe that option A is the best and only way forward.</p> <p>This gives the area the houses that it requires, also deliver the eastern relief road which will help alleviate some of the potential traffic problems. The Spennells protesters main argument seems to be don't build on Green Belt because we like to look at it and walk our dogs there, understandable but you could use that same argument about the proposed building sites in plan B.</p> <p>So it seems to me that option A is the only logical solution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2925</a>	Support	<p>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, and that is how it will be if this plan is</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITES AT SPENNELLS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>adopted.</p> <p>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 making it almost impossible for young couples to get their foot on the first rung of the housing ladder.</p> <p>Get the developer(s) to add in a shop, a school and plan for multi access points to distribute the traffic as much as is possible.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04954</a>	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 OC/13(S) – STONE HILL SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO4312</a>	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO5065</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <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>
	<a href="#">LPPO1980</a>	Comment	Why build 1300 houses here on Green Belt when other places are available, e.g. Birchen Coppice to Bewdley, the golf course has gone leaving plenty of land for shops/social activate with shorter bus journeys to town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO2041</a>	Object	Again you will be building on parts of the flood plain, with the added problem of increased run off into Captains Pool, which has an earth dam. If that goes there will be major problems to Hoo Brook and down stream. Building here will disrupt the flow North / South of wild life into the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve.
Health and Safety Executive CEMHD5	<a href="#">LPPO4164</a>	Comment	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: <b>STONE HILL SOUTH – OC/13</b> – HSE Ref:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/13(S) – STONE HILL SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			7169 National Grid Gas Pipeline – Hossil Lane/Kidderminster.  (see additional comment LPP0018)

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1003</a>	Object	This land is part of the former Stone Common. It has a surprisingly high agricultural grading for such land and should be retained for food production as should the site west of this. Its development would cause Kidderminster to join up with ribbon development at Summerfield.
	<a href="#">LPPO1684</a>	Object	Instead of Green Belt in Stanklyn Lane use former Burlish Golf Club site, has room for amenities, near town. Good public transport reduces costs/traffic
	<a href="#">LPPO1959</a>	Object	I object to proposed development of Green Belt land on Stanklyn Lane. New homes are definitely needed in the area, the destruction of Green Belt land is not the way to achieve this. We use the fields for exercise and recreation. 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 at the best of times, placing extra strain on the infrastructure by so many new homes. Local schools are oversubscribed already, where are all of the children whose families will move into these proposed new homes to be educated? No mention of proposed building of doctors surgeries to cope with increased demand. Building a lot of houses on Green Belt land is an attractive proposition for developers, as houses in this location command a higher price than houses built elsewhere. Building on Green Belt land makes the developers more money, rather than clearing brownfield sites of which we have many as a former industrial town. Green Belt land should be preserved for the health and enjoyment of generations to come. We will never get this land back once it is developed, the best use is not for houses that could be built literally anywhere else. Exhaust the brownfield sites and leave Green Belt alone.
	<a href="#">LPPO2043</a>	Object	Objects to site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Impact on views towards Stone</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2091</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of nesting areas for birds – corn buntings, skylarks etc. and destruction of habitat of butterflies and bees.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2236</a>	Object	I have attended the local drop-in sessions held in Kidderminster and have been truly dismayed at the proposals

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to build further houses on the fields WFR/ST/2 at the rear of Spennells estate.            We are already a vast expanse of houses with an <u>exceptionally poor road</u> transport system.            Little or no thought can have been given to traffic volumes when Spennells was built having only two roads serving the entire estate and both of these roads empty on to Spennells Valley Road- itself a bottle neck at various times of the day.            To consider adding further traffic volumes to this already inadequate system is madness.            If the alternative is to push the additional traffic into Stanklyn Lane this also will not work.            As indicated in the name this is a lane not a dual carriage-way and already has massive problems at the T-junction with the busy A449.            The estate also has a problem with the primary school situated on Heronswood Road. The school has very recently been expanded to cater for more children and again is already at full capacity and causing huge problems twice a day with parents parking their cars both sides of Heronswood Road and other close locations.            To consider building a second school to cater for the increased population growth 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.            If we must accept this seemingly inevitable need for expansion on to our Green Belt land, surely it must be better to use facilities designed for leisure purposes e.g. parks than prime agricultural land which will be needed to feed the increased masses.            There are already many houses being built in Kidderminster e.g. the old sugar beet site off the Stourport Road and I believe the site which was previously Lea Castle Hospital is to be used for housing.            There are other areas ripe for development available, the old wood yard site in Park Road (an area which very much needs attention) and Sladen old school are just two.            I really believe the proposals to build on land behind the existing Spennells Estate is ill conceived and has not been thought through completely and I would urge the planners to look seriously at other better options.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2244</a>	Object	<p>I object to the adoption of Option A in the Local Plan for the following reasons. I understand that the area is classified as Grade 2 farmland and it has been productive over the last 30+ years since I have lived here. Your plan document (page 38) suggests that the land is 'badly managed with poor crop growth'. If this is based on observations from last year I was told by the farmer that this field had been planted with clover to act as a natural nitrogen fertiliser to improve the future crop d. This year it is obvious that the barley has grown well</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and this field must be protected. I believe that all Brown Field sites inc those necessitating compulsory purchase or overturning covenants and inc former Wyre Forest Golf course must be used before Green Belt land is sacrificed despite the possible higher costs involved. The local authority has a duty to protect the Green Belt regardless of cost. I also feel that 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 all these houses are needed they should be shared around the three towns. I accept that in due course some houses may have to be built on the edge of Spennells but they should be done alongside the present development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2273</a>	Object	<p>I am a resident of Spennells and enjoy listening to the Skylarks and watching them fly over the garden. We also have visits from badgers, foxes, hedgehogs, partridges, pheasants and lizards occasionally. 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. I do not wish to move but I may seriously think about it if you do decide to build on these fields. I have walked my dogs around these fields since 1978.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2509</a>	Object	<p>As I travel around Kidderminster I am disheartened to see so many run down areas and disused factory buildings idly decaying as they are left forgotten. It is therefore with real dismay that I am contemplating how the area of Spennells could change for the worse for ever if the proposed development of land that lies between the Spennells estate and Stanklyn lane is given the go ahead. I have read that there are not enough brown field sites across the area to satisfy the projected demand for housing into the future and that Green Belt land must therefore be considered for development. On the other hand I have also read that the projected figures for the number of houses that will be needed to satisfy demand into the future are flawed. Indeed with impending Brexit who knows what will happen to population trends - is this the correct time to be making a decision so closely tied to population numbers? However, one thing that I do know is that if houses are built on the beautiful Green Belt land they will be in a very attractive location and an appealing purchase proposition for anyone who can afford the high prices they are likely to command. These people may of course be from out of area just as likely as they may be from within. It cannot be guaranteed that any new houses built will help any local housing supply issues that we may have. A quick tour of the Kidderminster estate agents suggests that there are a lot of houses for sale within the area. Therefore, I suspect that the demand for housing, if the statistics that have been published are correct, lies with the young and the not so well off who are looking for properties that are more affordable than those already available. I believe that more affluent families from out of area are more likely to purchase the new houses leaving those unfortunate Kidderminster residents who</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>cannot currently afford a house no better off than before. Indeed shortly after the recent television news coverage of the threat to the local Green Belt one local resident flagged the fact that the area had been painted in such a good light by the media that families from all over Worcestershire, and further afield, would be eager to move into the areas – perhaps the say no campaign have shot themselves in the foot a little here! Of course there are plenty of other reasons why we should be protecting Green Belt land in this country and these will all have been used countless times before. There are also reasons particular to the proposed Spennells / Stanklyn development. I am concerned for the scores of residents, including myself, who every day take walks along the boundary footpaths, sometimes with dogs, sometimes with children, sometimes on foot, sometimes on bicycles and sometimes even on horse back. This amenity will be lost for good if the proposed building goes ahead. If one thing raises the appeal of an area more that anything else it is green open space. For too long in the past have developers been guilty of cramming in as much housing as possible leaving very little space for recreation. We should not let this happen here, this area works as it is for the local residents – it should be left alone. I am also concerned about road traffic 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. Similarly, 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. Of course if access is provided to both the existing Spennells and Stanklyn areas then the whole area will very shortly become a thoroughfare for cars travelling north – south and vice-versa trying to avoid congestion on the A449 and A448 roads. Not a good situation for new or existing residents. I hope that my comments and those of other local residents will be given some consideration and that alternative proposals are looked at in order to satisfy the projected housing need into the future within the Kidderminster area. The Spennells estate should be a model for developers to follow, leave it alone; it works for the local residents!</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPP02523</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I have examined the plans and I know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the development of this location. The proposal for a large scale development on the fields adjacent to Spennells and Captains Lodge will overwhelm local roads, permanently remove Green Belt land and withdraw a popular recreational leisure area. <b>The overwhelming of local roads</b> - The two ends of Stanklyn Lane are already occupied by buildings. For literally hundreds more cars to access the A448 or A449 traffic lights would have to be installed (as there is no room for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a large roundabout (small roundabouts to not improve traffic flow on busy roads)). The impact on traffic would be massive – leading even more traffic problems on the south side of Kidderminster at rush-hour. One only has to look at the impact at evening rush-hour of one set of new lights on the A442 to access Silverwoods Way to see daily grid-lock is a real prospect. There could be a resulting impact on the local economy and investment.</p> <p>Roads off Stanklyn Lane like Heath Lane and Butts Lane would become rat-runs. These are single track lanes not capable of hosting increased traffic. Unless these roads are widened destroying field boundaries and hedge-rows which would further increase the environmental impact that the proposal already executes.</p> <p><b>The removal of Green Belt land:</b> - The fundamental purpose of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and to assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land (option B!). Authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; and to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. This proposal ignores all these principals. These fields host a wide variety of plant and wildlife and all will be lost: I have seen foxes, deer, mice and shrews, butterflies, bees, raptors and other birds. Option B (dispersed development) supports the fundamentals of Green Belt policy.</p> <p><b>The removal of leisure and recreational space:</b> The fields are used by dog walkers, runners, and rambblers. Despite being right next-door to a large housing estate (Spennells) they are a place of calm and safety for young and old, groups and individuals. Also used by children for kite-flying and by parents teaching their children to ride bikes. This proposal will remove space of this type. You do not see this kind of diversity in activity or people on the Spennells playing fields off Heronswood Road. I understand that a number of Councillors and local people share these concerns.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2584</a>	Object	<p>Our objections to the proposed development of land between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells estate are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are concerned about the scale and density of the proposed building in the corridor between the Bromsgrove and Worcester roads. We believe the current plan will significantly and adversely change the character of the area.</li> <li>• As the population of Kidderminster is stable and unemployment is low we question the source of the predicted rise in population, and, as Wyre Forest has little manufacturing industry the plan would “Warndonise” Kidderminster and transform it into a dormitory town for Birmingham and other large</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>conurbations along the M5 and M6 to the detriment of Kidderminster. Encouraging an increase in traffic on these roads, which is already heavy at certain times of day, will have a knock-on effect for Bromsgrove and Worcester as gateways to the M5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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, which will be unable to cope with an increase in population. We have to assume that the ambulance service and Worcestershire Royal Hospital will also be given the resources to deal with the increase in population</li> <li>• There will be strains on infrastructure. The plan to build a road to connect the Bromsgrove and Worcester roads will deliberately increase through traffic which will combine with the local traffic generated by the new residents causing increased air and noise pollution in a densely populated area. The suggestion that this road would relieve congestion and reduce pollution in other parts of Kidderminster is questionable and is more likely to move the problem and not solve it. The quality of life for existing residents on the Spennells, some of whom already have to cope with noise and pollution from the railway line and A449, would suffer.</li> <li>• The gradual erosion of Green Belt land is short sighted and unnecessary and impacts on everyone as green spaces, which are essential for physical and mental wellbeing, are irreversibly destroyed. We object to this plan on the grounds that it concentrates the burden of change disproportionately in one area and we would support a plan for smaller scale developments dispersed across the district where it is more likely that the impact could be absorbed by existing services and infrastructure.</li> </ul>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2965</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I am concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The accuracy of the Assessment of Housing Need &amp; the influence of developers, land owners and their agents who do not consider the views of existing residents.</li> <li>• The negative impact on the biodiversity &amp; wildlife in the area.</li> <li>• The impact on the existing residents from increased traffic which has already been adversely impacted by the new road between the Worcester &amp; Stourport roads.</li> <li>• The absorption of Summerfield &amp; Stone into Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The estimated requirement for the number of dwellings &amp; that most of the proposed development is</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>concentrated on one side of the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That there appears to be little consideration regarding infrastructure particularly access to medical treatment and schooling.</li> <li>• That the relief road has been proposed to divert traffic caused by existing issues because this can attract capital funding.</li> <li>• That the gypsy/traveller site is impractical in view of the lane being too narrow for large vehicles.</li> <li>• That fly tipping (already a problem) could increase.</li> <li>• That there seems to be few jobs being created for the proposed increase in the population &amp; this will create increased local traffic as residents commute to their workplace.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3203</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed building of new homes on the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane. We feel that these proposals are absolutely not needed and will cause so much harm and stress to all residents in Stanklyn Lane. Already traffic is a huge problem with Stanklyn Lane being used as a race track or rat run, it is no where near able to cope with any extra traffic that would be as a result of a huge housing development. The fields are truly Green Belt and enjoyed by many local residents, along with wildlife and it would be criminal to lose them. Please consider all other options that have already gained planning approval such as the Lea Castle site, further expansion of the Sugar Beet Site, along with the many brownfield sites available in Kidderminster town centre. Please reconsider this option as once we lose the Green Belt we can never get it back which is so wrong.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3454</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status will start a creep, just here and there. 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, just walking their dogs in the peace it still brings. Extra traffic caused by building all these houses will ruin it all. This area of Stanklyn Lane is well known for its wildlife habitat. This is very important and should not be destroyed. Farming takes place and our farmers produce crops which intertwine with nesting birds and their habitat. There is so much to lose with this project. Please think very carefully.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3524</a>	Object	<p>My objections of centred around noise and air pollution and the negative effect that this will have on the residents in the local area. Previous, ill thought out "traffic measures" on the A449 have resulted in a congested</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/2 – LAND OFF STANKLYN LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic flow on the A449, especially at, but not only restricted to, peak times which this development will exacerbate. The resulting air pollution, noise and increased inconvenience with increased travel times and additional school run traffic will have a significant negative impact on local residents. An additional exit from the Spennells estate onto Stanklyn lane would be highly unwise and additional traffic exiting the estate onto Spennells Valley road would result in grid-lock from Chester Road South, A449 and Wilden Lane. The resulting air and traffic pollution would be unacceptable. This scheme would appear to be based purely on a cheap solution to a perceived housing shortage that when analysed properly is questionable in the first place.</p>
Stone Parochial Charity	<a href="#">LPPO1157</a>	Support	<p>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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AS/10 – REAR OF SPENNELLS/EASTER PARK**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2078</a>	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood area-Take away the fields – would this cause flooding on the estate due to the natural water table?</li> <li>• Traffic-At school times the estate gets jammed up due to extra traffic/ parking by the school putting people’s lives at risk.</li> <li>• Wildlife-We are being encouraged to protect our wildlife and you want to take away their natural homes!</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4250</a>	Comment	My wife and I strongly object to the Option A Proposal with the exception of the northern half of site AS/10 which in some respects would tidy the southern boundary of Kidderminster Town without continuing urban sprawl into Summerfield and Stanklyn which the Green Belt is designed to protect us from.
	<a href="#">LPPO2044</a>	Object	Have a look at the environment agency web site. The railway embankment acts like a dam.
	<a href="#">LPPO2876</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of nesting areas for birds – corn buntings, skylarks etc. and destruction of habitat of butterflies and bees.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> </ul>
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1440</a>	Support	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. The site will ensure that the Council can establish a five year supply in the early part of the plan period. Comments in respect of the length of the plan period, Policy 6A, 6D and 7 should be considered in the context of the release of this site.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1006</a>	Comment	Important site for separating Kidderminster and Lea Castle Hospital. Inevitable that they will almost join - development of some of this site may not be so bad. Prefer to see site left open. Even if Hurcott ADR is developed any built development should be limited to eastern side of ridge only.
	<a href="#">LPPO1914</a>	Comment	Object to option A and B and the loss of 'Green Belt' local to Cookley. Lea Castle brown field areas should be developed and retain the perimeter trees. A smaller scheme could be adopted without major impact upon Wolverley and Cookley current services. Eastern relief road will join the A449 at some point before the County boundary with Staffs, this would mean a major junction local to or near the Caunsall tee junction and the Island Pool pub, this already is a dangerous road and currently is classed as an accident blackspot.
	<a href="#">LPPO1917</a>	Comment	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. By not building on Option A this will create a natural break and a wildlife corridor separating the Broadwaters estate and the newly developed Lea Castle Hospital site. This will maintain the visual appearance and 'feel' of the village of Cookley remaining separate from the expanding suburban sprawl of Kidderminster
	<a href="#">LPPO3131</a>	Comment	One of the positives put forward for the major housing development to the north and east is a potential eastern bypass. Without this, such development will be catastrophic in terms of travel in this area for local people and people wanting to visit the area. I have to object to options A & B including the Lea Castle site without proper provision for schools, medical services and other community services including open spaces and consideration of the impact on road infrastructure. I have to object to options A & B or any developments that effectively join the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. I have no objection to the development of the Lea Castle site without the intrusion onto Green Belt, and removal of wooded areas, however this needs to be done in a far more considered and sensitive way. Without an eastern bypass the impact of major housing development will impact significantly on the quality of life. An eastern bypass creates a possibility that I could support development on the Lea Castle site.
	<a href="#">LPPO3243</a>	Comment	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle 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,

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO5102</a>	Comment	<u>Proposal</u> - Having studied the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review we propose and support a plan to

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPP0409</a>	Object	OPTION A: Strongly object to this if Lea Castle WFR/WFC/15 is developed as it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster. Cookley <b>is not</b> an Urban Extension of Kidderminster it is a village in its own right.
	<a href="#">LPP0445</a>	Object	This proposal links Lea Castle development to Kidderminster, and therefore links Cookley to Kidderminster. Whilst the nature of Cookley as a village will be dramatically altered by the development, annexing the entire thing to Kidderminster will simply destroy the village. This proposal will be socially catastrophic for the residents of Cookley. Your proposals do not support your vision. You foresee "...outlying villages have grown organically to meet their own needs..." and "...the larger villages of Cookley and Blakedown continue..." but your plans are to double the size of Cookley with the core site at Lea Castle. Doubling the size of a village is most certainly NOT growing organically. Should Option A at Lea Castle be selected, Cookley will be annexed to Kidderminster (you will be able to walk from Kidderminster centre to Cookley centre without passing through any fields, Green Belt etc). Cookley will not be a village, it will be a suburb of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPP0492</a>	Object	I object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. I object to Option A 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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 to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. Hence, my suggestion that this site is more suited to the 540 unit elderly persons site.
	<a href="#">LPP0651</a>	Object	I object to both options A&B. There is lack of local infrastructure to support either. Cookley have roughly 480 houses, suggesting building 600-1200 houses, triple the amount. Schools, doctors, shops and transport will not cope. Roads around Lea Castle and Cookley are accident black spots. The amount of houses are not supporting the local infrastructure. I strongly object to linking Kidderminster to Cookley. Cookley is a village, it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. Development of Lea Castle needs to be done with more sensitivity, supporting local infrastructure and need, the current plans do not do this. Please build on housing estates like Comberton or Spennells. They have been designed for and could be extended. I object to the use of any Green Belt land as it should be protected.
	<a href="#">LPP0656</a>	Object	Proposed development of Lea Castle - I object to options A&B for the following grounds; Lack of supporting infrastructure and lack of appropriate access. Option A would effectively join Cookley to Kidderminster. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster. It is not; it is a village. The document states that villages should be allowed to develop to expand in line with their own needs. This proposed development would expect Cookley to accommodate a minimum of 600 new homes with 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.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0798</a>	Object	Lea Castle Hospital extensions - we do not consider it possible for east of Kidderminster to sustain completion rates needed to deliver these allocations during Plan period. Green Belt assessment states that sites make a contribution/significant contribution to Green Belt at this location. Non-Green Belt sites should be favoured instead.
Wolverley & Cookley Parish	<a href="#">LPP01151</a>	Object	The Parish Council are TOTALLY opposed and vehemently object to development of Option A Lea Castle Hospital extension (South) (WFR/WC/16) as this would mean the village of Cookley would be joined to the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Council			town of Kidderminster and this would remove important Green Belt land and be contrary to retaining the local identity of Cookley. The Parish Council want to safeguard the setting and special character of the villages which have grown organically to meet their own needs and do not want to see disproportionate and aggressive housing development around the Lea Castle Site resulting in Urban Sprawl so Cookley is joined onto Kidderminster.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01443</a>	Object	Number of concerns with some of the proposed Kidderminster Urban Extensions, as detailed below:  WFR/WC/16 – Lea Castle Hospital Extensions – 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.
	<a href="#">LPP01640</a>	Object	I object to option A&B as it is Green Belt land and not enough Brownfield sites have considered. No consideration given to infrastructure i.e. Schools, Doctors etc. Kidderminster Hospital is inadequate and puts pressure on Worcester hospital, which is in special measures. Health care for the amount of people 6000 houses would bring puts peoples’ health and lives at risk. Cookley is a village not an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPP01643</a>	Object	I object to option A&B and wish to retain Cookley as a village – school and GP Surgery just coping with current numbers. Lea Castle site could be used for a badly needed care home complex. Yes to Brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPP01915</a>	Object	Objects to development of the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lack of infrastructure (doctors, schools, shops and transport - Cookley can't cater for any more)</li> <li>2. Objects to building on Green Belt when there is sufficient Brownfield land</li> <li>3. Cookley is a village not an extension of Kidderminster</li> <li>4. Concerned about housing development areas without any employment or entertainment for young people</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP01918</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development at Lea Castle - Options A &amp; B on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>• Access and highways infrastructure is insufficient to cope with proposed development. 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.</li> <li>• 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. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment.</li> <li>• Development would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. The Local Plan Cookley refers to Cookley as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village and it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. Accommodating 600 houses would be for Kidderminster’s needs.</li> <li>• Development of the Lea Castle site is needed, however this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.</li> </ul> <p>Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. 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 with large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Brownfield part of Lea Castle, without the destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brown field sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02054</a>	Object	Appalled at the timing. Objects to option A that would link the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. Regenerate Kidderminster Town centre instead.
	<a href="#">LPP02094</a>	Object	Objection to Options A & B Lea Castle:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uses Green Belt land not just Lea Castle.</li> <li>2. What are plans for infrastructure; schools, public transport, doctors and impact on Cookley village.</li> <li>3. Will houses be taken by commuters and what would impact be on roads, services and carbon footprint.</li> <li>4. Develop Kidderminster town centre prior first</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2136</a>	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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• This area should be left alone for natural wildlife.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>There are empty buildings in the Kidderminster area that could be developed into homes/apartments so there should be no need to build new homes on these areas of natural beauty/wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2151</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of local infrastructure available to support this.</li> <li>• village school that could not expand to cope with a further 600 houses and neither could Cookley Medical centre</li> <li>• increased level of traffic this development would produce</li> </ul>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cookley is a village and is no way an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley should not suffer to support Kidderminster's needs</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2245</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>:</p> <p>Lack of local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, doctors, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would necessitate an additional School/doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the doctor's surgery v. busy. Plans would effectively link the village Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.</p> <p><b>Policy 7</b> refers to "insetting"/"washing over" of specific village's development but 1200 – 1400 homes would stretch village envelope to Kidderminster and Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p><b>Table, page 29</b>, Cookley is referred to as "Inset Green Belt". How will this be Inset when our southern Green Belt is completely removed?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2271</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my comments on the proposed development of the Lea Castle site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current road infrastructure would not support the development of 600 houses on the proposed option Core housing site. Indeed any building on the site would severely impact upon the lives of people living in Cookley, Broadwaters and Wolverley with increased traffic on already busy roads that already have traffic hotspots. (A449 traffic lights, Broadwaters mini roundabouts, the junctions of Cookley onto the A449 and the appalling turning from the Stourbridge Road by the Park Gate Inn).</li> <li>There is no mention of building a school or availability of Drs Surgeries. Local primaries are currently full/oversubscribed, Drs Surgeries are already stretched. The village amenities of Cookley could not cope with the influx of people from 600 homes.</li> <li>Cookley is 'Inset Green Belt' pg29 LPR. This will no longer be the case if the proposed development option A is carried out. Indeed it would join up with Broadwaters and the rest of Kidderminster. Cookley</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is a village and should remain so.</p> <p>Whilst I have no objection to building on Lea Castle with additional supporting social infrastructure I do <b>object</b> to building on the land WFR/wc/16 and WFR/wc/32 and also building on established woodland (to the West and South of The Crescent) within the Core A site. (Which is not shown on the plan from the consultation evenings).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2287</a>	Object	<p>I object to proposed core housing and options A and B at Lea Castle. Development will contribute to urban sprawl and remove separation between Cookley and Kidderminster. Insufficient infrastructure, congestion and pollution will get worse in an already very busy area. 600 houses will completely change the local character for the independent village. Road and pedestrian access is congested and dangerous Local facilities' have no capacity to handle the extra load. Site is wildlife friendly, deer, bats, badgers, birds and other wildlife. Site could instead be developed for other purposes sympathetic to the environment and local community. A 600-house development would destroy wildlife and greenery. I object to using The Crescent as an access route to the development. It is a narrow road with difficult pedestrian and vehicular access to the busy Wolverhampton Road. Any development should be totally separate from the community on The Crescent.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2318</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A &amp; B as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. 600 houses would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. In Cookley Schools, Doctors, shops and transport already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, visibility splays and traffic lights will help this. Junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot and close to the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent. Object to Option A. it would link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. Development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. No evidence for employment or commercial provision around Lea Castle site. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>31.2 fails that the planning application for 600 homes involves removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			the site. The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended to A449 would lead to congestion further up the A449 affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt with a strong identity and provides key local services. WFDC should be support Wolverley and Cookley to meet its local needs in a sustainable way, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village to join Cookley to Kidderminster. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2334</a>	Object	In addition I would like to object to Option A and the northern urban expansion in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2360</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle 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. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright 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. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an 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. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's need 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 support local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.
	<a href="#">LPPO2364</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B at Lea Castle 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

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2386</a>	Object	<p>I would like to 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 &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster, particularly if the option B site was also used. 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</li> </ul>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2395</a>	Object	In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2446</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the plan will see Cookley being joined to Kidderminster and it will cease to be a village and destroy /overwhelm our community</li> <li>• What is the main force driving this development, population growth? Population of Wyre Forest has not grown at all in the past five years and all indications are that UK population growth will retract over the next 10 years. Population growth cannot be used as a reason for this massive development.</li> <li>• Destruction of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• 1000 homes completely out of context with local environment inadequate infrastructure roads, schools, medical. No guarantee within plan.</li> <li>• Who is the development aimed at clearly not the local population with only 18% affordable housing.</li> <li>• This kind of development will attract people from outside the area not people who already live and work here, increasing pollution and traffic density.</li> <li>• There are enough Brownfield sites around the area to cope with any population growth.</li> <li>• This expansion is being driven by profit not social and enterprise needs.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>This Development should not be allowed to go ahead.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2457</a>	Object	<p>I object to both Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle on a number of grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>• The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic. Some additional visibility displays and traffic lights will do little to alleviate 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.</li> <li>• I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster and no longer a village in its own right.</li> <li>• Please do not use Green Belt land. There are a number of Brownfield sites that are not being considered and I would like to know why not How sympathetic will the new build be to the fairly abundant wildlife on the Lea Castle site some of which are protected species - dormice, bats (including pipistrelle), polecats etc. all of which have been found on the site.</li> <li>• 600 plus 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 has no usable playing field as it is.</li> <li>• The doctor’s surgery is very busy and it is hard to get an appointment within a reasonable time scale.</li> <li>• 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 meet the requirements of Wyre Forest rather than its and local needs.</li> <li>• I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</li> <li>• Furthermore the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Caunsall.</p> <p>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</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2465</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle 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. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright 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. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an 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. 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. As previous posted, 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. I have a 4 bedroom house that I wish to downsize from but am unable to find a suitable bungalow or house in the Cookley area. With an aging, but young mentally and physically, population growing, more suitable accommodation is needed in order to release the much-needed family homes. If the Lea Castle site is developed it should include much more of homes suitable for retired people.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2504</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 known 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 to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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 Green 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 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". One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>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.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2527</a>	Object	I must object to both options A & B. There is not the infrastructure in place to accommodate either. Option A) This would be linking Cookley to Kidderminster and is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village in it's own right and only develop when there is a need. That at this moment in time is not the case. It is not Kidderminster's overflow answer. Both of these options require the need to build on Green Belt. This should not be done until every Brownfield site has been utilised. Wyre Forest has a population growth below the national average. Therefore housing requirements are below the national average. To cater for increased housing that is not actually required is against the Development Needs Assessment 2015.
	<a href="#">LPPO2529</a>	Object	I wish to object to the inclusion of Green Belt arable land WFR/WC/16 within the Option A plan as it 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, particularly rising towards the A451 Stourbridge Road. 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 Green Belt study identifies this parcel of land as NE1 as having no nature conservation or cultural heritage interests. However, 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. Inclusion of these parcels of Greenfield, Green Belt land for development combined with the Lea Castle site will actively encourage urban sprawl to the north-east and thus should be removed from the Plan.
	<a href="#">LPPO2547</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding 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 known 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02567</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, doctor’s surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 (not in plans). 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. Currently lack of planned infrastructure would mean all new residents crossing the A449 into Cookley using the "secondary access?", for pedestrians and motorists this will present dangers due to the volume of high speed traffic. The current bus service is under review, this is not mentioned and needs to be considered as vital for residents both incoming and established. 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 to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. There is, also an identified need for housing suitable for elderly people. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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. Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt, known to WFDC as part of Wyre Forest Rural. 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, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than the established village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. Most local people wish to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>see sensible, balanced development of the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. Finally, Cookley is identified as self sustaining for it's housing needs, such a large development does not consider this or any harmonisation required with the established Community. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2574</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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 and proportionately-with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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 600-1200 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. The unique character and community of Cookley will become lost in urbanisation. Green Belt once lost, is lost forever. I fail to see why developing houses on Green Belt land is needed when there are multiple Brownfield sites that could be developed. Population numbers in Wyre Forest have barely risen in the last 7 years. These plans are disproportionate. Affordable housing- I see there is allowance for 18% affordable or social housing- this is low- please explain why? If houses are to be built- build homes people can afford to buy.</p> <p>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 its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village- 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			destruction of the woodland, which includes affordable housing. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brown field sites to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO2608</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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. As a parent of a child who has just completed her schooling at Cookley Sebright Primary School there is no room for expansion and they are full. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. There is also the danger of children crossing the A449 to get to school. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2623</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development takes over Green Belt land and is not just limited to the Lea Castle development.</li> <li>2. There are no submitted plans to describe where proposed facilities like doctors, shops, schools for us to consider.</li> <li>3. I believe that the redevelopment of Kidderminster is needed prior to the development of either site A&amp;B to support jobs and infrastructure.</li> <li>4. No clear explanation on the plans to identify the link roads and what impact this will have on local routes and villages.</li> </ol> <p>Under no circumstances should Green Belt land ever be surrendered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2660</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Option A 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 traffic lights; roundabouts will not do anything to help. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. 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 to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan for Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village &amp; not an extension of Kidderminster. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states, “The current approach to wash 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes. We as a society should be looking into local employment to minimise the travelling distances to our employment in light of the energy crisis that is looming on this world of ours. We need to be making these provisions of long-term employment in this area for our future generations &amp; not just thinking about the here &amp; now. This is especially prominent in light of the lack of employment in this area &amp; the up &amp; coming redundancies from local employers.</p> <p>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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2661</a>	Object	<p>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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			the additional traffic. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. It would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2761</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding 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 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. The proposed development of the Lea Castle site with 600 houses would require a surgery and school as Cookley is already at capacity for both with no room for expansion at the school. 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 addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster. 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. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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."The proposed development in no way supports this. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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. On a personal note, I moved the West Midlands from Wiltshire having grown up in a small village with a strong sense of social cohesion where neighbours supported one another. I have found this again for the first time in Cookley/ Caunsall since moving here 2 years ago. I work as a health visitor in Kidderminster I am acutely

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>aware of the housing and social problems there, however, I believe overall the population of Wyre forest has not increased substantially and amalgamating Kidderminster with the outlying villages will not solve either the housing or social problems of the town, but may destroy the positive community relationships that already exist in these villages. In Kidderminster what is needed is an investment in the existing housing stock with more local amenities which could be incorporated into the development of the Brownfield sites, the town centre in particular needs careful consideration. Housing schemes need good infrastructure support to prevent isolation and a strong emphasis on social and affordable housing incorporated into small mixed communities. The proposed development fails to deliver this.</p> <p>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 Green Belt. 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. I also strongly suggest that you consider other Brownfield sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2786</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 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 &amp; 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2817</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses would need additional school and Doctors surgery. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not help this. A development of Lea Castle is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. Object to Option A as it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is not an extension of Kidderminster. It is a village and should expand in line with its own needs. Asking it to take 600</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			houses is expanding Kidderminster's needs and expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO2848</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>• Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Develop Brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>• A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> <li>• Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2849</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>• Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Develop Brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>• A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> <li>• Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2867</a>	Object	<p>We would like to strongly object to Options A/B of the housing development at Lea Castle and surrounding areas. After looking at the plans online and at Cookley Village Hall our objection is that neither option A or B has been thought out or presented properly by the Council to our people. There are no proper plans for our local or Kidderminster's infrastructure. Unknown to us and neighbours who have lived in Cookley for over 40 years the Village is being referred to on the plans as an extension of Kidderminster to our knowledge it has</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>always been Cookley Village like its neighbour Wolverley Village which doesn't seem to be included in this re-titling on the plans. This presumably has been changed so as to decrease the needs of Kidderminster. Cookley Village infrastructure can hardly cope at the moment with its own needs. You are unable to get an appointment at the local Doctors surgery as it is very busy. The Primary school is full to capacity and now that Sion Hill and Sladen middle school have been closed there will be a knock on effect to Kidderminster schools and services. The Village bus service and few small shops won't cope with the extra load. Many residents are young parents or pensioners who do not drive and rely on these services, any new people will surely impact on their quality of life? The problems of an extra 600 houses at Lea Castle linking us to Kidderminster along the Green Belt up the Wolverhampton A449 &amp; along the Stourbridge Road A451 would be a nightmare. The Park Gate public house on the Stourbridge Road has always been an accident black spot along with the Cookley Village Castle Road entrance. This has been the scene of many accidents for over 40 years, The extra problems of traffic at both sites would be appalling. 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. Worcestershire is a beautiful county the envy of a lot of our neighbours, with beautiful nature reserves and countryside, walks, rivers, views etc, when this has all been built on and spoilt we will never get it back. Animal life, their habitats and way of life will all be gone. Like our friends in other parts of Kidderminster Offmore, Comberton, Hurcott and Spennells to name but a few, not one of us want to see our neighbourhood spoilt, the Green Belt gone and relief roads zigzagging all over our land. We need to go back to the drawing board and work together with the Council as a community to talk and find an agreeable solution together sharing the load and coming up with a proper workable plan for the future of our home, Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2875</a>	Object	<p>Option A Lea Castle. Object as lack of local infrastructure to support this - Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not help this. The pollution is yet another matter that needs to be addressed. Object to Option A as would link Cookley to Kidderminster. Cookley is not an extension of Kidderminster, it is a village. As a village it should expand in line with its own needs not expanding to</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Kidderminster’s needs and I do agree that development of Lea Castle site is needed but done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. PROTECT COOKLEY as a village inset Green Belt. Relief road extended as far as the A449, would just lead to more congestion and pollution further on affecting both of the villages COOKLEY and CAUNSALL. No objection to the building of homes on the Lea Castle site , on the Brownfield part of this site without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2882</a>	Object	<p>Whilst the initial planned housing for Lea Castle was proposed at 600 it is now clear there are proposals to increase this to over 1000. I am not opposed to building houses and light business units on the site but I am very concerned with the impact over 600+ houses will have <b>added</b> to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites nearby and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, doctors and people. It seems there is no definitive number of houses proposed for Sion Hill, but I have heard this could be between 45 and 150.</p> <p><b>Transport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted onto the A449 from Lea Castle.</b> The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities. Road safety, traffic flow and congestion are a serious concern. Concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow and</li> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted from Lea Castle via The Crescent.</b> Concerned with proposed exits off Lea Castle site and the volume of traffic which will impact on the traffic lights and A449. 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. I was told at one of the drop-in sessions that exiting via The Crescent would be discouraged, but in reality if the main exit off Lea Castle (Park Gate end) is busy, people will opt to exit via The Crescent — so no access via The Crescent would stop this.</li> <li>• <b>Axborough Lane-</b> 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 if people exit via The Crescent.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>This road is narrow with a blind summit and very poor visibility for exiting at both ends.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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. Predictably, if roads used to commute are congested, you find the next available 'cut through' and for those who wish to avoid congestion elsewhere in order to get to Kidderminster, Stourport Bewdley, Bridgenorth, Cookley and Lea Lane will be their option. This should be discouraged I Perhaps it should be considered that Lea Lane be made one way only?</li> <li>• No access from Lea Castle into The Crescent.</li> <li>• <b>Possible solution:</b> 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 (which may also reduce the speed on this road). Perhaps even another roundabout at the Park Gate T-Junction. Re-directing traffic in this direction will mean traffic does not exit onto the A449, may reduce traffic at the Park Gate Junction and prevent Axborough lane being a cut through to the A451. Maybe in the future the A451 could link into the Eastern Relief Road so traffic here can also circumvent the town .</li> <li>• <b>Public transport</b> needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest, run frequently and economic to use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Schools:</b> Cookley Primary cannot be expanded further and is already an oversubscribed school. Similarly, with Wolverley Primary. St Oswald's alone will not be able to cater for the potential extra intake from Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Stourbridge Road. Therefore any injection of funds would be futile to create extra places if buildings cannot be expanded to cope.</p> <p>Wolverley High School, although on a larger site is situated inside a small village, across two, one vehicle access bridges. Increased traffic in this area would be a major issue. There are already problems with parents having to collect children from surrounding areas such as The Lock car park. In an ideal world the children would walk to school but there is a danger element as the Wolverley Road is a very busy road with heavy vehicle traffic and pollution. As a priority <b>any proposed development must give serious thought to school</b></p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>access and the necessity of further primary school(s) being <b>built and how/where these children will move on to</b> High School and how practical (travelling to/from) this will be. It should be made possible for Children/families to be able to walk to school safely for all the obvious reasons.</p> <p><b>Health:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Doctors surgeries:</b> Cookley is a very small practice with no parking and difficult road access. Wolverley, although slightly bigger, I would assume would not be able to take an influx of patients. This would mean that residents would have to commute into town — impacting on traffic load. Again this requires serious thought and if necessary further doctors surgery(s) should be incorporated into the developments.</li> <li>• With the planned expansion of Kidderminster I feel very strongly that hospital services needs to be at the forefront in terms of a hospital with A&amp;E and more services. Re-instating a proper hospital will relieve the current pressure on Worcester and Russell’s Hall hospitals especially given these areas are also massively expanding. Could part of Lea Castle be ring fenced and considered for a hospital should the current hospital site not be considered big enough?</li> </ul> <p><b>Shops on Lea Castle:</b> Were Lea Castle to be developed then I feel it is very important it is self-sufficient with good shops/takeaways/public transport links so residents are not reliant on travelling to amenities in Cookley/Wolverley or Broadwaters - to limit traffic flow. The site must also ensure there are safe play areas to suit all ages.</p> <p><b>Sympathetic Building and Wildlife Lea Castle:</b> 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 the fact that a housing estate may exist there. I hope that existing wildlife would be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2976</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>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. Additionally the doctors surgery busy.</p> <p>I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that 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.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, 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 at the southern meeting 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 Green 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 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. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, doctors, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road.</p> <p>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 its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2977</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would 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.</p> <p>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. Additionally the doctors surgery busy.</p> <p>I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that 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.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, 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 at the southern meeting 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 Green 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 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. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, doctors, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road.</p> <p>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 its 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3014</a>	Object	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opinion on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport are 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 and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. 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. I cannot comprehend the volume of traffic and neither it seems can the planning developers that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term (again something that appears there is a gross lack of) I wonder how long it would be with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. 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 incomprehensible. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment, oh and did I mention that it's impossible to park outside it also? In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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. Also 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. I would at this point like to draw your attention to this article please to this article, which yes I appreciate dates back to 2012 - <a href="http://www.kidderminstershuttle.co.uk/news/9825320.Wyre_Forest_s_population_growth_lowest_in_Worcestershire_over_10_years/">http://www.kidderminstershuttle.co.uk/news/9825320.Wyre_Forest_s_population_growth_lowest_in_Worcestershire_over_10_years/</a> I am of course not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing ? 30% or 18 % ? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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 leading to only consequence. It strikes me that it won't be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging ? I'm let's be honest....where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase ? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3015</a>	Object	<p>I would like to voice my opinion regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport are 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 and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Crescent, Cookley. I cannot comprehend the volume of traffic that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term, how long with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing? 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctor's surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. 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 incomprehensible. Additionally the Doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment - and impossible to park outside it also. 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 the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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. Also 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. I would at this point like to draw your attention to the Shuttle article (2012) stating the 10yr (2001-2011) population growth for Wyre Forest was 1.1%. I am not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing? 30% or 18 %? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. It won't be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging? Where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3113</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO3126</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPPO3137</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to both plans A&amp;B of the local plan review for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley is, as you know, a small rural village which is part and parcel of our unique heritage and characteristic of the "British countryside" which in my opinion is worth fighting to preserve.</li> <li>• I also do not agree with Green Belt land being swallowed up into urban development unless, as a very last resort!</li> <li>• I myself face a huge change living here in The Crescent, as we are more than likely to have 600++?houses built upon the former Lea Castle site and my road which has been a cul-de-sac for at least 15 years is apparently, to be re-opened to accommodate this development. The A449 road is already a nightmare for both drivers\walkers alike. I recently did a random survey of traffic passing The Crescent during a week day 9am-9pm in which I calculated approx 16,000 vehicles per day(12hrs) passed the entrance to The Crescent.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3175</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A&amp;B on numerous grounds set out below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cookley is a Green Belt village, the council has a responsibility to ensure this continues. This proposed build goes against this. Just because Green Belt land is adjacent to Brownfield sites does not give a right or justification to build on that Green Belt. This goes against all ruling and requirements to protect the environment, agriculture and farming in the area.</li> <li>2. The proposed site is Cookley plus another 50% in a condensed area and there is no capacity to cope. No parking in the village, no Doctor's appointments, no extra school places. The A449 is already a very busy fast road well known as an accident black spot with many serious accidents in the recent past leading to serious injury and death. Extra housing across the road from the village, Dr's and school will lead to a vast increase in traffic driving into the village as it will be unsafe for children and</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>adults to cross this busy, dangerous road on foot. Parking will be a nightmare with increased congestion due to people driving into cookley as opposed to walking across A449. Poor parking = accidents. There is no room for extension of any local services in cookley.</p> <p>3. Removal of Green Belt including established woodland will affect wildlife in the area, Buzzards and Bats along with other species. Living just across the road from the proposed site we have restrictions on what type of lighting we are allowed because of the established wildlife. Surely these restrictions show the green credentials of Councils past. Why is this council proposing at least 600 houses requiring numerous street lights that will render these past green ideals null and void? Properties away from the site have these restrictions so it is more imperative for properties closer to have stricter lighting regulations to protect the bats and other species.</p> <p>4. Cookley is referred to as “village Inset Green Belt” how can this be if our Green Belt is removed? Cookley is NOT an urban extension of Kidderminster! Cookley deserves and needs to be retained as a village. I know that the old hospital site will need to be redeveloped but it surely should be on a much smaller scale than proposed. It should stay within the established footprint of buildings already on the site. Access should be via the B4189 and the A451 in order not to over burden the already busy A449.</p> <p>5. A smaller development should concentrate on environmentally sound, eco-friendly housing to compliment the local area not to decimate it! The community should be encouraged to maintain the wildlife and established animal community for future generations to enjoy and maintain a healthy human existence.</p> <p>6. Before established Green Belt is destroyed for new housing all existing Brownfield sites within the councils jurisdiction should be fully developed. These may not be as financially appealing to developers but should be a priority to our council. Profit should not come before the environment and the devastation of existing communities and wildlife. Animal life some of which are protected will be lost, the bees will be reduced due to removal of plant life and the removal of hundreds of established trees will negatively effect the environments and will have detrimental long term effects to the area and sustaining of human beings in the future.</p> <p>7. As a society we are all aware of the damage we have done and are doing to our environment . The government is actively looking to rectify damage for the future re cars, pollution and the council</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			should be looking to do the same and not just provide a quick fix to housing problems which is not environmentally friendly, not conducive to society long term and is putting the community both in Cookley and the new site at risk in its location, lack of amenities and destruction of wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO3202</a>	Object	It is Green Belt land currently being farmed. It supports populations of Skylarks amongst it's wildlife and such Green Belt land should be preserved where ever possible.
	<a href="#">LPPO3204</a>	Object	It is Green Belt land currently being farmed. It supports populations of Skylarks amongst it's wildlife and such Green Belt land should be preserved where ever possible. It also will be the only countryside buffer separating Kidderminster from Cookley village.
	<a href="#">LPPO3257</a>	Object	I would like to comment 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 to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 Green 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 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”. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3379</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3403</a>	Object	<p>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. Once Green Belt land is gone, it is gone forever. I fear and strongly suspect that your plans will result in Cookley losing this sense of identity, history and community. If your proposals go ahead, there seem to be no plans for the people who will live in them! It seems that local schools must already have capacity for increased numbers of pupils. Local shops and current facilities will be able to absorb increased demand; and there is available employment in the local area. Not to mention the adverse impact on local roads and volume of traffic potentially resulting in an increase in accidents and injury.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3459</a>	Object	<p>This local plan does not promote sustainable development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> <li>6. Promoting healthy communities</li> <li>7. Protecting Green Belt Land.</li> <li>8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</li> <li>9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</li> </ol> <p>Kidderminster is a market town, not an urban sprawl. Cookley is a village, not an extension of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3504</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety. As all people from the new build area will need to come to the existing Cookley area for school, the Doctors or small local shops, they will need to cross a busy road which is already an accident blackspot.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure. if they drive into the main village this will cause further congestion around the school and Doctors. There is not sufficient parking in this area for people at present. The local school is already at capacity.</li> <li>3. Green Belt. 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.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3526</a>	Object	<p>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 <b>added</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Roads around the Lea Castle site</b> – 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 <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and safety.</p> <p><b>Castle Road Cookley and The Crescent</b> – 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><b>Lea Lane</b> – 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> <p><b>Schools:</b> Local schools being Cookley Primary, Wolverley Sebright Primary, St Oswald’s Primary, Wolverley Secondary. Cookley has recently had a new build and would suggest cannot be expanded further and is already an oversubscribed school. Similarly, with Wolverley Primary. I would suggest St Oswald’s alone will not be able to cater for the potential extra intake from Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Stourbridge Road. Also there is a danger element as the Wolverley Road is a very busy road with heavy vehicle traffic and pollution.</p> <p><b>Doctors surgeries:</b> Cookley is a very small practice with no parking and difficult road access. Wolverley, although slightly bigger, I would assume would not be able to take an influx of patients</p> <p><b>Shops on Lea Castle:</b> Were Lea Castle to be developed then I feel it is very important it is self-sufficient with good shops/takeaways/public transport links so residents are not reliant on travelling to amenities in Cookley/Wolverley or Broadwaters - to limit traffic flow.</p> <p><b>Sympathetic Building and Wildlife Lea Castle:</b> I would be <u>totally against</u> removing/destroying the forest area as this creates a natural ‘wall’. I hope that existing wildlife would be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife.</p> <p><b>Retirement/low level housing:</b> What I would like to see on ANY development particularly on Lea Castle, given its beauty and location would be housing and a community for the elderly. A safe and secure complex with services for the elderly, shops, community centre, hair salon, doctors etc. A site of this nature would not necessarily have commuters at peak times, not impact on schools and local shops would mean no heavy impact on current supermarkets in the town. It will also create jobs and business opportunities.</p> <p><b>Public Transport:</b> Needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			run frequently and economic to use. <b>Proposed Options A and B:</b> I do feel that housing should be spread as equally as possible across Wyre Forest so that it does not negatively impact one side/area. I also would also not support Lea Castle becoming a HUGE estate because of its surrounding road links.
	<a href="#">LPPO3534</a>	Object	The village of Cookley is entirely separate and clearly distinct from the outer suburban areas of Kidderminster. By not building on Option A this will create a natural break and a wildlife corridor separating the Broadwaters estate and the newly developed Lea Castle Hospital site. This will maintain the visual appearance and 'feel' of the village of Cookley remaining separate from the expanding suburban sprawl of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO3569</a>	Object	The entire plan goes against a number of planning policy clauses in addition to being wholly against the need to rejuvenate Kidderminster town centre, provide housing within areas accessible to local services, promote the use of public transport, reduce car use and in turn carbon emissions within the region. This local plan does not promote sustainable development.  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> <li>6. Promoting healthy communities</li> <li>7. Protecting Green Belt Land.</li> <li>8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</li> <li>9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</li> </ol> Kidderminster is a market town, not an urban sprawl. Cookley is a village, not an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO3641</a>	Object	This is a development plan on a massive scale for such a rural area, and I oppose all of the options. I agree to



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			development on Lea Castle on the blue print only. Our infrastructure is already stretched to full capacity, 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.
	<a href="#">LPP04311</a>	Object	I object to use of Green Belt land as proposed by your Option A. Thus is both un necessary and morally wrong Green Belt is not to be used in this fashion it is fir agricultural and recreational use only.
	<a href="#">LPP04401</a>	Object	I strongly disagree with the proposal plans (both options) and feel that the lack of facilities within Kidderminster such as local shops and poor transport links, will not be able to cope with the volume of new homes you are proposing to build. Not to mention the beautiful Green Belt that will disappear if these plans are granted. My other strong concern is for the local wildlife, they will have no where to go if their natural habitat is destroyed, this includes the local bat population which are protected species. The rural feel of the outskirts of Kidderminster will be no more. The beautiful view from Kendlewood Road and nearby will be ruined and the view is the reason my family moved to Kendlewood Road. This will also de value the house if the plans go ahead. I also feel that Kidderminster will suddenly no longer feel rural, but completely over-crowded with no amount of local amenities to cope with the volume of people proposed to live here. I question why developments are proposed on beautiful Green Belt and not derelict industrial sites.
	<a href="#">LPP04453</a>	Object	I object to options A 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 known local accident spot. It is also less than 50 meters from the proposes entrance to the core site via the Crescent, Cookley.  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 be destroying our Green Belt and putting 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 in the Brownfield part of the site and without destruction of the woodland. O also strongly suggest that you consider other Brownfield sites such

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			those I have outlines in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPP04558</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>:</p> <p>Lack of local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, doctors, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would necessitate an additional School/doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the doctor's surgery v. busy. Plans would effectively link the village Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. <b>Policy 7</b> refers to <i>"insetting"/"washing over" of specific villages</i> development but 1200 – 1400 homes would stretch village envelope to Kidderminster and Green Belt will be decimated. <b>Table, page 29</b>, Cookley is referred to as <i>"Inset Green Belt"</i>. How will this be Inset when our southern Green Belt is completely removed?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04566</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>:</p> <p>Lack of local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, doctors, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would necessitate an additional School/doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the doctor's surgery v. busy. Plans would effectively link the village Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. <b>Policy 7</b> refers to <i>"insetting"/"washing over" of specific villages</i> development but 1200 – 1400 homes would stretch village envelope to Kidderminster and Green Belt will be decimated. <b>Table, page 29</b>, Cookley is referred to as <i>"Inset Green Belt"</i>. How will this be Inset when our southern Green Belt is completely removed?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04567</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>:</p> <p>Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, doctors, shops</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			and transport . The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the doctor's surgery v. busy.
	<a href="#">LPP04688</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. 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 object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors, 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 black spot. It is also approx. only 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. <b>600 houses</b> in the Lea Castle Hospital site area as a number in itself will mean at least <b>1200 people</b> needing services, with children in the families to swell these numbers, they will 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 has undergone classroom expansion last year to accommodate the children who already attend it. There is no room for further expansion. Who has considered the additional impact on Wolverley High school or King Charles High school? Additionally the Doctor's surgery is small, and a spur to Aylmer lodge in Kidderminster already these days. Likewise there is no room for expansion. What does the Practice Management and GP's/Nursing services attached to this busy Cookley surgery think of these proposals? What meaningful discussion has taken place or research done regarding medical service provision? The Lea Castle Hospital housing estate Core building area covering the existing Brownfield site, should have its own services, which should include, community centre, services for the increasing older population, play areas for children, pharmacy, sensible sized shops in a safe accessible location. Not on a junction of a busy road (Park Gate entrance). In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster, making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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 the social and infrastructural needs of 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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 would be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. This is totally unacceptable. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 commercial activity for the 2,800+ people that will move into the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. On page 178, Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal is described as <b>(for 600+plus homes) this is very disturbing and is not giving a final build intention, which in terms of planning, it clearly should.</b> Most disturbing is additional numbers of houses, (above 600 properties) involves the removal of woodland which would be devastating to wildlife, and the environment of this part of the county, this is unacceptable. <b>To summarise:</b> 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. There is strong feeling about this issue in the village. We have met as a community and will stand together for what is right. But it is vital that the message comes across to Local Plan Review, that I like many local people believe in the development of the Brownfield site areas of Lea Castle Hospital site, for housing and services. However I do not approve of the plan as it is set out in the Local Plan Review document.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04696</a>	Object	<p>In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04703</a>	Object	In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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.
	<a href="#">LPP04744</a>	Object	<b>Policy 6D</b> page 32 which gives the first mention of the proposed site of the Lea Castle Hospital. I, along with many in the area, would consider this the perfect site for development. The mature trees around the site would shield much of the housing from view of the general public and the access into the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads would be acceptable. However, there does not seem to be any logic at this stage to extend the housing along Hurcott Lane out onto the A456.
	<a href="#">LPP04952</a>	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 doctors 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 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.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION SOUTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04966</a>	Object	<p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04979</a>	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"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04981</a>	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"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the doctor's surgery.</p> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04983</a>	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"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04995</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is a need for more housing, there are plenty of Brownfield sites around the area.</li> <li>• School is full to capacity, as is the medical centre.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site is home to a lot of wildlife.</li> <li>• The Crescent cannot support the amount of extra traffic for the development and I fear that it will be unsafe for the residents.</li> <li>• Cookley is a lovely village in its own right, it is not an extension of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04999</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans at Lea Castle on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Community</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/16 – LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION SOUTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPP05132</a>	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.
	<a href="#">LPP05138</a>	Object	The Lea Castle site 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.
	<a href="#">LPP01767</a>	Support	Support Option A- Lea Castle
	<a href="#">LPP01769</a>	Support	Option A Lea Castle is better suited as the roads are capable to cope with a larger population.



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO497</a>	Object	Object to WFR/WC/32.
	<a href="#">LPPO1933</a>	Comment	<p>If 1000 dwellings were built on Lea Castle we understand that this would constitute sufficient additional increased demand for primary school places to warrant/justify the creation of a new Primary School.</p> <p>Prefer the larger Option B to be developed to achieve the required number of dwellings for an additional primary school.</p> <p>Concern with Lea Castle is that the Cookley village primary school should remain a village primary school serving the needs of the immediate local village.</p> <p>If Cookley village primary school is developed and expanded to increase number of class rooms/class sizes/attendance from outside the village (increasing traffic into the village with parents from outside the village leaving/collecting children by car) this would cause significant adverse impact on the village infrastructure (vast majority of village parents walk children to school) and the overall performance/results of the school.</p>
Health and Safety Executive	<a href="#">LPPO4165</a>	Comment	<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><b>LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION (EAST) – WFR/WC/32</b> – HSE Ref: 6867 National Grid Gas Pipeline – Blakedown/Swindon (see additional comment LPPO018)</p>
Homes England	<a href="#">LPPO4402</a>	Comment	<p>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. 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 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.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital Extension (east) site for 360 dwellings as part of Option B is supported, and considered an appropriate location to deliver additional housing at Kidderminster. High level technical assessments in relation to landscape, ecology and transport, have been</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>undertaken for the Lea Castle Hospital Extension (east) site to demonstrate how the site could be developed. This assessment should be read in parallel with these representations. A Concept Masterplan is also included which demonstrates that the site could provide around 360 dwellings (at a density of around 27 dph). The HCA also owns the land to the west of the Lea Castle Hospital site which could also support the the delivery of housing should the Council consider the site to be appropriate for development.</p> <p>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 HCA requests that the wording under Option B is changed to state that the indicative number of dwellings <b>(subject to detailed masterplanning is 360)</b>.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4904</a>	Comment	<p><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 Axeborough 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4932</a>	Comment	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' 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 Green 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 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 &amp; 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4968</a>	Comment	Object to option A and B and the loss of 'Green Belt' local to Cookley. Lea Castle brown field

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			areas should be developed and retain the perimeter trees. A smaller scheme could be adopted without major impact upon Wolverley and Cookley current services. Eastern relief road will join the A449 at some point before the County boundary with Staffs, this would mean a major junction local to or near the Caunsall tee junction and the Island Pool pub, this already is a dangerous road and currently is classed as an accident blackspot.
	<a href="#">LPPO4990</a>	Comment	One of the positives put forward for the major housing development to the north and east is a potential eastern bypass. Without this, such development will be catastrophic in terms of travel in this area for local people and people wanting to visit the area. I have to object to options A & B including the Lea Castle site without proper provision for schools, medical services and other community services including open spaces and consideration of the impact on road infrastructure. I have to object to options A & B or any developments that effectively join the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. I have no objection to the development of the Lea Castle site without the intrusion onto Green Belt, and removal of wooded areas, however this needs to be done in a far more considered and sensitive way. Without an eastern bypass the impact of major housing development will impact significantly on the quality of life. An eastern bypass creates a possibility that I could support development on the Lea Castle site.
	<a href="#">LPPO410</a>	Object	The current infrastructure will not support this development. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO493</a>	Object	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 Doctors' surgery. Cookley

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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 Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. Hence, my suggestion that this site is more suited to the 540 unit elderly persons site.
	<a href="#">LPPO658</a>	Object	I object to the blue and sandy coloured areas being developed. The red area which is the original Lea Castle site is sustainable in size and amount of dwellings originally proposed which I believe to be 600. The options A&B in addition to the red area are too much for surrounding villages/areas to sustain. More definition needs to be revealed as to infrastructure going in place, schools, GP's shops etc.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1007</a>	Object	<u>Land east of Lea Castle Hospital</u> From a map site appears as a natural extension to Hospital site but it is very different. Hospital is hidden behind tree belt but this site is very open. Development would mean urbanisation of open countryside. If more land is needed in this area then WFR/WC/16 would be preferable.
	<a href="#">LPPO1888</a>	Object	The Lea Castle site 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2202</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local infrastructure i.e. schools, Doctors' etc. in Cookley.</li> <li>• Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic.</li> <li>• Junction of A449 and Castle Road is busy and a well known accident spot.</li> <li>• Also less than 50m from the proposed entrance of the core site.</li> <li>• Cookley is a village inset in Green Belt.</li> <li>• Cookley has its own identity and provides key local services.</li> <li>• Should be meeting local needs in a sustainable way and not destroying Green Belt by putting a development larger than Cookley village next to us.</li> <li>• Will join Cookley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Happy to see residential development in Lea Castle Hospital site as long as only the</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Brownfield part is used - without the destruction of woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider other brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2246</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>: Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2272</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my comments on the proposed development of the Lea Castle site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current road infrastructure would not support the development of 600 houses on the proposed option Core housing site. Indeed any building on the site would severely impact upon the lives of people living in Cookley, Broadwaters and Wolverley with increased traffic on already busy roads that already have traffic hotspots. (A449 traffic lights, Broadwaters mini roundabouts, the junctions of Cookley onto the A449 and the appalling turning from the Stourbridge Road by the Park Gate Inn).</li> <li>There is no mention of building a school or availability of Drs Surgeries. Local primaries are currently full/oversubscribed, Drs Surgeries are already stretched. The village amenities of Cookley could not cope with the influx of people from 600 homes.</li> <li>Cookley is 'Inset Green Belt' pg29 LPR. This will no longer be the case if the proposed development option A is carried out. Indeed it would join up with Broadwaters and the rest of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village and should remain so.</li> </ul> <p>Summary: Whilst I have no objection to building on Lea Castle with additional supporting social infrastructure I do <b>object</b> to building on the land WFR/wc/16 and WFR/wc/32 and also building on</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			established woodland (to the West and South of The Crescent) within the Core A site. (Which is not shown on the plan from the consultation evenings).
	<a href="#">LPPO2332</a>	Object	I object to Option B due to lack of local infrastructure, schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport. Access/highways infrastructure would not cope. As a brownfield site some development necessary on Lea Castle but 600 homes too much; Option B would compound this. Need affordable housing/sheltered facilities for the elderly; development should be proportionate throughout area. I object to Option A as it would link Cookley to Kidderminster, it doesn't suit 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 will it just become 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?
	<a href="#">LPPO2335</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 178 relating to Options A and B (appendix a) regarding the Kidderminster Urban Development, and the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Option B on the grounds that together with the development of the core site at Lea Castle, 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. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley, is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. It is also less than 50 metres from one of the proposed entrances to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. Lea Castle, even though it has a Wolverley post code, has always been regarded as part of Cookley. Indeed many people from the village worked there and it has always been a nightmare crossing the A449 to the Lea Castle centre. It is inevitable that as a Brownfield site some development will have to go ahead and it is right and proper that it should. However, 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 problem. We need growth as everywhere in Kidderminster and we should take our share but not disproportionately. We were led to believe there would be some affordable housing for our young and sheltered care facilities for the elderly as a very high proportion of the residents are indeed 65 plus. The village needs to

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>expand according to its own needs and the development of this site should reflect this. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to the whole of Kidderminster’s needs and is being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. It states in the local plan that development should be proportionate. This would not be the case. As an aside, I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2000+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. There seems to be very limited employment in the Wyre Forest and very small population growth, so are we just trying to creating a commuter belt for Birmingham and Worcester as opposed to meeting our own need? On page 178 Justification 31.1 it states “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.” 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 and proposing a development larger than 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. As long as it is sensitive to our needs, on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2458</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to both Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle on a number of grounds: 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 not cope with the additional traffic. Some additional visibility displays and traffic lights will do little to alleviate 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. Please do not use Green Belt land. There are a number of brownfield sites that are not being considered and I would like to know why not How sympathetic will the new build be to the fairly abundant wildlife on the Lea Castle site some of which are protected species - dormice, bats (including pipistrelle), polecats etc. all of which have been found on the site. 600 plus houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It has no usable playing field as it is. The Doctors’</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>surgery is very busy and it is hard to get an appointment within a reasonable time scale. 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 meet the requirements of Wyre Forest rather than its and local needs. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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 &amp; a small office building is insufficient. Furthermore the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. 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</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2466</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle 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. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright 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. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. 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. 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. As previous posted, other local action groups are</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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. I have a 4 bedroom house that I wish to downsize from but am unable to find a suitable bungalow or house in the Cookley area. With an aging, but young mentally and physically, population growing, more suitable accommodation is needed in order to release the much-needed family homes. If the Lea Castle site is developed it should include much more of homes suitable for retired people.
	<a href="#">LPPO2626</a>	Object	<p>object to both A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land not just at Lea Castle.</li> <li>• What plans are there for more facilities e.g. Doctors', shops, schools</li> <li>• Redevelop Kidderminster first to support local jobs/infrastructure/transport</li> <li>• Where are link roads and what is their impact?</li> </ul> <p>Do not surrender Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2696</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors', shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>2) 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 black spot. It is also approx. only 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p><b>600 houses</b> in the Lea Castle Hospital site area as a number in itself will mean at least <b>1200 people</b> needing services, with children in the families to swell these numbers, they will need an additional school and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and has undergone classroom expansion last year to accommodate the children who already attend it. There is no room for further expansion. Who has considered the additional impact on Wolverley High school or King Charles High school? Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is small, and a spur to Aylmer lodge in Kidderminster already these days. Likewise there is no room for expansion. What does the Practice Management and GP’s/Nursing services attached to this busy Cookley surgery think of these proposals? What meaningful discussion has taken place or research done regarding medical service provision? The Lea Castle Hospital housing estate Core building area covering the existing brownfield site, should have its own services, which should include, community centre, services for the increasing older population, play areas for children, pharmacy, sensible sized shops in a safe accessible location. Not on a junction of a busy road (Park Gate entrance). 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 the social and infrastructural needs of 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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 would be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. This is totally unacceptable. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2,800+ people that will move into the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. On page 178, Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal is described as <b>(for 600+plus homes) this is very disturbing and is not giving a final build intention, which in terms of planning, it clearly should.</b> Most disturbing is additional numbers of houses, (above 600 properties) involves the removal of woodland which would be devastating to wildlife, and the environment of this part of the county, this is unacceptable. <b>To summarise:</b> 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. There is strong feeling about this issue in the village. We have met as a community and will stand together for what is right. But it is vital that the message comes across to Local Plan Review, that I like many local people believe in the development of the brownfield site areas of Lea Castle Hospital site, for housing and services. However I do not approve of the plan as it is set out in the Local Plan Review document.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2751</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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 known 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 Doctors’ 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. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2753</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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 known 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</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>school and a Doctors' 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. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2787</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 Doctors’ 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 Doctors’ 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 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 &amp; 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2819</a>	Object	Object to Option B as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses would need additional school and Doctors' surgery. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not help this. A development of Lea Castle is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO2878</a>	Object	Option B 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 Lea Castle site without destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2883</a>	Object	Whilst the initial planned housing for Lea Castle was proposed at 600 it is now clear there are proposals to increase this to over 1000. 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 <b>added</b> to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites nearby and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, Doctors' and people. It seems there is no definitive number of houses proposed for Sion Hill, but I have heard this could be between 45 and 150.



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Transport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted onto the A449 from Lea Castle.</b> The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities. Road safety, traffic flow and congestion is a serious concern. Concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow and</li> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted from Lea Castle via The Crescent.</b> Concerned with proposed exits off Lea Castle site and the volume of traffic which will impact on the traffic lights and A449. 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. I was told at one of the drop-in sessions that exiting via The Crescent would be discouraged, but in reality if the main exit off Lea Castle (Park Gate end) is busy, people will opt to exit via The Crescent — so no access via The Crescent would stop this.</li> <li>• <b>Axborough Lane-</b> 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 if people exit via The Crescent. This road is narrow with a blind summit and very poor visibility for exiting at both ends.</li> <li>• 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. Predictably, if roads used to commute are congested, you find the next available ‘cut through’ and for those who wish to avoid congestion elsewhere in order to get to Kidderminster, Stourport Bewdley, Bridgenorth, Cookley and Lea Lane will be their option. This should be discouraged I Perhaps it should be considered that Lea Lane be made one way only?</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No access from Lea Castle into The Crescent.</li> <li>• <b>Possible solution:</b> 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 (which may also reduce the speed on this road). Perhaps even another roundabout at the Park Gate T-Junction. Re-directing traffic in this direction will mean traffic does not exit onto the A449, may reduce traffic at the Park Gate Junction and prevent Axborough lane being a cut through to the A451. Maybe in the future the A451 could link into the Eastern Relief Road so traffic here can also circumvent the town.</li> <li>• <b>Public transport</b> needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest, run frequently and economic to use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Schools:</b> Cookley Primary cannot be expanded further and is already an oversubscribed school. Similarly, with Wolverley Primary. St Oswalds alone will not be able to cater for the potential extra intake from Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Stourbridge Road. Therefore any injection of funds would be futile to create extra places if buildings cannot be expanded to cope. Wolverley High School, although on a larger site is situated inside a small village, across two, one vehicle access bridges. Increased traffic in this area would be a major issue. There are already problems with parents having to collect children from surrounding areas such as The Lock car park. In an ideal world the children would walk to school but there is a danger element as the Wolverley Road is a very busy road with heavy vehicle traffic and pollution. As a priority <b>any proposed development must give serious thought to school access</b> and the necessity of further primary school(s) being <b>built and how/where these children will move on to</b> High School and how practical (travelling to/from) this will be. It should be made possible for Children/families to be able to walk to school safely for all the obvious reasons.</p> <p><b>Health:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Doctors’ surgeries:</b> Cookley is a very small practice with no parking and difficult road</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>access. Wolverley, although slightly bigger, I would assume would not be able to take an influx of patients. This would mean that residents would have to commute into town — impacting on traffic load. Again this requires serious thought and if necessary further Doctors’ surgery(s) should be incorporated into the developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With the planned expansion of Kidderminster I feel very strongly that hospital services needs to be at the forefront in terms of a hospital with A&amp;E and more services. Re-instating a proper hospital will relieve the current pressure on Worcester and Russell’s Hall hospitals especially given these areas are also massively expanding. Could part of Lea Castle be ring fenced and considered for a hospital should the current hospital site not be considered big enough?</li> </ul> <p><b>Shops on Lea Castle:</b> Were Lea Castle to be developed then I feel it is very important it is self-sufficient with good shops/takeaways/public transport links so residents are not reliant on travelling to amenities in Cookley/Wolverley or Broadwaters - to limit traffic flow. The site must also ensure there are safe play areas to suit all ages.</p> <p><b>Sympathetic Building and Wildlife Lea Castle:</b> 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 the fact that a housing estate may exist there. I hope that existing wildlife would be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3461</a>	Object	<p>This local plan does not promote sustainable development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>6. Promoting healthy communities 7. Protecting Green Belt Land. 8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change 9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment 10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</p> <p>Kidderminster is a market town, not an urban sprawl. Cookley is a village, not an extension of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3642</a>	Object	This is a development plan on a massive scale for such a rural area, and I oppose all of the options. I agree to development on Lea Castle on the blue print only. Our infrastructure is already stretched to full capacity, 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.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO4090</a>	Object	Number of concerns with some of the proposed Kidderminster Urban Extensions, as detailed below: WFR/WC/32 – Lea Castle Hospital Extensions – 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4256</a>	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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill;</li> <li>• noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters;</li> <li>• pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc);</li> <li>• 4) Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			and secondary schools to access by walking.
	<a href="#">LPPO4397</a>	Object	I strongly disagree with the proposal plans (both options) and feel that the lack of facilities within Kidderminster such as local shops and poor transport links, will not be able to cope with the volume of new homes you are proposing to build. Not to mention the beautiful Green Belt that will disappear if these plans are granted. My other strong concern is for the local wildlife, they will have no where to go if their natural habitat is destroyed, this includes the local bat population which are protected species. The rural feel of the outskirts of Kidderminster will be no more. I also feel that Kidderminster will suddenly no longer feel rural, but completely over-crowded with no amount of local amenities to cope with the volume of people proposed to live here. I question why developments are proposed on beautiful Green Belt and not derelict industrial sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4420</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to both plans A&amp;B of the local plan review for the following reasons...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley is, as you know, a small rural village which is part and parcel of our unique heritage and characteristic of the "British countryside" which in my opinion is worth fighting to preserve.</li> <li>• I also do not agree with Green Belt land being swallowed up into urban development unless, as a very last resort!</li> <li>• 3) I myself face a huge change living here in The Crescent, as we are more than likely to have 600++?houses built upon the former Lea Castle site and my road which has been a cul-de-sac for at least 15 years is apparently, to be re-opened to accommodate this development. The A449 road is already a nightmare for both drivers\walkers alike. I recently did a random survey of traffic passing The Crescent during a week day 9am-9pm in which I calculated approx 16,000 vehicles per day (12hrs) passed the entrance to The Crescent.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4425</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A&amp;B on numerous grounds set out below...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cookley is a Green Belt village, the council has a responsibility to ensure this continues. This proposed build goes against this. Just because Green Belt land is adjacent to brown field sites does not give a right or justification to build on that Green Belt. This goes against all ruling and requirements to protect the environment, agriculture and farming in the area.</li> <li>2. The proposed site is Cookley plus another 50% in a condensed area and there is no capacity to cope. No parking in the village, no Doctors' appointments, no extra school places. The A449 is already a very busy fast road well known as an accident black spot with many serious accidents in the recent past leading to serious injury and death. Extra housing across the road from the village, Dr's and school will lead to a vast increase in traffic driving into the village as it will be unsafe for children and adults to cross this busy, dangerous road on foot. Parking will be a nightmare with increased congestion due to people driving into cookley as opposed to walking across A449. Poor parking = accidents. There is no room for extension of any local services in cookley.</li> <li>3. Removal of Green Belt including established woodland will affect wild life in the area, Buzzards and Bats along with other species. Living just across the road from the proposed site we have restrictions on what type of lighting we are allowed because of the established wildlife. Surely these restrictions show the green credentials of Councils past. Why is this council proposing at least 600 houses requiring numerous street lights that will render these past green ideals null and void? Properties away from the site have these restrictions so it is more imperative for properties closer to have stricter lighting regulations to protect the bats and other species.</li> <li>4. Cookley is referred to as "village Inset Green Belt" how can this be if our Green Belt is removed? Cookley is NOT an urban extension of Kidderminster! Cookley deserves and needs to be retained as a village. I know that the old hospital site will need to be redeveloped but it surely should be on a much smaller scale than proposed. It should stay within the established footprint of buildings already on the site. Access should be via the B4189 and the A451 in order not to over burden the already busy A449.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>5. A smaller development should concentrate on environmentally sound, eco-friendly housing to compliment the local area not to decimate it! The community should be encouraged to maintain the wildlife and established animal community for future generations to enjoy and maintain a healthy human existence.</p> <p>6. Before established Green Belt is destroyed for new housing all existing brown field sites within the councils jurisdiction should be fully developed. These may not be as financially appealing to developers but should be a priority to our council. Profit should not come before the environment and the devastation of existing communities and wildlife. Animal life some of which are protected will be lost, the bees will be reduced due to removal of plant life and the Removal of hundreds of established tress will negatively effect the environments and will have detrimental long term effects to the area and sustaining of human beings in the future (we should be thinking long term!).</p> <p>7. As a society we are all aware of the damage we have done and are doing to our environment. The government is actively looking to rectify damage for the future re cars, pollution and the council should be looking to do the same and not just provide a quick fix to housing problems which is not environmentally friendly, not conducive to society long term and is putting the community both in Cookley and the new site at risk in its location, lack of amenities and destruction of wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4443</a>	Object	I agree that the Lea Castle site is in need of development as it has been standing empty for many years and has been subject to vandalism and criminal activity. The locals put this forward as an option several years ago, when the Council proposed turning it into a Traveller's site as they stated there was no need for housing in the town. Were the Planners wrong then or now? This site on its own I believe has scope for 600+ houses. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4448</a>	Object	I agree that the Lea Castle site is in need of development as it has been standing empty for many years and has been subject to vandalism and criminal activity. The locals put this forward as an

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			option several years ago when the Council proposed turning it into a Traveller's site as they stated there was no need for housing in the town. Were the Planners wrong then or now? This site on its own I believe has scope for 600+ houses. 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.
	<a href="#">LPP04539</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding 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 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. The proposed development of the Lea Castle site with 600 houses would require a surgery and school as Cookley is already at capacity for both with no room for expansion at the school. 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. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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."The proposed development in no way supports this. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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. On a personal note, I moved the West Midlands from Wiltshire having grown up in a small village with a strong sense of social cohesion where neighbours supported one



### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>another. I have found this again for the first time in Cookley/ Caunsall since moving here 2 years ago. I work as a health visitor in Kidderminster I am acutely aware of the housing and social problems there, however, I believe overall the population of Wyre forest has not increased substantially and amalgamating Kidderminster with the outlying villages will not solve either the housing or social problems of the town, but may destroy the positive community relationships that already exist in these villages. In Kidderminster what is needed is an investment in the existing housing stock with more local amenities which could be incorporated into the development of the brownfield sites, the town centre in particular needs careful consideration. Housing schemes need good infrastructure support to prevent isolation and a strong emphasis on social and affordable housing incorporated into small mixed communities. The proposed development fails to deliver this. 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 Green Belt. 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. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brownfield sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04557</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>: Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04564</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>: Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.
	<a href="#">LPP04565</a>	Object	I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b> : Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.
	<a href="#">LPP04612</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B at Lea Castle 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 Doctors'' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors'' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. 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. Please do not destroy the village for the children of the future.
	<a href="#">LPP04662</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding 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 known 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>school and a Doctors’ 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. Additionally the Doctors’ 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4671</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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 (not in plans). 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. Currently lack of planned infrastructure would mean all new residents crossing the A449 into Cookley using the "secondary access?", for pedestrians and motorists this will present dangers due to the volume of high speed traffic. The current bus service is under review, this is not mentioned and needs to be considered as vital for residents both incoming and established. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a Doctors’ 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. Additionally the Doctors’ 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. There is, also an identified need for housing suitable for elderly people. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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.</p> <p>In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Belt when our southern Green 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. Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt, known to WFDC as part of Wyre Forest Rural. 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, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than the established village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. Most local people wish to see sensible, balanced development of the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. Finally, Cookley is identified as self sustaining for it's housing needs, such a large development does not consider this or any harmonisation required with the established Community. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4743</a>	Object	<b>Policy 6D</b> page 32 which give the first mention of the proposed site of the Lea Castle Hospital. I, along with many in the area, would consider this the perfect site for development. The mature trees around the site would shield much of the housing from view of the general public and the access into the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads would be acceptable. However, there does not seem to be any logic at this stage to extend the housing along Hurcott Lane out onto the A456.
	<a href="#">LPPO4765</a>	Object	I would like to voice my opinion regarding 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. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport are 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 and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. 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. I cannot comprehend the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>volume of traffic that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term, how long with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing? 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. 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 incomprehensible. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment - and impossible to park outside it also. 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 the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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. Also 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. I would at this point like to draw your attention to the Shuttle article (2012) stating the 10yr (2001-2011) population growth for Wyre Forest was 1.1%. I am not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing? 30% or 18 %? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. It won’t be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging? Where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Wolverhampton and others.
	<a href="#">LPP04769</a>	Object	<p>I would like to voice my opinion regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport are 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 and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. 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. I cannot comprehend the volume of traffic that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term, how long with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing? 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. 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 incomprehensible. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment - and impossible to park outside it also. 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 the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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. Also 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. I would at this point like to draw your attention to the Shuttle article (2012) stating the 10yr (2001-2011) population growth for Wyre Forest was 1.1%. I am not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing? 30% or 18</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>%? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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. It won’t be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging? Where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4818</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would 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.</p> <p>600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery busy.</p> <p>I note that 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.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, 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</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end to Broadwaters at the southern meeting the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p>Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, Doctors’, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road. 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 its 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4822</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would 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.</p> <p>600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery busy.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I note that 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.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, 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 at the southern meeting the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p>Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, Doctors’, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road. 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 its 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4888</a>	Object	I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 Doctors' 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. Additionally the Doctors' 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 Green 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 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". One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4892</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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 Doctors' 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. Additionally the Doctors' 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 Green 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 commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; 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.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4901</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; 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 Doctors’ surgery. As a parent of a child who has just completed her schooling at Cookley Sebright Primary School there is no room for expansion and they are full. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. There is also the danger of children crossing the A449 to get to school. Additionally the Doctors’ 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it 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</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO4908</a>	Object	I would like to comment on the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Option 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 traffic lights; roundabouts will not do anything to help. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. 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 Doctors’ 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. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan for Cookley is referred to as an urban

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village &amp; not an extension of Kidderminster. 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. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states, "The current approach to wash 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. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green 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 commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes. We as a society should be looking into local employment to minimise the travelling distances to our employment in light of the energy crisis that is looming on this world of ours. We need to be making these provisions of long-term employment in this area for our future generations &amp; not just thinking about the here &amp; now. This is especially prominent in light of the lack of employment in this area &amp; the up &amp; coming redundancies from local employers. 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 brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4937</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 hotspot. 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 Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' 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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4941</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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 Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' 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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 &amp; 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.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4945</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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 Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 <i>our</i> southern Green 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 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 &amp; 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.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4953</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to object strongly to the proposed development of Lea Castle site and surrounding areas. I object to Options A &amp; 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 Doctors’ 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 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4957</a>	Object	Proposed development of Lea Castle - I object to options A&B for the following grounds; Lack of supporting infrastructure and lack of appropriate access. Option A would effectively join Cookley to Kidderminster. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster. It is not; it is a village. The document states that villages should be allowed to develop to expand in line with their own needs. This proposed development would expect Cookley to accommodate a minimum of 600 new homes with 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4959</a>	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4961</a>	Object	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recent modernisation of school will not accommodate more than 600 houses in the area.</li> <li>- This area is Green Belt and priority should be redevelopment of brown belt of which there are several around Kidderminster.</li> <li>- Increase in traffic in and around our quiet village</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			- I do not have any objection to development of red Lea Castle site as this is brown field.
	<a href="#">LPPO4963</a>	Object	I object to option A&B as it is Green Belt land and not enough Brownfield sites have considered. No consideration given to infrastructure i.e. Schools, Doctors' etc. Kidderminster Hospital is inadequate and puts pressure on Worcester hospital, which is in special measures. Health care for the amount of people 6000 houses would bring puts peoples' health and lives at risk. Cookley is a village not an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4964</a>	Object	I object to option A&B and wish to retain Cookley as a village – school and GP Surgery just coping with current numbers. Lea Castle site could be used for a badly needed care home complex. Yes to Brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4967</a>	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4969</a>	Object	Objects to development of the Lea Castle site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lack of infrastructure (Doctors', schools, shops and transport - Cookley can't cater for any more)</li> <li>2. Objects to building on Green Belt when there is sufficient brownfield land</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. Cookley is a village not an extension of Kidderminster</p> <p>4. Concerned about housing development areas without any employment or entertainment for young people</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4970</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the proposed development at Lea Castle - Options A &amp; B on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>• Access and highways infrastructure is insufficient to cope with proposed development. 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.</li> <li>• 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment.</li> <li>• Development would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. The Local Plan Cookley refers to Cookley as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village and it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. Accommodating 600 houses would be for Kidderminster’s needs.</li> <li>• Development of the Lea Castle site is needed, however this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.</li> </ul> <p>Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. 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 with large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the brownfield part of Lea Castle,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			without the destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brown field sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4971</a>	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4972</a>	Object	Objection to Options A & B Lea Castle: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uses Green Belt land not just Lea Castle.</li> <li>2. What are plans for infrastructure; schools, public transport, Doctors' and impact on Cookley village.</li> <li>3. Will houses be taken by commuters and what would impact be on roads, services and carbon footprint?</li> <li>4. Develop Kidderminster town centre prior first</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4973</a>	Object	We object to the development at Hurcott ADR/BW4 and the development at Lea Castle WFR/WC/15/16. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 Hall hospital.</li> <li>This area should be left alone for natural wildlife.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <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>
	<a href="#">LPPO4974</a>	Object	I object to proposed core housing and options A and B at Lea Castle. Development will contribute to urban sprawl and remove separation between Cookley and Kidderminster. Insufficient infrastructure, congestion and pollution will get worse in an already very busy area. 600 houses will completely change the local character for the independent village. Road and pedestrian access is congested and dangerous Local facilities' have no capacity to handle the extra load. Site is wildlife friendly, deer, bats, badgers, birds and other wildlife. Site could instead be developed for other purposes sympathetic to the environment and local community. A 600-house development would destroy wildlife and greenery. I object to using The Crescent as an access route to the development. It is a narrow road with difficult pedestrian and vehicular access to the busy Wolverhampton Road. Any development should be totally separate from the community on The Crescent.
	<a href="#">LPPO4975</a>	Object	Lack of local infrastructure available to support this. Village school that could not expand to cope with a further 600 houses and neither could Cookley Medical centre. Increased level of traffic this development would produce. Cookley is a village and is no way an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley should not suffer to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO4976</a>	Object	Object to Options A & B as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. 600 houses would



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. In Cookley Schools, Doctors’, shops and transport already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, visibility splays and traffic lights will help this. Junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot and close to the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent. Object to Option A it would link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. 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. Development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. No evidence for employment or commercial provision around Lea Castle site. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. 31.2 fails that the planning application for 600 homes involves removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site. The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended to A449 would lead to congestion further up the A449 affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt with a strong identity and provides key local services. WFDC should be support Wolverley and Cookley to meet its local needs in a sustainable way, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village to join Cookley to Kidderminster. 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.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4977</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle 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. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright 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. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. 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. In being</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s need 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 support local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.
	<a href="#">LPPO4978</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B at Lea Castle 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 Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ 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. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4980</a>	Object	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.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• 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 Doctors’ surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4982</a>	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"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• 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 Doctors’ surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4984</a>	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"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>in Cookley or at the Doctors’ surgery.</p> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4985</a>	Object	<p>I must object to both options A &amp; B. There is not the infrastructure in place to accommodate either. Option B) The existing roads are not capable of taking the additional traffic. The A449 would not be able to cope with the number of cars resulting from a proposed 600 house development on Lea Castle. Not to mention the increase in emissions that would be caused. The Doctors’ surgery in the village is full to capacity and so is the school. Therefore a new school and Doctors’ surgery will be required to accommodate probably 2000 plus people for 600 homes. Both of these options require the need to build on Green Belt. This should not be done until every brownfield site has been utilised. Wyre Forest has a population growth below the national average. Therefore housing requirements are below the national average. To cater for increased housing that is not actually required is against the Development Needs Assessment 2015.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4986</a>	Object	<p>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. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. It would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4987</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors’/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>- Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>- Develop brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>- A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>- Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4988</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors'/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>- Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>- Develop brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>- A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> <li>- Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>- Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4989</a>	Object	<p>We would like to strongly object to Options A/B of the housing development at Lea Castle and surrounding areas. After looking at the plans online and at Cookley Village Hall our objection is that neither option A or B has been thought out or presented properly by the Council to our people. There are no proper plans for our local or Kidderminster's infrastructure. Unknown to us and neighbours who have lived in Cookley for over 40 years the Village is being referred to on the plans as an extension of Kidderminster to our knowledge it has always been Cookley Village like its neighbour Wolverley Village which doesn't seem to be included in this re-titling on the plans. This presumably has been changed so as to decrease the needs of Kidderminster. Cookley Village infrastructure can hardly cope at the moment with its own needs. You are unable to get an appointment at the local Doctors' surgery as it is very busy. The Primary school is full to capacity and now that Sion Hill and Sladen middle school have been closed there will be a knock on effect to Kidderminster schools and services. The Village bus service and few small shops won't cope with the extra load. Many residents are young parents or pensioners who do not drive and rely on these services, any new people will surely impact on their quality of life? The problems of an extra 600 houses at Lea Castle linking us to Kidderminster along the Green Belt up the Wolverhampton A449</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>&amp; along the Stourbridge Road A451 would be a nightmare. The Park Gate public house on the Stourbridge Road has always been an accident black spot along with the Cookley Village Castle Road entrance. This has been the scene of many accidents for over 40 years. The extra problems of traffic at both sites would be appalling. 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. Worcestershire is a beautiful county the envy of a lot of our neighbours, with beautiful nature reserves and countryside, walks, rivers, views etc, when this has all been built on and spoilt we will never get it back. Animal life, their habitats and way of life will all be gone. Like our friends in other parts of Kidderminster Offmore, Comberton, Hurcott and Spennells to name but a few, not one of us want to see our neighbourhood spoilt, the Green Belt gone and relief roads zigzagging all over our land. We need to go back to the drawing board and work together with the Council as a community to talk and find an agreeable solution together sharing the load and coming up with a proper workable plan for the future of our home, Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4991</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety. As all people from the new build area will need to come to the existing Cookley area for school, the Doctors' or small local shops, they will need to cross a busy road which is already an accident blackspot.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure. If they drive into the main village this will cause further congestion around the school and Doctors'. There is not sufficient parking in this area for people at present. The local school is already at capacity.</li> <li>3. Green Belt. 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.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4992</a>	Object	<p>The entire plan goes against a number of planning policy clauses in addition to being wholly against the need to rejuvenate Kidderminster town centre, provide housing within areas accessible to local services, promote the use of public transport, reduce car use and in turn carbon emissions within</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the region.</p> <p><b>Achieving Sustainable Development</b></p> <p>This local plan does not promote sustainable development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> <li>6. Promoting healthy communities</li> <li>7. Protecting Green Belt Land.</li> <li>8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</li> <li>9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</li> </ol>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4993</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>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 <b>added</b> 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 <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> 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. Axborough Lane will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			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. 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>
	<a href="#">LPPO4996</a>	Object	<p>If there is a need for more housing, there are plenty of brownfield sites around the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School is full to capacity, as is the medical centre.</li> <li>- The Lea Castle site is home to a lot of wildlife.</li> <li>- The Crescent cannot support the amount of extra traffic for the development and I fear that it will be unsafe for the residents.</li> <li>- Cookley is a lovely village in its own right, it is not an extension of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4997</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the plan will see Cookley being joined to Kidderminster and it will cease to be a village and destroy /overwhelm our community</li> <li>• What is the main force driving this development, population growth? Population of Wyre Forest has not grown at all in the past five years and all indications are that UK population growth will retract over the next 10 years. Population growth cannot be used as a reason for this massive development.</li> <li>• Destruction of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• 1000 homes completely out of context with local environment inadequate infrastructure roads, schools, medical. No guarantee within plan.</li> <li>• Who is the development aimed at clearly not the local population with only 18% affordable housing.</li> <li>• This kind of development will attract people from outside the area not people who already</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>live and work here, increasing pollution and traffic density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are enough brownfield sites around the area to cope with any population growth.</li> <li>• This expansion is being driven by profit not social and enterprise needs.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>This Development should not be allowed to go ahead.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4998</a>	Object	<p>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. Once Green Belt land is gone, it is gone forever. I fear and strongly suspect that your plans will result in Cookley losing this sense of identity, history and community. If your proposals go ahead, there seem to be no plans for the people who will live in them! It seems that local schools must already have capacity for increased numbers of pupils. Local shops and current facilities will be able to absorb increased demand; and there is available employment in the local area. Not to mention the adverse impact on local roads and volume of traffic potentially resulting in an increase in accidents and injury.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5000</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans at Lea Castle on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Community</li> </ul> <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>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO5001</a>	Object	<p>Lea Castle Hospital extensions - we do not consider it possible for east of Kidderminster to sustain completion rates needed to deliver these allocations during Plan period. Green Belt assessment</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			states that sites make a contribution/significant contribution to Green Belt at this location. Non-Green Belt sites should be favoured instead.
	<a href="#">LPPO5002</a>	Object	<p><b>LEA CASTLE SITE</b>                      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 &amp; 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 &amp; the Island Pool &amp; crossroads. All of this area has experienced many accidents &amp; fatalities.</p> <p><b>THE PARK GATE PUBLIC HOUSE</b>                      A451 Stourbridge Road, both this junction &amp; the whole of the Stourbridge Road again is a fast road experiencing many accidents &amp; fatalities. When considering the large number of houses in this area consideration should be whether it is a safe environment for the increased traffic. &amp; the fact each household has a least 2 cars to each family.</p> <p><b>LEA CASTLE SITE footprint</b>                      The avenue of trees &amp; woodland &amp; 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><b>HOSPITALS</b>                      KIDDERMINSTER hospital has downgraded &amp; 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>District Nurses are in the same position.</p> <p><b>SCHOOLS</b> 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>
	<a href="#">LPPO513</a>	Support	<p>I support building on the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large number of the dwellings would be on existing brown field ground and not reducing the amount of Green Belt land. The size of the area could be further increased by using the land up to Axborough Lane.</li> <li>- A large number of dwellings could support a 2 form entry primary school, thus reducing the impact on the local facilities.</li> <li>- It would be within the catchment of Wolverly CE High School and would positively impact the schools long term viability.</li> <li>- It would be capable of sustaining a bus service</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- It would potentially be able to provide live-work units</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2141</a>	Support	<p>Support as site is already part developed with services required. Access is available to all types of transportation. Impact on The Crescent would be small, road runs through existing site and has supported the services daily to a large population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3006</a>	Support	<p>I choose option B the lea Castle site.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3201</a>	Support	It is more of a brownfield site, being adjacent to the area that has previously been built on.
	<a href="#">LPPO3205</a>	Support	It is more of a brownfield site, being adjacent to the area that has previously been built on.
	<a href="#">LPPO3430</a>	Support	I believe the alternative proposal is the best option. The old Lea Castle site is large and will accommodate the housing required to be built. Without encroaching on surrounding areas of Green Belt land and Cookley. No major alterations to man roads. No bridge to be built. No by-pass required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3536</a>	Support	I was advised that if a combined total of approx 1000 dwellings were built on the Lea Castle Hospital site this would constitute sufficient additional increased demand for primary school places to warrant/justify the creation of a new Primary School. With this in mind we would prefer the larger Option B to be developed to achieve the required total number of dwellings to trigger the requirement for an additional primary school. Our main concern with the Lea Castle Hospital development is that the Cookley village primary school should remain a village primary school serving the needs of the immediate local village. If the existing Cookley village primary school is further developed and expanded to increase number of class rooms/class sizes/attendance from outside the village (increasing traffic into the village with parents from outside the village leaving/collecting children by car) this would cause significant adverse impact on the village infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPPO4088</a>	Support	Include WFR/WC/32 and reduce the size or density of development on the Spennells/Stanklyn Lane sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4297</a>	Support	Following attending the Cookley consultation event I wish to submit my comments as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 which already seems to be at capacity. Lea Lane which the school is situated on gets dangerously busy in term</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL  
 EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>time when the school starts and ends each day, so with additional people having to drive their children to school 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I can see the merit of developing road infrastructure around the Spennells area to provide relief to the centre of Kidderminster which is often bottle necked something needs to be done to make road travel easier to the area.</li> <li>• 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, therefore I would be in favour of option A.</li> </ul> <p>I have registered with your consultation website however did not find it easy to add any comments hence this email.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3073</a>	Object	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic,  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  Loss of wildlife
	<a href="#">LPPO2056</a>	Object	With the Burlish Top Nature reserve having homes, right up to its border. Will these defeat the object of a nature reserve?  Currently during heavy rain falls, the Kingsway gutters are like fast flowing streams. Also the Junction of Elan Avenue to the Kingsway floods.
	<a href="#">LPPO2148</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposed plan due to the loss of Green Belt when there are areas that are empty buildings in Kidderminster than can be used to more effect.</li> <li>2. There isn't enough spaces in schools as there is</li> <li>3. It takes too long to get any GP, dentists</li> <li>4. The road network now struggles with the demand of vehicles let alone extra carbon footprint emissions.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2137</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic noise and pollution</li> <li>• Removal of agricultural land have an impact on the wildlife in the area</li> <li>• Building of houses behind property will reduce value of her home.</li> <li>• Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO168</a>	Object	I object to the inclusion of land adjoining Burlish Top nature reserve as being included within the plan for housing.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>We have enjoyed access to the land for the 18 years.</p> <p>The land has always been used by walkers and is a natural buffer to the nature reserve. 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.</p> <p>Inclusion of this land in the plan is wholly inappropriate</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1754</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that The Kingsway is already a 'rat-run' and residents struggle to exit their driveways safely due to congestion and speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Also concerned that Bewdley Rd won't cope with a new building site and more traffic. Public transport is not seen as viable as bus service is 'extremely poor.'</li> <li>• Worried that increased congestion will delay the emergency services. Also concerned about increased traffic and impact of pollution on health.</li> <li>• Highlights the fact that Stourport lacks a by-pass or ringroad. Concerned that doctors and dentists won't cope with growing population.</li> <li>• Believes that there isn't any evidence of a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area that couldn't be met by utilising brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3289</a>	Comment	<p>This is 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. Again concerns must exist about the suitability of The Kingsway for access to this site. This land in the past had been farmland, and its inclusion as part of the Golf Course was acceptable on the grounds that it would still provide a predominantly green area for local enjoyment and recreation. It is concerning too that the land has been contaminated by recent waste tipping, again detracting from its suitability.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO166</a>	Comment	<p>Site L1/2, the Kingsway road will require widening to a standard carriageway so that residents can access the A451 safely rather than use Burlish Crossing or Windermere Way. 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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO741</a>	Comment	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
	<a href="#">LPPO2178</a>	Comment	Wyre Forest Golf Club land could be an option for development.
	<a href="#">LPPO2189</a>	Comment	Wyre forest golf club (Burlish Golf club), if the golf course cannot be reopened the 62 acres could be used for building more homes having good accessibility to both Kidderminster and Stourport,
	<a href="#">LPPO234</a>	Comment	The proposal to develop the golf course does not take in to consideration that for building of properties the site will be cut in to 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. Both of which border an SSI.
Wyre Forest District Council	<a href="#">LPPO1254</a>	Comment	Concerns related to potential impacts on biodiversity at Wyre forest golf club. Due to the presence of acidic habitat.
	<a href="#">LPPO2651</a>	Comment	<p>I cannot comment on most of the proposed sites for development because I do not have a thorough knowledge of the environment and area for each of them. The same applies to those preparing the plans – flow chart trends and geographical pictures may well suggest “potentially” suitable areas but there may be local specific considerations that contradict this view.</p> <p>My comments are therefore restricted to proposed development sites in my immediate area.</p> <p>I have some serious concerns for any changes to the use of land in the areas on Burlish Top and the immediate surrounding land. With reference to the plans this is the area shown as a CORE SITE immediately behind Torridon Close and Elan Avenue that the council have owned and I believe has been previously referred to as “the potential golf academy” land. It is shown on the plan as a core site.</p> <p><b><u>HISTORIC FLOODING</u></b></p> <p>The lie of this land has previously been the cause of severe flooding to properties in Elan Avenue, my own property</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>included. We suffered this issue numerous times from the mid-seventies. Although local residents had grave concerns about the land fill matter that was being dumped in this site it has resulted in a situation where we have not had any flooding for the past few years. I was fortunate that only my garden was affected (the flood water was lapping my rear doorstep about an inch below entering the house) – but that resulted in me having to remove many inches of mud from my land and losing equipment from my shed that was ruined. Other properties were more unfortunate, they had huge amounts of water entering their houses as much as 18 inches deep – one house in particular that I went to had raw sewerage in their house because the force of flood water had blown the manhole cover.</p> <p>This was not just a one-off occurrence.</p> <p>The current lie of the land has been created by a company, authorised by the council, dumping excessive land fill which I believe deems the current land unsafe for building on. There has been talk of asbestos and all sorts of stuff being dumped there. This would require the height of the land being reduced significantly prior to development and this would take us back to the same as it was when the flooding occurred.</p> <p>At the moment the lie of the land allows the grassed open area to absorb heavy rainfall. Flattening out the area it is believed will cause the water to start running off again – standard drainage channels are unlikely to prevent the problem because, as stated above, the force of water was able to blow off manhole covers.</p> <p><b><u>PROTECTION</u></b></p> <p>There is a spring at the bottom of this land which I believe is a protected area because it has been identified there are newts there. I believe in the past that the council said this area would be fenced off but that has not happened.</p> <p><b><u>EXISTING PROPERTY PRIVACY</u></b></p> <p>I have no objection on this basis, the new properties would not interfere visually with my home at all so this is not part of my concern. Neighbours in the Elan Avenue cul-de-sac might have a different opinion because the new</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			houses being on higher land would make them fully overlook their properties.  <b><u>CHANGE OF USE</u></b>  We have previously been advised by the council that land owners cannot be held responsible for water escapement if they have not changed the use of the land because the land was there before our properties.  In this instance there would be a change of use so the land owner (the council) would be held responsible for any subsequent issues, damages and losses.
	<a href="#">LPPO4221</a>	Comment	If you are going to build why do you have to build on Green Belt when you have land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf Course L1/2 and the land that runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where the children and parents are in walking distance surely this makes more sense?
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1301</a>	Comment	This currently acts as a “buffer” between a large residential area and the local nature reserve and SSI. It is used by many walkers (ref. obesity figures for Wyre Forest District). We question the suitability of The Kingsway access to this site. There are also suggestions that the land has been contaminated by past activities.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1444</a>	Comment	Wyre Forest Golf Club - only part of site has been assessed in Green Belt assessment so entire site cannot be released. Should be subject to requirements of para.74 of NPPF. No evidence to show the requirements have been met. Allocation should be removed,
	<a href="#">LPPO3435</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public rights of way. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat, skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nest in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also have significant impact upon the vast variety of pant and wildlife</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.
	<a href="#">LPPO3440</a>	Object	<p>The roads on Burlish/Lickhill and Bewdley Road are already being used as rat runs and can't cope with any more traffic never mind the population with the inevitable building of houses.</p> <p>Houses mean requirements for schools and doctors and dentists and we are already at overflow point.</p> <p>Let's keep the bit of beauty we have left.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4182</a>	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 – L1/2 Wyre Forest Golf Club.
	<a href="#">LPPO4217</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urbanisation, threatening the existing public Rights of Way. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. We think that building would have impact on the vast variety of plant and wildlife.</li> <li>• Significant increased traffic on all roads on Bewdley Road North, Burlish Estate and Lickhill Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs which will effect times for emergency services to reach destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emission of exhaust fumes with results of higher risk to local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a By-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing despite promises of a "By-pass.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to another area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities i.e. GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3632</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Wyre Forest Golf Club.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will destroy wildlife.</li> <li>○ Will put more pressure on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>○ This will undermine the work WFDC Rangers have done to create more biodiversity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The route to local schools is limited adding to more traffic congestion.</li> <li>○ Risk of class sizes increasing if schools take on more pupils.</li> <li>○ County Council receives received one of the lowest payments per pupil in the country.</li> </ul> <p>To summarise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The increase in hosing will bring more traffic, noise and air pollution.</li> <li>● Poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion need to be addressed in Stourport.</li> <li>● Doctors will not be able to cope with more patients.</li> <li>● Plans need to be put in place to alleviate these problems before any developments go ahead.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4019</a>	Object	<p>I am aware that it has been extensively tipped on and understand that the nature of the materials tipped there may not be fully known. There is still evidence of settlement with area's not draining &amp; pooling with water. The new Birmingham relief water pipe which is still undergoing installation passes through the middle of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There is a pond which has a population of protected Great Crested Newts.</li> <li>● There's a spring on the site which is utilised.</li> <li>● The site provides a natural barrier between the existing houses &amp; the Birchen Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>● The site is regularly &amp; extensively used for recreational purposes by the local population.</li> <li>● The building of housing would spoil the open aspect &amp; greatly effect my enjoyment.</li> <li>● 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.</li> <li>● I am concerned that any development will increase the risk of flooding properties.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5097</a>	Object	<p>Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Extra Traffic.</li> <li>● More children to local schools.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of wildlife.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO451</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to development of the Kingsway/ Golf Club site and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Development of this land will be detrimental to the natural environment on this site and to the adjoining nature reserve. The site is essential for the many insects, small wildlife and nesting birds that make their homes there.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The infrastructure to support such a large development on Lickhill and on Burlish is not in place. The roads, schools and doctors are not coping now and when planning such a large scale development in the Stourport and Burlish area plans are included to improve these also in order to make it a self contained community rather than an add on to an already not coping system.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO523</a>	Object	<p>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. The road is used as a shortcut by heavy goods vehicles in both directions, despite the signage pointing out its unsuitability. Little evidence of the need for additional recreational facilities to address the "pressure on the adjoining Burlish Top Nature Reserve" the suggested need for additional housing in this area can be addressed through the use of existing brownfield sites. Severn Trent Water should be consulted over the wisdom of building anything at all over its new water pipeline once it is finished.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO748</a>	Object	<p>Need to protect Green Belt; loss of habitat, increased traffic, pollution, schools full, doctors would not be able to cope, no evidence to justify building on Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1644</a>	Object	<p>Object loss of Green Belt and good quality agricultural land.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1201</a>	Object	<p>Concerns with the Stourport-on-Severn site allocations :</p> <p>LI/2 – Wyre Forest Golf Club – Part of site assessed through Green Belt assessment. No evidence base to support the release of the entire site shown from the Green Belt Site last used as a golf course and therefore, a form of open space subject to the requirements of paragraph 74 of the Framework. Areas of open space should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space to be surplus to requirements, or the loss resulting from the proposed development will be replaced by equivalent or better provision. No evidence to support this. This allocation should be removed in its entirety.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1673</a>	Object	<p>I object to LI/2 as it impacts on wildlife and a loss of open green space. The natural beauty of the area would be blighted, the Kingsway and Buggy Lane are not suitable for the increase in traffic generated from new houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1761</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to building houses on the fields at the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road North and on the garden centre and horse paddocks on the Lickhill Road.</p> <p>There will be a loss of Green Belt areas, a lot more traffic with increased noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes. Stourport lacks a bypass.</p> <p>There will be loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife habitat and impact on a variety of plants.</p> <p>More people needing facilities such as school, doctors, dentists etc.</p> <p>Asks if there are brownfield sites that could be used as an alternative.</p> <p>Objects to building on Green Belt areas.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1801</a>	Object	<p>It would add extra traffic and more children to the local schools.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1815</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 and LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stourport does not have the infrastructure to support sufficient increase in traffic.</li> <li>2. Burlish Crossing is already overwhelmed by traffic at peak times causing tailbacks,</li> <li>3. Loss of valuable Green Belt will lead to loss of wildlife.</li> <li>4. Impact on habitat - there are nesting skylarks and tawny owl</li> <li>5. Increase in traffic pollution</li> <li>6. Need to consider schools and Doctor's surgeries as they are already under pressure.</li> </ol> <p>Please re consider your plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2365</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTIONS TO Policy 32- Core Sites/Wyre Forest Golf Club as development would almost join Stourport and Kidderminster at Kinver Avenue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO657</a>	Object	<p>This site is on landfill, next to a narrow lane at national speed limit and next to an SSI site and beauty spot. If developed site is right next to Kidderminster Gun Club which operates all through the summer months clay shooting. I have complained twice now to environmental health as the noise level is unacceptable. New houses would be even closer to this site. Severn Trent has put a major pipeline through the site surely this cannot be compromised.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1856</a>	Object	<p>Stourport has enough new housing sites, building more would be disastrous. Our roads are too busy now. Kingsway is like a main road, and with new houses built at the field adjacent to Burlish Park, can only make it worse.</p> <p>Getting in and out of Stourport. is very difficult because of so much traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1896</a>	Object	<p>Map L1/2 - This area of land was used as landfill for a considerable time. Was this waste there toxic and even if not</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is it advisable to build on this type of land?</p> <p>It is adjacent to Burlish Top Nature Reserve and surely households and traffic will adversely affect this important facility and the flora and fauna of the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1993</a>	Object	Object
	<a href="#">LPPO2032</a>	Object	L1/6/7: Kingsway traffic is already busy and noisy. More houses would add to this. The schools could not cope with more pupils doctors/local hospitals are already stretched; we do not need more housing in the area due to lack of infrastructure ad should protect wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO2067</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal</p> <p>Kingsway is already a very road between Kidderminster to Bewdley with speeding issues</p> <p>The proposal will impact on schools, doctors/dentists and wildlife</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4203</a>	Object	Traffic at the Burlish traffic lights is already unacceptable. Extra housing on Kingsway, golf course or on Lickhill sites will make this severe issue even worse for everyone. The extra volume of cars will cause even more pollution and will impact on the environment. Building on Green Belt sites is unacceptable. Many brown field sites are not being developed, many parts of Stourport are derelict and run down, why can't these be utilised before destroying the parts of the town that are still attractive, unpolluted and well kept.
	<a href="#">LPPO1807</a>	Object	Object to LI/2.
	<a href="#">LPPO1636</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The field at the top of Kingsway is contaminated and unsuitable for housing development.</li> <li>• Roads are already congested w/o more traffic/pollution; when will improved infrastructure be provided?</li> <li>• GP's/Schools will be unable to cope and wildlife will be affected</li> <li>• This will not bring wealth to Stourport it will only attract commuters; Stourport town centre requires growth.</li> <li>• Why has riverside development not happened and Lloyds Garage site used as car park?</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use brownfield sites - old vinegar works/“Cheapside” area of Stourport is ripe for development not Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1631</a>	Object	<p>Can't see justification for building at Burlish crossing:</p> <p>Lack of roads/schools and doctors/dentists already busy</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3261</a>	Object	<p>The extra traffic - it is already difficult to get out of the immediate area at rush hour times and holidays/sunny days.</p> <p>The safety caused by the extra traffic, Kingsway is already a speedy and busy lane. We are regular walkers to Burlish Top along with a lot of locals with dogs, children, and cycles.</p> <p>The area has a Newt community which I thought were protected. There is also a Badger family living quietly and happily as well as other animals/birds/ reptiles. These would no doubt be disturbed and possibly evicted. A lot of council money has been spent on Burlish Top Nature Reserve bringing it back to its natural heathland habitat, for a home to wildlife, birds, reptiles and flora. I can only think that developing the land so close to this will undo all of that hard work.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There may be problems with the nature of materials in/on the land. There is still evidence of settlement; area's not draining and pooling with water and subsidence/holes appearing. We have previously suffered flooding to our property due to changes in the lie of the said land which resulted in substantial claims against our insurances.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3307</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top of 'Kingsway' (L1/2) restricted number of houses with no infringement towards the 'Golf Club' / Nature Reserve.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Housing next to 'New Tesco'!?</p> <p>3. Utilising 'Brownfield Sites' or existing housing stock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2631</a>	Object	This site should not be developed as it is essential to maintain green space between the three towns. WFDC should pursue other avenues to gain important revenue from this site, whilst still maintaining a green attractive appearance perhaps a wildflower meadow. Keeping this as a green site would not only be attractive to anyone wishing to move into the area, but would also benefit the current residents of Kidderminster and Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO3013</a>	Object	<p>Object to Burlish Golf Course which was used as an unauthorised a tip despite being SSI/health risk. Better sites - Stourport/ Kidderminster town centres &amp; former Chichester Caravans site being centrally located/on a bus route.</p> <p>Impact of extra traffic on Kingsway, distance from doctors surgeries/limited public transport/possible damage to property (already have pipe line close by)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3041</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I received NO communication from the council. .</li> <li>• Strongly object to loss of Green Belt status.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Object to the increase in road noise and extra pollution from exhaust fumes.</li> <li>• Stourport does not have ring road or by pass like Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Will more schools, GP and dental surgeries be built?</li> <li>• Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1996</a>	Object	<p>Objects due to the increase of traffic on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road.</p> <p>Traffic is already bad. Stourport is already a congested town and is not able to cope with increased traffic from increasing housing estates.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2017</a>	Object	<p>Site LI/2 was previously a landfill site and I would be concerned about residential properties being built here. Firstly considerable excavation will be needed potentially leading to environmental problems for existing residents and users of Burlish Top Nature Reserve and secondly I'm not sure how attractive such a site would be to would be house buyers of the new builds.</p> <p>There has recently been much disruption due to the laying of the Severn Trent Water Pipeline. The prospect of yet more noise, mess and danger is not attractive.</p> <p>If LI/2 goes ahead the traffic situation will become even more horrendous leading to public safety and environmental impacts of untenable proportion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2062</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way.</li> <li>• Burlish Top Nature Reserve under threat/decrease in wildlife</li> <li>• Lack of road infrastructure in Stourport/increase in traffic noise/pollution in area/total upgrade of roads in Wyre Forest would be necessary</li> <li>• New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers</li> <li>• Lead to extreme pressure on – schools, doctors, dentists, gas/electricity and water/sewage suppliers</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2084</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of brown belt not Green Belt land</li> <li>• Proposed plans would increase of traffic, pollution, medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Don't let profit be the major factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2154</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status. The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected.</li> <li>• Traffic at ALL times of the day is extremely busy. An extra 300+ properties centred around this area without additional major roads included in your plans will be very foolhardy</li> <li>• The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GP's, Dentists and all local schools will not be able to cope!</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2363</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Badger Set and Protected acid grassland and newts on the site</li> <li>• The New Birmingham relief pipe line goes through the site.</li> <li>• Considerable depth of contaminated material on site.</li> <li>• There is a spring feeding an Aquifer for Blackwell Abstraction point on the site</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Drainage issues if built on;</li> <li>• There is no storm drain system in Elan Avenue</li> <li>• Former Golf Course would be a better option having space, being easier to develop, with good access to roads/schools/transport/sports facilities and Stourport.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1990</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Kingsway, Burlish and Lickhill Road due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from large tailbacks.</li> <li>2. Significant impact on facilities e.g. GP surgeries, dentists, hospitals already over burdened.</li> <li>3. Impact on schools – larger class sizes or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to outside area to school.</li> <li>4. Impact on wildlife habitat and Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>5. Lack of bypass to alleviate traffic in Stourport</li> <li>6. Loss of Green Belt status which should protect countryside and protect rights of way.</li> <li>7. No evidence of shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by brownfield sites e.g. Power Station site.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4206</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic/pollution</li> <li>• Stourport is already a bottleneck</li> <li>• Local amenities – schools/GP Surgeries full.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1795</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any plans that involve building on Green Belt land for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are sufficient brownfield sites to exploit before needing to consider Green Belt</li> <li>2. Concerned about development around Burlish as the crossing is very busy.</li> <li>3. Concerned about access road to Bewdley for emergency services- at peak times Burlish crossing can be gridlocked.</li> <li>4. Infrastructure in and around Stourport - questions if it will be able to cope with the additional demand on services and roads</li> <li>5. Green Belt needs to be retained to protect wildlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1904</a>	Object	<p>Concerned about:-the loss of Green Belt, -Significant increase of traffic on all roads in Burlish Park, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (peak times tailbacks). -Increase in time it will take emergency services to reach residents. - The bus service is already poor. - The erosion of what makes Wyre Forest special, the three towns keeping their separate identities. - Increased pressure on GP surgeries, dentists and schools. -The wonderful addition we have of Burlish Nature Reserve will be affected by loss of wildlife. There are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields and rare plant species too. - Surely there are many brownfield sites that can be utilised within Wyre Forest. Once again Stourport-on-Severn comes out worst affected. Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster a ring road but Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic. My objections are not of the ‘in my backyard’ syndrome but a plea for an already over crowded little town not to grow anymore. We do not have the infrastructure to grow further and let us keep the cherished parts of put town</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			that make it a place we want to live.
	<a href="#">LPPO1664</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</li> <li>• Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</li> <li>• Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1778</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any loss of Green Belt that protects the countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</li> <li>• Concerned about increased noise and pollution due to traffic and the impact on the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Suggests not building on the Green Belt but alternatively utilising land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf course L1/2 and the land that runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where children and parents are within walking distance. Suggests prioritising these sites before developing on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Concerned about lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries dentists and public transport in this area.</li> <li>• Also concerned that Stourport lacks a good public transport infrastructure including a decent safe cycle path. This all needs to be done before any houses should be considered.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3176</a>	Object	<p>The field which is part of the golf course is heavily contaminated with industrial waste including chemical waste.</p> <p>The Kingsway already suffers heavy traffic congestion in the morning and evening rush hour. Any further traffic would be entirely unacceptable, would increase pollution and add to the traffic queues.</p> <p>It was stated in your report that building houses on this site "would take pressure off the Burlish Top Nature Reserve" That is completely the opposite of what would happen. People would be attracted to and buy houses on this site because of the location.</p> <p>No new roads, no bridge or by pass.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3325</a>	Object	<p>Site L1/2 Wyre Forest Golf Club, represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. The volume of traffic has increased substantially in the past 7 years, to the point where it can be difficult to leave our property. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Other core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will also increase the traffic at Burlish lights, I don't see how development at L1/2 can be integrated into the area with adequate transport facilities for both existing and new residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2908</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to this site being used.</li> <li>• Will encroach in The Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• The tranquillity of 'The Top' will be jeopardised with more people living in the area and cause damage to wildlife.</li> <li>• Nothing will be left for future generations except bricks, concrete and tarmac.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2543</a>	Object	<p>I strongly contest the Core development areas in the Burlish/ Lickhill areas, I do understand, just from the basic maths, that there is a need for additional housing within the district. However, I have raised my main concerns above to highlight the obvious issues that I assume someone within the Planning Policy Team has already considered.</p> <p>Following the drop-in and after having reviewed the documents again online I have a few points/queries to make, in particular in respect of the Core housing sites in the Burlish/Kingsway and Lickhill areas of Stourport and also the Option B sites, in particular the one at Burlish Crossing:</p> <p>In respect of the land agreed as a Core housing development at Kingsway (LI/2) I have seen and heard comments that this site has already been 'agreed' for development - is this the case? If so, this would suggest that Wyre Forest DC have already been in negotiations with a developer to sell the land to? Also, it has been brought to my attention, that part of this land (the south section) is immediately developable, again is this the case? If so, does this mean that the north part of the land isn't suitable to be developed and would mean less than 80 dwellings would be built there?</p> <p>Within the initial development plan (prior to the June 2017 options) I read that the site at LI/2 had been highlighted as a possible site for recreational development as well as housing development, which was a strategy to 'reduce the burden on the nearby Burlish Top Nature Reserve'. 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? 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? Similarly, there are hectares of land here that is now inhabited by wildlife and which houses a vast number of trees, all of which would presumably be destroyed if this land was developed.</p> <p>- Road networks and traffic - Both of the core housing sites at Lickhill and the Kingsway along with the Option B site at LI/5 would have a detrimental effect on the congestion within the local area. These three sites would potentially mean 331 new homes could be built within a 1/4 of a mile of each other, thus raising the concern that there could be potentially 331 more vehicles using the 3 main roads in this area being Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road and The</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Kingsway. Currently, even without these additional houses, the traffic at Burlish Crossings is already a complete nightmare and inconvenience for all commuters going to/from work and/or school. With these additional (potential) developments I can only assume that this congestion will continue to become a more difficult problem to solve.</p> <p>- Roads networks and safety - Similarly these additional vehicles will be using roads which are direct links to the High School and several primary schools within the area, which surely raises a safety concern? Should we be encouraging increased use of The Kingsway, Windermere Way and Lickhill Road given the number of children who use those routes to school every day? Also, if these sites in particular were to be developed where would the access to those 'estates' be? I would assume accessing a large housing development from any of these roads would mean that traffic systems would need to be put in place to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike - would this mean more traffic due to signalling on top of the expected increased in vehicle numbers?</p> <p>- Road networks/ The Bridge - it probably goes without saying that the traffic issues on the Stourport Bridge are already a major problem for the town. The Option B sites, in their vastness, backing onto the Areley Kings area of Stourport would only add to this problem. I have been informed that if a developer were to buy this land then a second bridge and supporting roads would be built - what would the impact of this buildings works be on the town's road infrastructure in the meantime? Also, where would that bridge be located and what would the environmental impacts of that development be?</p> <p>- Schools - The schools within the Burlish and Lickhill vicinity are already over-subscribed each year with many children being rejected from their first choice (and quite often most local) primary school. From the Plan document I can see that there are several options available to deal with the potential increase in children within the area, however 0.5FE proposals are almost a complete waste of time as sustaining a structure within a primary school with an additional 0.5FE is almost impossible with the current funding cuts being made by central government. What 0.5FE increase would do, would be to unnecessarily force joint year group teaching in order to deliver efficient and break-even budgets. Your education team will well know that this is not the most effective way of delivering the curriculum and could also have negative effects on future OFSTED ratings, particularly if pressure is going to be put on to teaching staff to deliver to larger group of pupils. This is one of the easiest ways to make Stourport a less attractive town of choice as parents currently have the knowledge that primary schools within these areas are</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>OFSTED good or outstanding! Similarly, 1FE primary schools are as difficult to sustain, especially within such areas where the majority of students receive only basic funding but the normal costs of running a school still have to be met. Have governors of all local primary schools been informed of the suggestions within the plan so that they can think about succession planning if any of these sites were to be developed? Would their budgets be able to handle any potential changes? Where would a new development for a 1FE school be situated if this were the route that was taken in Stourport, I would assume it would be in the over-subscribed areas? If so, Green Belt?</p> <p>- Medical centres - As above for schools. Local medical centres, surgeries and hospitals are already working to capacity - would residents then be expected to travel longer distances into Kidderminster to seek medical attention? Would Kidderminster Hospital A&amp;E department be re-instated by the time all of the development is complete and these 5,400 dwelling have been built?</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly object to the sites that have been included in the Core housing plans and Option B which would so strongly affect the Burlish and Lickhill areas of Stourport for all of the above mentioned reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2434</a>	Object	<p>My objection centres around the building of houses under Option B, specifically relating to Burlish Crossing. The provision of 157 houses on the site when coupled to the core sites of Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2) and Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7) would mean an additional 331 houses, perhaps 600 extra cars, in an area that struggles at times to cope with the volume of traffic currently. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The resultant reduction in air quality, additional noise pollution and increased damage to road surfaces would lead to further strain on local medical and other community services, protracted response times from emergency services and increased dangers to pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>Without adequate provision for additional schools, medical facilities and other community services I believe this option to be ill conceived.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2367</a>	Object	Object Kingsway/Burlish crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road because:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased traffic congestion, noise pollution/fumes</li> <li>○ Burlish top nature reserve would be ruined/wildlife lost</li> <li>○ Capacity of NHS services/Drs/dentists/schools and access by emergency services.</li> <li>○ Stourport has nothing to cope with extra traffic e.g. a bypass</li> <li>○ Don't build on the agricultural land instead do something for the community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2324</a>	Object	<p>Without more houses being built there are traffic jams every weekday early morning, mid afternoon and early evening in Kingsway, Windermere Way, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. There are also traffic problems outside the schools in Kingsway/Windermere Way with the school run vehicles and Kingsway is also used as a shortcut for lorries (Talbot largest culprit) and at times when the A451 Kidderminster Road is blocked because the town roads are blocked with traffic.</p> <p>More cars means more pollution, will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles and poor public transport adding to number of cars on the road.</p> <p>The compulsory purchase of a Care Home in Lickhill Road (another kick in the teeth for the elderly of the area), loss of a business and peoples horse riding hobby.</p> <p>Nearest doctors are based in Stourport. They will not cope with the extra numbers of patients. Are there enough places available at the schools?</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2009</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>● Increase in traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill and Bewdley Road</li> <li>● Health risks from traffic.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in school places and classes getting bigger.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries, emergency services.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests utilising sites old brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2111</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt land must be protected at all costs.</li> <li>• Doctors and Dentists will find it difficult to cope with extra people.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Emergency services will find it difficult at busy times on our roads.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2115</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools.</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2120</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all local roads = more noise/fumes</li> <li>3. Kingsway already subject to speeding</li> <li>4. Impact on capacity of schools, GPs, dentists</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			5. Loss of wildlife and productive agricultural land
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPPO3560</a>	Object	Use of green/brownfield sites. All areas outstanding Bewdley particularly in Bewdley Road North area/Kingsway. Loss of floral and fauna, already eroded during last 25years.
	<a href="#">LPPO1653</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no bus routes, more cars will be needed to take children to already overcrowded schools</li> <li>2. Existing traffic issues esp. at school times in Lickhill Road/Windermere Way</li> <li>3. If there is no play area on the estate children will play in streets which could result in an accident</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1752</a>	Object	<p>Asking if there is evidence to prove that more housing is really needed. Is the population really increasing and are there really not enough Brownfield sites?</p> <p>Asking if there will be any increase in bus services, doctor's surgeries, schools and policing because they do not believe current support services will cope with a growing population.</p> <p>Questioning the rationale behind building more houses and if it's simply to make more money for the Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1781</a>	Object	Object to the collective three sites L1/2, L1/6/7 and M1/6 being the subject of new developments. When there are a number of Brownfield sites that should take priority over Green Belt sites. We all heartily support the 10 points of objections put forward by the Burlish & Lickhill Green friends against these proposals.
	<a href="#">LPPO1802</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/2, L1/5, L1/6/7, M1/6 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Est., Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</p> <p>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1811</a>	Object	<p>My objection is that the road and infrastructure cannot cope with anymore traffic on the Bewdley Road and crossroads at lights between 7:00-9:30am and 3:00pm-7:00pm it is gridlock most of the time which will also effect on the L/1/2 site proposed. The Kingsway will not be big enough to cope another reason is the Nature Reserve just coming back to how is should be.</p> <p>The boundaries between Kidderminster and Stourport are just yards apart known so let's just keep it as it is.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4209</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the destruction of Green Belt and resultant increase in already congested traffic/assoc pollution, where is promised bypass?</li> <li>2. Poor bus service</li> <li>3. Schools/Doctors already oversubscribed.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4211</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The field at the top of Kingsway – object strongly mainly on traffic grounds as this is extremely heavy on working and school days.</li> <li>• Also the proximity to the nature reserve.</li> <li>• Garden Centre and Paddocks.</li> <li>• Also traffic concerns and proximity to Ravenhurst Nursing home.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4218</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt natural habitat.</li> <li>2. Lack of health care to support a higher population.</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic/pollution.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1634</a>	Object	<p>I object to these new developments as collectively the 3 sites would mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also initially affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alienate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes or unable to take in local children them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat: there are sky larks, linnets, and other red-listed birds resting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also have a significant impact in the vast variety of plants and wildlife on Burlish Top nature reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. There is no evidence that there is a short fall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO990</a>	Object	<p>Strongly object to this site being developed. Was part of Burlish Common enclosed in 1820s? Golf course is sporting uses and must be regarded as greenfield. Beyond the Old Worcester Road is Burlish Top Nature Reserve. It is desirable to have a buffer between this and any developed area. Lowland heath is a scarce natural resource and should be protected. Development here would also narrow gap between Stourport and Kidderminster significantly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3323</a>	Object	<p>Many issues if further development along any part of the Kingsway;</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2961</a>	Object	<p>The Green Belt needs to be protected for the good of the environment and country as a whole. No Green Belt</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>status areas should be up for consideration for housing.</p> <p>LI/2 is too close to Burlish Top Nature Reserve to be used for housing. Housing would pose a significant threat to wildlife.</p> <p>All three proposed sites already have more than enough houses situated in a relatively small area. There is no evidence that this amount of new housing is required in the area, where the population growth is below the national average.</p> <p>I would hope that plans for housing in this area will be restricted to Brownfield sites only, and kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>More housing would inevitably increase the volume of traffic, traffic noise, and pollution to an unacceptable level.</p> <p>The Green Belt is vital to the health and well-being of all of us. The former Wyre Forest Golf Club site was a much appreciated area of peace and quiet. More effort should be made to find a similar use for this land. We do not want to lose any more of our precious, green, open views. The three new school/college buildings have already encroached enough on our open landscape in this area of Stourport</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2980</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and sugar beet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2982</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and sugar beet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3177</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land along The Kingsway and at the back of some of the houses in Torridon Close is not suitable for housing.</li> <li>• This field is contaminated with industrial waste which was illegally dumped when the land was used for landfill. Contamination was confirmed when Severn Trent recently surveyed the land with a view to burying the pipeline. They found high levels of contamination and the course of the pipe had to be re-routed.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion in the Kingsway leading down to Burlish Crossing is already a problem and with even more cars resulting from a housing development along Kingsway, the congestion would be greatly increased.</li> <li>• The amount of traffic in Stourport has increased greatly in recent years due to additional housing and yet the infrastructure has not improved. There have been no additional schools, medical centres, hospitals in the Wyre Forest area and no improvement with the roads to help alleviate traffic, apart from a set of traffic lights at Burlish Crossing. What a difference that made! Over the years promises have been made by MPs to improve traffic problems by introducing a new relief road and bridge, but these promises have never materialised.</li> <li>• Stourport is already heavily congested and these traffic problems are increased in the summer months as it is popular with tourists.</li> <li>• Rather than improvements to the infrastructure of Stourport, we have witnessed a decrease in our facilities, i.e. Police, Fire Station, Leisure Centre and swimming pool, children's paddling pool in the Memorial Park. These facilities have all been moved to Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Although I object to the large housing estates and social housing on Green Belt land in theory I accept that with increased population and immigration there is a need for additional housing. But with increased population in an area, surely the facilities and infrastructure for that area should also be increased to cater for the increased needs of the populace.</li> </ul> <p>I would add that although I am against these concrete jungles taking over Green Belt land, it would appear that Kidderminster would be better placed to accommodate the additional housing, as its infrastructure and facilities are far superior to those in Stourport. In addition, the proposed new road joining the A456 to the A449 would also help alleviate the additional traffic; whereas I believe there are no such new roads proposed for Stourport.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2372</a>	Object	<p>We had not received any notification of these plans which we think is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of Green Belt Land makes a mockery of Green Belt Status, and is a precedent that will affect existing farmland, public access / rights-of-way.</p> <p>Stourport-on-Severn is expected to support the local allocation of houses but while Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring-road and a proposed new road to cope with both housing and extra traffic, Stourport-on-Severn does not have the existing or planned infrastructure to cope and the significant amounts of proposed traffic. This will have knock on environmental effects, and the traffic affecting existing local traffic and emergency service access at peak times.</p> <p>Local schools and NHS services are already stretched; there is no proposal for how this will be dealt with, and will lead to increased class sizes, longer waiting lists or people having to travel outside of the area which will further add traffic to areas where overspill fills the requirements.</p> <p>The plans will lead to a loss of both good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Skylarks, Linnets and other red-listed birds nest in these proposed sites. The use of the Kingsway field will also, we believe, have a significant impact on the diversity of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no evidence that in the Wyre Forest area the shortfall cannot be met by the use of brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport-on-Severn) and sugar beet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2728</a>	Object	<p>LI/2 - Wyre Forest Golf Club - The site is situated next to Burlish Top Nature Reserve, which needs to be protected. There is a strong likely hood that if the area is built upon, the nature reserve would be damaged with increased levels of rubbish. The site being proposed should be used as a buffer zone between development and the natural environment to ensure the protection of designated natural sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2435</a>	Object	<p>I should like to object to the building of houses at Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2). They would mean an additional 331 houses together with the extra cars, in an area that cannot cope now at certain times of the day. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The extra traffic would result in a reduction in air quality and additional noise, plus the unnecessary use of Green Belt land with no provision it seems for medical and educational services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2463</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing development will be likely to increase littering/dumping of household waste.</li> <li>• There are already concerns over anti-social behaviour that takes place on a daily basis and this is likely to worsen. There will also be affects on the local wildlife and damage to their habitat.</li> <li>• Traffic at Burlish crossing during peak times is already the cause of much annoyance to residents.</li> <li>• Increasing the housing population will only make this situation worse and will also increase pollution in the area as well as noise pollution.</li> <li>• The land next to Tesco should be a priority for the council in view of the best interests of the town as it looks bad to people visiting. So why ruin the country side on the edge of town when the centre of town is in clear need of re-development?</li> <li>• The new houses on the old Sugar Beet site are yet to be completed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2109</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the building of houses on Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These roads already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• The noise, emissions of exhaust fumes, getting on and off out drives, when there's no hold ups we have to put up with speeding cars along Kingsway.</li> <li>• Lack of facilities as such GP surgeries, dentists and schools.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing. Only hold ups with woo much traffic, road works or accidents. How ill emergency services cope?</li> <li>• The impact of building houses in Kingsway field would have significant impact on plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Council.
	<a href="#">LPPO449</a>	Object	Object to development on greenfield sites Wyre Forest Golf Club, corner of Kingsway LI/2.
	<a href="#">LPPO681</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Traffic noise.</li> <li>• Crowded doctors and schools.</li> <li>• Nature.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2007</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Further development between Stourport and Kidderminster in the open area should not be permitted to prevent link-up of these two towns.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. Kingsway is already a dangerous road caused by speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will also affect time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. The impact of building houses would have significant impact on vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2035</a>	Object	I object to the development in Kingsway/Lickhill Road areas.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads here are not coping with the current amount of traffic esp. at peak times adding more traffic would increase this problem and be dangerous for pedestrians</li> <li>• Schools/Doctors surgeries are currently stretched</li> <li>• Wildlife/residents will suffer if green spaces lost</li> <li>• Other areas/empty properties could be used</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2048</a>	Object	<p>I was unaware of these proposals/deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/prime agricultural land for food production</li> <li>• Preferred option must be brownfield sites.</li> <li>• More traffic = more noise/pollution. Plan will compound area's existing traffic problems.</li> <li>• GP/dental surgeries/local schools already oversubscribed</li> <li>• Negative impact on businesses at top of Lickhill Rd and wild/plant life</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1853</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green Belt Status</li> <li>2. Loss of Rights of ways/walking.</li> <li>3. Poor Road access down Kingsway to Stourport High School</li> <li>4. Loss of habitat/plants/wildlife on Burlish Top.</li> </ol> <p>No infrastructure in place around Stourport for increased population/ traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1678</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the plans for building on Wyre Forest Golf club map ref. LI/2.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A loss of Green Belt and precious open land which will affect wildlife populations.</li> <li>2. The introduction of more traffic on already congested roads (peak periods) i.e. Kingsway, Bewdley Road, Windermere Way.</li> <li>3. More junctions causing even more traffic chaos.</li> <li>4. Stourport has already catered for more people. I.e. Tan Lane, Manor Road, Vale Road, which will impact on local</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>facilities such as GPs, dentists, schools etc.</p> <p>5. Stourport is notorious for peak time traffic jams which include Bewdley Road, Kidderminster Road, Hartlebury Road, Worcester Road and Dunley Road often causing gridlock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO682</a>	Object	Proposals for Burlish/Lickhill areas - traffic already at standstill at peak times. Greenfields are all there is to separate 3 different towns. Doctors/dentists - hard to get appointment. Schools - not enough places. Must use existing brownfield sites in Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO683</a>	Object	<p>Very concerned about developing sites in the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and Steatite Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing,</li> <li>• Pressure on local schools already at capacity with waiting lists,</li> <li>• Pressure on GP's and NHS dentist,</li> <li>• Retaining Stourport's character and identity,</li> <li>• Threat to wildlife,</li> <li>• Pollution,</li> <li>• Additional traffic and places pressure on road network.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO717</a>	Object	Object to proposals around Burlish
	<a href="#">LPPO723</a>	Object	Development would have significant impact on plants and wildlife habitat. Industrial/brownfield sites should be developed.
	<a href="#">LPPO747</a>	Object	Concerned at loss of Green Belt land so close to Burlish Top. Roads already very busy. Increased pollution from extra traffic will affect nature and young families. Stourport lacks road infrastructure of Kidderminster. Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth.
Barratt Homes West	<a href="#">LPPO796</a>	Object	Wyre Forest Golf Club - only part of site has been assessed in Green Belt assessment so entire site cannot be released. Should be subject to requirements of para.74 of NPPF. No evidence to show the requirements have been

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Midlands			met. Allocation should be removed,
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO1575</a>	Object	We don't need any more buildings going up in this area. We have enough problems with traffic now coming in and out of Stourport. We don't want our Green Belt spoiled.
	<a href="#">LPPO185</a>	Object	Further to my previous objection comment it must be noted that the field now has a major STW pipeline dissecting it which is not engineered to be built on. The site is also still settling from the many years of infill, up to 15m in the central section. There are several seasonal ponds caused by settlement, these will grow over time as further settlement takes place. Key facts regarding this proposed site have been over looked, when these are taking into consideration it is clear that the site should not be included within the Local Plan
	<a href="#">LPPO1668</a>	Object	Stourport has a very poor road network and more houses will worsen, esp. The Kingsway as a country lane
	<a href="#">LPPO3807</a>	Support	<p>I support the release of land at site LI/2, subject to significant landscape considerations.</p> <p>The whole of the western edge of Stourport lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. It is appropriate that all settlements make a contribution to the current housing shortages. Even though the LPR commissioned research defines Wyre Forest as a self- sustaining housing market, it does not mean that, in the plan period, this might not change in different economic or transport circumstances. House prices in Wyre Forest compared to other districts in Worcestershire and nearby metropolitan boroughs are significantly lower and the reasons for this might change. The plan makes little provision for this area becoming more attractive because it is so cheap and commuting becomes easier with improved transport- such as new train station and services, as well as an impact because of low carbon technologies- electric cars for example.</p> <p>In relation to site LI /2, a large part of the site is in a visually prominent location and would be only too apparent for a wide local area. A policy of the plan should set out at this stage that only the lower-Lying areas of 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> <p>Burlish Top is a very well used resource for recreation- cycling and dog walking - and its car park is very cramped- rightly so in order to protect a beautiful and large oak tree. Part of the northern most land could be used to provide</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a car park for the Wildlife reserve at Burlish Top.</p> <p>However the above aspects need to be set out in the Local Plan at this stage so as to secure appropriate development.</p> <p>In relation to the housing market, site LI/2 could also be designated for use by self-build applicants. Green technologies, design codes, landscaping and materials guidance should also be set out at this stage so prospective developers are aware of the significance/importance of the site, It is an opportunity for the Council to set standards for the future as well as contribute to the housing market in an innovative way.</p> <p>Overall, the plan does not require enough of prospective developers. Some of the sites are significant areas and masterplans, guiding principles and 'green infrastructures' should be required at this stage in the Local Plan and at Outline. Specifying the need for future-proofing designs, layout principles so as to drive uniqueness in landscape, access, housing and open space, as well as providing for housing designs adaptability for future purposes, with regard to new technologies as well as existing green ones, should be made explicit in the Local Plan. It would set a standard that reassures local communities that new areas will add to their betterment in living near to it- it will have direct benefits for them- by green routes connected open spaces and clear identities by block designs and legibility. Such broad principles have to be set out in the Local Plan now so as to be sustainable for the future and deliver excellence where there is already a presumption of approval by NPPG guidance.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1749</a>	Support	<p>Avoid building on Green Belt when you have land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf course L1/2 and the land the runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where the children and parents are in walking distance. Worried about travellers moving on site.</p> <p>Re. Stourport - There is a lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries Dentists and Public Transport in this area. Stourport needs a good public transport infrastructure in place first and a decent and safe cycle path if you are going to increase the amount of houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO727</a>	Support	use land at top of Kingsway for mixed housing and green space

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO4030</a>	Comment	The proposal for development at Lickhill Road North does compromise open land and will, without doubt, add extra pressure to a very busy junction (Burlish Crossing traffic lights) which currently sees regular traffic queues outside residential properties.
	<a href="#">LPPO1895</a>	Comment	LI/6/7 Obviously I am concerned about its effect on the value of my home, and on the Green Belt.  Will the dwellings will be private or council homes. Will their access be from Lickhill Road North? When will construction begin?
	<a href="#">LPPO3389</a>	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO384</a>	Comment	Re: Lickhill Road North LI/6/7 - Roads around Burlish Crossing are already heavily congested and additional traffic would cause further congestion at the Swan Hotel/High street junction.
	<a href="#">LPPO3511</a>	Object	We strongly object to building houses on the fields at the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road North and on the garden centre and horse paddocks on the Lickhill Road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a loss of Green Belt areas, a lot more traffic with higher noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes Stourport has no by-pass and no ring road.</li> <li>• There will be loss of wildlife habitat and impact on a variety of plants.</li> <li>• Loss of productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• More people needing facilities such as school, doctors, dentists etc.</li> </ul> <p>Surely there are a number of brown sites that can be used for a limited number of houses. We certainly object to building on Green Belt areas.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3568</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available.</li> <li>• Inadequate facilities.</li> <li>• We need to safeguard what we have for suture generations.</li> <li>• Only doing it for extra council tax and to provide for Birmingham overspill.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planners have allowed developments go ahead before without listening to objections.</li> <li>• Building companies are to large and have too much money for objections to be noted.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3600</a>	Object	L1/6/7: Kingsway traffic is already busy and noisy. More houses would add to this. The schools could not cope with more pupils doctors/local hospitals are already stretched; we do not need more housing in the area due to lack of infrastructure
	<a href="#">LPPO4207</a>	Object	<p>I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</p> <p>Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3974</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urbanisation, threatening the existing public Rights of Way. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. We think that building would have impact on the vast variety of plant and wildlife.</p> <p>Significant increased traffic on all roads on Bewdley Road North, Burlish Estate and Lickhill Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs which will effect times for emergency services to reach destinations.</p> <p>Traffic noise and higher emission of exhaust fumes with results of higher risk to local residents.</p> <p>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing despite promises of a "by-pass.</p> <p>Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to another area to attend school.</p> <p>Lack of other facilities i.e. GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4043</a>	Object	Garden Centre/Horse Paddocks (L16/7) very small development, give the 'garden centre' the opportunity to move

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			to the already used ground on the Bewdley Road, leaving 'The Paddocks' in situ.
	<a href="#">LPPO662</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even more traffic noise.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• Erosion of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Possibly even more development even nearer to house.</li> <li>• Was never informed of this development – I can not express how strongly we object.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO437</a>	Object	<p>I object to loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</p> <p>The development will significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</p> <p>This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time take for emergency services to reach their destinations.</p> <p>Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</p> <p>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</p> <p>Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</p> <p>Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitat there are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</p> <p>There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugar Beet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1988</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Kingsway, Burlish and Lickhill Road due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from large tailbacks.</li> <li>2. Significant impact on facilities e.g. GP surgeries, dentists, hospitals already over burdened.</li> <li>3. Impact on schools – larger class sizes or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to outside area to school.</li> <li>4. Impact on wildlife habitat and Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>5. Lack of bypass to alleviate traffic in Stourport</li> <li>6. Loss of Green Belt status which should protect countryside and protect rights of way.</li> <li>7. No evidence of shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by brownfield sites e.g. Power Station site.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2059</a>	Object	<p>Land Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the traffic increase in already congested area.</li> <li>• Need land for food production post Brexit.</li> <li>• Use brownfield site e.g. near Tesco first.</li> <li>• Build affordable housing near shops/services for people w/o own transport.</li> <li>• Do not take the Green Belt as an easy option</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2064</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way.</li> <li>• Burlish Top Nature Reserve under threat/decrease in wildlife</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of road infrastructure in Stourport/increase in traffic noise/pollution in area/total upgrade of roads in Wyre Forest would be necessary</li> <li>• New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers</li> <li>• Lead to extreme pressure on – schools, doctors, dentists, gas/electricity and water/sewage suppliers</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4038</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic,</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4045</a>	Object	<p>Re; Kingsway/Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road housing plans.</p> <p>I wish to state my objection to any of these housing plans. The roads on Burlish/Lickhill and Bewdley Road are already being used as rat runs when Stourport is at gridlock, which is now a daily occurrence and can't cope with any more traffic never mind the population with the inevitable building of houses. Stourport has no other roads in order to alleviate or divert traffic. If there is a requirement for housing needs there can be met in the area of the dual carriageway, where there is unused land or land being used to put yet more industrial units on, which either lie un-let or are not necessity or added value to the area.</p> <p>Green Belt is Green Belt and we have so little of it, or peaceful areas to walk and ride horses and feel safe and the wildlife will be destroyed, particularly at Burlish Top.</p> <p>Houses mean requirements for schools and doctors and dentists and we are already at overflow point with all of there. If you want to encourage tourism and welcome visitors to Stourport, let's keep the bit of beauty we have left. Thank you.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4053</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increase in housing will bring more traffic, noise and air pollution.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion need to be addressed in Stourport.</li> <li>• Doctors will not be able to cope with more patients.</li> <li>• Plans need to be put in place to alleviate these problems before any developments go ahead.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4069</a>	Object	I object to LI/5 because of already heavy traffic in area and already busy facilities e.g. Drs would not cope
	<a href="#">LPPO3570</a>	Object	Object. This area in the proposal is obviously Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3586</a>	Object	<p>I wish to make my comments and raise objections to the plans affecting all age groups living in the vicinity of these three areas.</p> <p>My list as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl and threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads in Burlish Park, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times suffers significantly from long tailbacks at present.</li> <li>• This increase will inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach the residents. Not to forget, for us, non car drivers, the appalling bus service that already exists and will certainly not improve the situation (already difficult getting to appointments).</li> <li>• The erosion of what makes Wyre Forest special, the three towns keeping their separate identities.</li> <li>• GP surgeries and dentists will struggle to cope with such an influx of patients.</li> <li>• As an ex teacher, schools will definitely suffer – they are not big enough to cope – class sizes will increase and it will be back to mobile classrooms and lack of parking for parents picking up their children – adding to the traffic chaos.</li> <li>• The wonderful addition we have of Burlish Nature Reserve will be affected by loss of wildlife. There are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields and rare plant species too. These spaces are all too rare and must be cherished.</li> <li>• Surely there are many brownfield sites that can be utilised within Wyre Forest. Once again Stourport-on-Severn comes out worst affected.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster a ring road but Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic.</li> <li>• My objections are not of the ‘in my backyard’ syndrome but a plea for an already over crowded little town not to grow anymore. We do not have the infrastructure to grow further and let us keep the cherished parts of put town that make it a place we want to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3596</a>	Object	Object
	<a href="#">LPPO3604</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the proposal</li> <li>• Kingsway is already a very road between Kidderminster to Bewdley with speeding issues</li> <li>• The proposal will impact on schools, doctors/dentists and wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3661</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status. The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected.</p> <p>Traffic at ALL times of the day is extremely busy. An extra 300+ properties centred around this area without additional major roads included in your plans will be very foolhardy</p> <p>The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity. GP’s, Dentists and all local schools will not be able to cope!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3399</a>	Object	Need to protect Green Belt; loss of habitat, increased traffic, pollution, schools full, doctors would not be able to cope, no evidence to justify building on Green Belt
	<a href="#">LPPO1656</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Increase in traffic/pollution</li> <li>• Stourport is already a bottleneck</li> <li>• Local amenities – schools/GP Surgeries full.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO3414</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can't see justification for building at Burlish crossing:</li> <li>• Lack of roads/schools and doctors/dentists already busy</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3047</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly object to loss of Green Belt status.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Object to the increase in road noise and extra pollution from exhaust fumes.</li> <li>• Stourport does not have ring road or by pass like Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Will more schools, GP and dental surgeries be built?</li> <li>• Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO663</a>	Object	Object to proposed allocations
	<a href="#">LPPO2622</a>	Object	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2704</a>	Object	If LI/6/7 goes ahead the traffic situation will become even more horrendous leading to public safety and environmental impacts of untenable proportion.
	<a href="#">LPPO2021</a>	Object	We don't want any building on Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2070</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the sewers be able to cope with the extra quantity generated by 80 homes?</li> <li>• Will the water supply be sufficient to cope with these extra 80 homes or will the current houses suffer from pressure supply drop.</li> <li>• Current the traffic builds up, pass the junction of the Kingsway and Elan Avenue with an extra 80 homes, say 120 cars. This will get worse and take longer to clear up, down passed Windermere Way onto Burlish</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Crossing traffic lights.
	<a href="#">LPPO2083</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of brownfield not Green Belt land</li> <li>• Proposed plans would increase of traffic, pollution, medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Don't let profit be the major factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4204</a>	Object	Object to LI/6/7.
	<a href="#">LPPO1836</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects.</li> <li>• Local facilities inadequate.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4205</a>	Object	<p>My objection is that the road and infrastructure cannot cope with anymore traffic on the Bewdley Road and crossroads at lights between 7:00-9:30am and 3:00pm-7:00pm it is gridlock most of the time which will also effect on the L/1/2 site proposed. The Kingsway will not be big enough to cope another reason is the Nature Reserve just coming back to how is should be.</p> <p>The boundaries between Kidderminster and Stourport are just yards apart known so let's just keep it as it is.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3995</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>area to attend school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugar Beet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4015</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugar Beet Factory</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			(Kidderminster).
	<a href="#">LPPO4071</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt/wildlife.</li> <li>2. more traffic/junctions on roads already congested at peak times</li> <li>3. Stourport has already increased population</li> <li>4. Impact on GPs, dentists, schools etc.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3074</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road is very busy not only with cars belonging to the residents between Burlish crossroads and Stourport town but also it is used as a bypass to avoid the one way system for areas over the bridge.</li> <li>• I really don't think that the space between the Scout Hut and Ravenhurst Rest Home is big enough for 90 houses, there are only 16 or so on this side of the road opposite to the field so it must be a very dense development with small houses and close together.</li> <li>• There is also a pipeline running across the middle of the field that was put in 30 years or more ago</li> <li>• Public transport can be difficult.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3324</a>	Object	<p>Sites L1/6/7 Lickhill Road North represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. The volume of traffic has increased substantially in the past 7 years, to the point where it can be difficult to leave our property. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Other core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will also increase the traffic at Burlish</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			lights, I don't see how development at L1/6/7 can be integrated into the area with adequate transport facilities for both existing and new residents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3341</a>	Object	Proposals for Burlish/Lickhill areas - traffic already at standstill at peak times. Greenfields are all there is to separate 3 different towns. Doctors/dentists - hard to get appointment. Schools - not enough places.
	<a href="#">LPPO3344</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very concerned about developing sites in the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and Steatite Way.</li> <li>• Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing,</li> <li>• Pressure on local schools already at capacity with waiting lists,</li> <li>• Pressure on GP's and NHS dentist,</li> <li>• Retaining Stourport's character and identity,</li> <li>• Threat to wildlife,</li> <li>• Pollution,</li> <li>• Additional traffic and places pressure on road network</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3384</a>	Object	Object to proposals around Burlish
	<a href="#">LPPO3395</a>	Object	Concerned at loss of Green Belt land so close to Burlish Top. Roads already very busy. Increased pollution from extra traffic will affect nature and young families. Stourport lacks road infrastructure of Kidderminster. Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth.
	<a href="#">LPPO3422</a>	Object	<p>I object to these new developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt /existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Increase in already bad traffic</li> <li>• Affect on emergency services</li> <li>• Increase in traffic noise/ fumes health risk</li> <li>• No Stourport by pass</li> <li>• Lack of facilities e.g. GP surgeries, schools and dentists</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat and productive agricultural land.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use brownfield first</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3490</a>	Object	<p>Asking if there is evidence to prove that more housing is really needed. Is the population really increasing and are there really not enough Brownfield sites?</p> <p>Asking if there will be any increase in bus services, doctor's surgeries, schools and policing because they do not believe current support services will cope with a growing population.</p> <p>Questioning the rationale behind building more houses and if it's simply to make more money for the Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3518</a>	Object	<p>We object to the collective three sites (referred to figures stated above) being the subject of new developments. When there are a number of Brownfield sites that should take priority over Green Belt sites. We all heartily support the 10 points of objections put forward by the Burlish &amp; Lickhill Green friends against these proposals.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3520</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/6/7 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Est., Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> <li>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3603</a>	Object	<p>I was unaware of these proposals/deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/prime agricultural land for food production</li> <li>• Preferred option must be brownfield sites.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More traffic = more noise/pollution. Plan will compound area’s existing traffic problems.</li> <li>• GP/dental surgeries/local schools already oversubscribed</li> <li>• Negative impact on businesses at top of Lickhill Rd and wild/plant life</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3651</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools.</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3653</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on local roads = more noise/fumes</li> <li>3. Kingsway already subject to speeding</li> <li>4. Impact on capacity of schools, GPs, dentists</li> <li>5. Loss of wildlife and agricultural land</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3660</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposed plan due to the loss of Green Belt when there are areas that are empty buildings in Kidderminster than can be used to more effect.</li> <li>2. There isn’t enough spaces in schools as there is</li> <li>3. It takes too long to get any GP, dentists</li> <li>4. The road network now struggles with the demand of vehicles let alone extra carbon footprint emissions.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO3708</a>	Object	<p>Without more houses being built there are traffic jams every weekday early morning, mid afternoon and early evening in Kingsway, Windermere Way, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. There are also traffic problems outside the schools in Kingsway/Windermere Way with the school run vehicles and Kingsway is also used as a shortcut for lorries (Talbot largest culprit) and at times when the A451 Kidderminster Road is blocked because the town roads are blocked with traffic.</p> <p>More cars means more pollution, will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles and poor public transport adding to number of cars on the road.</p> <p>The compulsory purchase of a Care Home in Lickhill Road (another kick in the teeth for the elderly of the area), loss of a business and peoples horse riding hobby.</p> <p>Nearest doctors are based in Stourport. They will not cope with the extra numbers of patients. Are there enough places available at the schools?</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3714</a>	Object	<p>We had not received any notification of these plans which we think is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of Green Belt Land makes a mockery of Green Belt Status, and is a precedent that will affect existing farmland, public access / rights-of-way.</p> <p>Stourport-on-Severn is expected to support the local allocation of houses but while Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring-road and a proposed new road to cope with both housing and extra traffic, Stourport-on-Severn does not have the existing or planned infrastructure to cope and the significant amounts of proposed traffic. This will have knock on environmental effects, and the traffic affecting existing local traffic and emergency service access at peak times.</p> <p>Local schools and NHS services are already stretched; there is no proposal for how this will be dealt with, and will</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>lead to increased class sizes, longer waiting lists or people having to travel outside of the area which will further add traffic to areas where overspill fills the requirements.</p> <p>The plans will lead to a loss of both good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Skylarks, Linnets and other red-listed birds nest in these proposed sites. The use of the Kingsway field will also, we believe, have a significant impact on the diversity of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no evidence that in the Wyre Forest area the shortfall cannot be met by the use of brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport-on-Severn) and Sugar Beet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3727</a>	Object	<p>I should like to object to the building of houses at Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7). They would mean an additional 331 houses together with the extra cars, in an area that cannot cope now at certain times of the day. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The extra traffic would result in a reduction in air quality and additional noise, plus the unnecessary use of Green Belt land with no provision it seems for medical and educational services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2270</a>	Object	<p>Our wonderful view has already been ruined by a thick hedge which darkens our lounge. If houses are then put along there which we were assured was Green Belt land and would never be built on, we will also lose the remaining view from our bedroom window.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4220</a>	Object	<p>Stourport has a very poor road network at present and more houses will only add to the problems. The Kingsway in particular is a country lane and the plans for LI/2 will create more traffic on an already dangerous road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2907</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to this site being used.</li> <li>• It is a greenfield site.</li> <li>• Greenfield sites are subject to Green Belt status - should not be concreted or tarmacked over.</li> <li>• Traffic from site will create more congestion on an already busy road.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1881</a>	Object	Object LI/6/7
	<a href="#">LPPO2024</a>	Object	<p>The two reasons for my objection are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses mean more people and more cars which mean more fumes which is bad for health.</li> <li>• Bewdley Road can't cope with more cars at peak times morning/evening. There are already queues from the lights at Burlish traffic light, some very long.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2112</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt land must be protected at all costs.</li> <li>• Doctors and Dentists will find it difficult to cope with extra people.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Emergency services will find it difficult at busy times on our roads.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3559</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses=more cars – already busy crossroads/increased traffic.</li> <li>• No infrastructure is in place around Stourport for increased population/traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3598</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Further development between Stourport and Kidderminster in the open area should not be permitted to</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>prevent link-up of these two towns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. Kingsway is already a dangerous road caused by speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will also affect time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. The impact of building houses would have significant impact on vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3599</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt areas.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill and Bewdley Road, (this has a massive impact on us all).</li> <li>• Health risks from traffic.</li> <li>• Increase in school places and classes getting bigger.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries, emergency services.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Use sites such as old brownfield sites</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3602</a>	Object	<p>I object to the development in Kingsway/Lickhill Road areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads here are not coping with the current amount of traffic esp. at peak times adding more traffic would increase this problem and be dangerous for pedestrians</li> <li>• Schools/Doctors surgeries are currently stretched</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife/residents will suffer if green spaces lost</li> <li>• Other areas/empty properties could be used</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3650</a>	Object	<p>The noise, emissions of exhaust fumes, getting on and off out drives, when there's no hold ups we have to put up with speeding cars along Kingsway.</p> <p>Lack of facilities as such GP surgeries, dentists and schools.</p> <p>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing. Only hold ups with too much traffic, road works or accidents. How ill emergency services cope?</p> <p>The impact of building houses in Kingsway field would have significant impact on plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3713</a>	Object	<p>Object Kingsway/Burlish crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic congestion, noise pollution/fumes</li> <li>• Burlish top nature reserve would be ruined/wildlife lost</li> <li>• Capacity of NHS services/Drs/dentists/schools and access by emergency services.</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to cope with extra traffic e.g. a bypass</li> <li>• Don't build on the agricultural land instead do something for the community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3725</a>	Object	<p>My objection centres around the building of houses under Option B, specifically relating to Burlish Crossing. The provision of 157 houses on the site when coupled to the core sites of Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2) and Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7) would mean an additional 331 houses, perhaps 600 extra cars, in an area that struggles at</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>times to cope with the volume of traffic currently. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The resultant reduction in air quality, additional noise pollution and increased damage to road surfaces would lead to further strain on local medical and other community services, protracted response times from emergency services and increased dangers to pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>Without adequate provision for additional schools, medical facilities and other community services I believe this option to be ill conceived.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3733</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Although I don't strongly agree with any of the options available but do strongly contest the Core development areas in the Burlish/ Lickhill areas, I do understand, just from the basic maths, that there is a need for additional housing within the district. However, I have raised my main concerns above to highlight the obvious issues that I assume someone within the Planning Policy Team has already considered.</p> <p>Following the drop-in and after having reviewed the documents again online I have a few points/queries to make, in particular in respect of the Core housing sites in the Burlish/Kingsway and Lickhill areas of Stourport and also the Option B sites, in particular the one at Burlish Crossing:</p> <p>In respect of the sites highlighted for Option B (especially within the Burlish/Lickhill area) I have a few concerns which I'd like to raise:</p> <p>- Road networks and traffic - Both of the core housing sites at Lickhill and the Kingsway along with the Option B site at LI/5 would have a detrimental effect on the congestion within the local area. These three sites would potentially mean 331 new homes could be built within a 1/4 of a mile of each other, thus raising the concern that there could be potentially 331 more vehicles using the 3 main roads in this area being Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road and The Kingsway. Currently, even without these additional houses, the traffic at Burlish Crossings is already a complete nightmare and inconvenience for all commuters going to/from work and/or school. With these additional (potential) developments I can only assume that this congestion will continue to become a more</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>difficult problem to solve.</p> <p>- Roads networks and safety - Similarly these additional vehicles will be using roads which are direct links to the High School and several primary schools within the area, which surely raises a safety concern? Should we be encouraging increased use of The Kingsway, Windermere Way and Lickhill Road given the number of children who use those routes to school every day? Also, if these sites in particular were to be developed where would the access to those 'estates' be? I would assume accessing a large housing development from any of these roads would mean that traffic systems would need to be put in place to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike - would this mean more traffic due to signalling on top of the expected increased in vehicle numbers?</p> <p>- Road networks/ The Bridge - it probably goes without saying that the traffic issues on the Stourport Bridge are already a major problem for the town. The Option B sites, in their vastness, backing onto the Areley Kings area of Stourport would only add to this problem. I have been informed that if a developer were to buy this land then a second bridge and supporting roads would be built - what would the impact of this buildings works be on the town's road infrastructure in the meantime? Also, where would that bridge be located and what would the environmental impacts of that development be?</p> <p>- Schools - The schools within the Burlish and Lickhill vicinity are already over-subscribed each year with many children being rejected from their first choice (and quite often most local) primary school. From the Plan document I can see that there are several options available to deal with the potential increase in children within the area, however 0.5FE proposals are almost a complete waste of time as sustaining a structure within a primary school with an additional 0.5FE is almost impossible with the current funding cuts being made by central government. What 0.5FE increase would do, would be to unnecessarily force joint year group teaching in order to deliver efficient and break-even budgets. Your education team will well know that this is not the most effective way of delivering the curriculum and could also have negative effects on future OFSTED ratings, particularly if pressure is going to be put on to teaching staff to deliver to larger group of pupils. This is one of the easiest ways to make Stourport a less attractive town of choice as parents currently have the knowledge that primary schools within these areas are OFSTED good or outstanding! Similarly, 1FE primary schools are as difficult to sustain, especially within such areas where the majority of students receive only basic funding but the normal costs of running a school still have to be met. Have governors of all local primary schools been informed of the suggestions</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>within the plan so that they can think about succession planning if any of these sites were to be developed? Would their budgets be able to handle any potential changes? Where would a new development for a 1FE school be situated if this were the route that was taken in Stourport, I would assume it would be in the over-subscribed areas? If so, Green Belt?</p> <p>- Medical centres - As above for schools. Local medical centres, surgeries and hospitals are already working to capacity - would residents then be expected to travel longer distances into Kidderminster to seek medical attention? Would Kidderminster Hospital A&amp;E department be re-instated by the time all of the development is complete and these 5,400 dwelling have been built?</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly object to the sites that have been included in the Core housing plans and Option B which would so strongly affect the Burlish and Lickhill areas of Stourport for all of the above mentioned reasons.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3986</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to object to the proposed use for the area LI/6/7 Stourport-on-Severn, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status. Our Green areas need to be protected at all costs, for existing &amp; future residents, and for the good of the environment and country as a whole. No Green Belt status areas should be up for consideration for housing.</p> <p>Overcrowding. All three of these proposed sites already have more than enough houses situated within a relatively small area. From what I have read, it would seem 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.</p> <p>I would hope that plans for housing in this area will be restricted to Brownfield sites only, and kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution. The Burlish Estate/Kingsway/Lickhill roads are more than busy enough as things are. More housing would inevitably increase the volume of traffic, traffic noise, and pollution to an unacceptable level for these areas.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Quality of life. Green, unspoilt areas are vital to the health and well-being of all of us. We do not want to lose any more of our precious, green, open views. The three new school/college buildings have already encroached enough on our open landscape in this area of Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO1649</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt natural habitat.</li> <li>2. Lack of health care to support a higher population.</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic/pollution.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1759</a>	Object	<p>Opposes development sites L1/6/7, L1/5/ AKR/14, AKR/15.</p> <p>Believes that development will have a negative impact on people living in these areas as the values of their properties will drop because it will affect their outlook.</p> <p>Also concerned about traffic increase on Lickhill Lower, Lickhill and Lickhill North roads. Very busy during school run and speeding during weekends already an issue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1814</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to any more development around Lickhill Road North due to the number of road accidents and speeding.</li> <li>• Concerned about noise and air pollution as a result of increased traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1846</a>	Object	<p>We have recently moved from a busy urban to a rural environment. Why build on Green Belt Land when there is brown belt land available.</p> <p>There isn't the infrastructure to cope with extra traffic or sufficient capacity in local schools and already stretched GP Surgeries.</p> <p>Any housing shortfall in Wyre Forest can be taken up in other areas with existing infrastructure.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4219</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no bus routes, more cars will be needed to take children to already overcrowded schools</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Existing traffic issues esp. at school times in Lickhill Road/Windermere Way</li> <li>3. If there is no play area on the estate children will play in streets which could result in an accident</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3338</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Traffic noise.</li> <li>• Crowded doctors and schools.</li> <li>• Nature.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3332</a>	Object	I object to development on greenfield sites Lickhill Road North LI/6/7.
	<a href="#">LPPO2698</a>	Object	<p>Houses being built in Lickhill Road North (LI/6/7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic will lead to more road noise, pollution &amp; congestion. Where will the entrance and exits be? Causing potential risk of accidents.</li> <li>• Schools already full with lack of places for children. Where will the new house residents' children go?</li> <li>• The land is already owned and being used for its intended purpose, where horses are kept and grazing. Why take this away?</li> <li>• Road surface not suitable for extra traffic and also already as a lack deterrent for speeding, something that would need to be tackled if it was to go ahead.</li> <li>• If it wasn't for local groups making residents aware of this, very few people would be aware.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2107</a>	Object	<p>Objections to Lickhill Road North.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Very busy road, traffic would be worse</li> <li>2. Traffic noise/exhaust fumes health risk</li> <li>3. Loss of Green Belt status</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO2138</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic noise and pollution</li> <li>• Removal of agricultural land have an impact on the wildlife in the area</li> <li>• Building of houses behind property will reduce value of her home.</li> <li>• Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1983</a>	Object	<p>Objects to Burlish and Lickhill development:</p> <p>We object to any development on the Green Belt land and Greenfield sites.</p> <p>There is more than sufficient despoiled land and brownfield sites to accommodate having development – it is vital that Green Belt land is not developed in anyway.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2065</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will add to traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites by Tesco store first.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1909</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley Road North is already a very busy road so more building would cause mayhem.</li> <li>• Local government said there would be more building on brownfield sites not on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1850</a>	Object	<p>I object, on the grounds of loss of Green Belt areas/agricultural land, the increase in traffic/(noise) and the loss/impact any development would have on wildlife, to plans to develop the field at the top of Kingsway that runs parallel with Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North and the area currently a garden centre/horse paddocks on Lickhill Road.</p> <p>Development here would also increase class sizes (which are already high) and impact on the quality of education in local schools. Why can't these developments be built on brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1804</a>	Object	Green Belt

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO1675</a>	Object	<p>The field at the top of Kingsway – object strongly mainly on traffic grounds as this is extremely heavy on working and school days. Also the proximity to the nature reserve.</p> <p>Garden Centre and Paddocks.</p> <p>Also traffic concerns and proximity to Ravenhurst Nursing home.</p> <p>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>
	<a href="#">LPPO608</a>	Object	<p>Enough congestion along Bewdley Road North around the traffic lights as it is. Schools and doctors in the town cannot cope with extra families that are proposed.</p>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO799</a>	Object	<p>Lickhill Road North - lies outside settlement boundary in Green Belt. Has been allocated ahead of suitable/sustainable non-Green Belt sites adjacent to settlement edge. No exceptional circumstances.</p>
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO1576</a>	Object	<p>We don't need any more buildings going up in this area. We have enough problems with traffic now coming in and out of Stourport. We don't want our Green Belt spoiled.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1666</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the increase in already congested traffic/assoc pollution, where is promised bypass?</li> <li>2. Poor bus service</li> <li>3. Schools/Doctors already oversubscribed.</li> </ol>
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">LPPO1960</a>	Support	<p>To the North of the site there is a well established line of trees which will assist in controlling development in this direction but also assist to mitigate the visual impact of the development from public places such as traffic approaching Stourport via Bewdley Road North / Blackstone. Appropriate landscaping can be secured, in the planning process to assist in mitigating the impact of the proposal when viewed from the River Severn to the West. Such planting would enhance the biodiversity of the proposals and assist in creating habitat as a result of the development. The site as it currently stands is highly trafficked and of low ecological value. The remainder of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>the site is grassland which is grazed which again will be of low ecological value.</p> <p>The site at Lickhill Road North would be preferable to Option B (LI/5) as it restricts development moving towards Blackstone. We have had approaches from developers, and promoters, and in that regard (subject to the relevant planning consents) the site is deliverable within the required time-scales for the local plan.</p> <p>Objectors may comment on the inability of the road network to cope with the increase in housing numbers on the area and out into Lickhill Road North. This is clearly a concern with all developments, however, realistically none of the road networks in the district were ever designed to take the increase in housing which we have seen over the last few decades. It is for this reason, amongst others, that there is an emphasis <i>on</i> reduction on the use of the private car and a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF.</p> <p>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. Overall the site has good highway access and visibility in both directions. There are also water, electricity and sewage pipes in close proximity which, subject to approval from the relevant suppliers. There are footpath and pavement links to a number of nature reserves. Within the local area there are schools, community centres, a sports ground and a park as well as local services within walking and cycling distance.</p> <p>Overall this site is one which represents a sustainable location for development, on a site which has been partially developed previously which can be removed from the Green Belt with minimal impact or impacts which could successfully be mitigated.</p> <p>This site would create a good boost to local housing supply as well as a viable scheme for a developer assisting its delivery.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3804</a>	Support	<p>I support the release of land at site LI/6/7, subject to significant landscape considerations.</p> <p>The whole of the western edge of Stourport, lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. It is appropriate that all settlements make a contribution to the current housing shortages. Even though the LPR</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>commissioned research defines Wyre Forest as a self-sustaining housing market, it does not mean that, in the plan period, this might not change in different economic or transport circumstances. House prices in Wyre Forest compared to other districts in Worcestershire and nearby metropolitan boroughs are significantly lower and the reasons for this might change. The plan makes little provision for this area becoming more attractive because it is so cheap and commuting becomes easier with improved transport- such as new train station and services, as well as an impact because of low carbon technologies- electric cars for example.</p> <p>Site LI/6 seems under-used agricultural land with a marginally viable garden centre as an unattractive interface between urban and rural landscapes. Again, requiring a significant contribution to green infrastructure and technologies at this slightly elevated would help the development blend into the landscape context.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO726</a>	Support	Use garden centre site for mixed housing with green space

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/1 – BRIDGE STREET BASINS**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3701</a>	Comment	It is surprising to note the proposal to build 17 houses at the old Lloyd's garage site in Bridge St, Stourport. When council tax payers' money was used to compulsory purchase this site it was for the intention of transforming it into an attractive entrance to the Basins, thus enhancing Stourport as a tourist destination. There was no mention of housing at the time. Once again this would seem to contradict the Council's stated aim to increase developments in Stourport "which focus on tourism, particularly capitalising on the historic canal basins ..." (LPR; section 6 p34)
	<a href="#">LPPO2102</a>	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AKR/1 – site set aside to access to the canal basins - claw back cost if not?</li> <li>• Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</li> <li>• Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food &amp; entertainment.</li> </ul>
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1299</a>	Comment	Following agreement with Advantage West Midlands this site was set aside to provide improved access to the basins' area. Any attempt to develop it for housing will result in a demand for "claw back" from the successor body to Advantage West Midlands.
	<a href="#">LPPO2620</a>	Support	Should be developed for mixed use - residential with retail. The retail units would complement and enhance the existing retail units within the town.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/2 - CHEAPSIDE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO3409</a>	Comment	Some sites are not being brought forward for development by allegedly unrealistic assumptions of development value by the landowners. The Council might wish to consider Planning or Regeneration CPO powers to bring such landowners to a realistic expectation of land value. Cost and risk of promoting a CPO would need to be considered as part of a scheme being brought forward.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO3404</a>	Object	AKR/2 – Cheapside – Part of site is subject to flood risk. Framework makes it clear that development should be directed to sites within Flood Zone 1 before sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Site should be removed and an alternative site with a lower risk of flooding allocated for development. Site not currently available. Needs evidence that the site should not be protected for employment purposes before a mixed use allocation is pursued.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO800</a>	Object	Cheapside - 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.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1445</a>	Object	Cheapside - 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.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/7 – SWAN HOTEL**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO236</a>	Comment	The whole of the Swan/Workmen's Club site is indicated, I was told that this represents land ownership and the whole site is not affected. As indicated two successful enterprises are to be removed including a property locally listed. This needs significant clarification to indicate the areas involved. 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.
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO3312</a>	Comment	Swan Hotel/Workmen's Club: this site appears to include a bowling green
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1300</a>	Comment	<p>The partial loss of Vale Road car park has put pressure on parking in the town centre. This affects both shopping provision, viability of local businesses and the night-time economy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We are curious as to how development of this site would improve the frontage on Lickhill Road which is narrow and has a number of difficult junctions.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3612</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AKR/7 – Swan/workmen's club/bowling green are important social centres with car parking which should be maintained.</li> <li>• Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</li> <li>• Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food &amp; entertainment.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3711</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AKR/7 Swan Hotel/Workmens' Club - Regeneration of The Swan Hotel has been a success and should remain</li> <li>• Housing would worsen already congested traffic in town centre</li> <li>• No walking access to rail links or reliable bus service at present</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/7 – SWAN HOTEL**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2643</a>	Object	We would like to comment on the proposed compulsory purchase of the workmen's club in Stourport. This club has been well established for several decades, and has a thriving membership. 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 people out of work and should therefore be removed by WFDC from any compulsory purchase or future residential development plans
	<a href="#">LPPO2616</a>	Object	I do not agree with compulsory purchase of the Swan Hotel as Robert Plant and Worley's Strings have invested a lot of money doing it up and it is an asset to the town in its current state.
Stourport Workmen's Club	<a href="#">LPPO1547</a>	Object	<p>Stourport Workmen's Club Management Committee wish to register our protest in the strongest terms against the stated intention of Wyre Forest District Council to compulsory purchase our club and to replace it with twenty dwellings.</p> <p>Stourport Workmen's Club is one of the oldest established private clubs in Worcestershire with over 700 members and a dominant social hub of Stourport. It is used by Stourport Civic Society, RAOB and as an Election Polling Station.</p> <p>Presently, there is a rising tide of resentment and anger amongst Stourport residents about their perception of many of WFDC's actions disposing in favour of Kidderminster, with Stourport being ignored or treated as a poor relative.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO674</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of the "Stourport Workmans Club"</p> <p>Used as venue for wide variety of social occasions.</p> <p>Why consider this site when the site at the "Bond Worth" former factory has been lying idle for so many years?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3550</a>	Comment	AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth site to be used for housing before AKR/14 Pearl Lane or AKR/15 Rectory Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO3221</a>	Comment	On the site of the large Tesco stores in Stourport there was supposed to be houses allocated, this is an area that would be worth reviewing again.
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO1259</a>	Comment	Some sites are not being brought forward for development by allegedly unrealistic assumptions of development value by the landowners. The Council might wish to consider Planning or Regeneration CPO powers to bring such landowners to a realistic expectation of land value. Cost and risk of promoting a CPO would need to be considered as part of a scheme being brought forward.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO3405</a>	Object	AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth –site had planning permission for 159 units which lapsed. Is site suitable and deliverable? The allocation should be removed from the plan
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1446</a>	Object	Carpets of Worth - planning permission has lapsed which calls into question suitability and deliverability of site. Allocation should be removed.
	<a href="#">LPPO2228</a>	Object	<p>Objects to AKR/20 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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?</li> <li>2. There will be a large increase in footfall of people wanting to get from Cheapside into the High Street area of town. At the moment, a large number of walking groups, motorbikes, quad bikes, push bikes and even horses come through Waters Edge, which is a private development, even though there is a public Right of Way, running parallel only a couple of metres away.</li> <li>3. A number of residents of Waters Edge are very unhappy about the “traffic” coming through Waters Edge a moment, as, because it is a private development, we as owners are responsible for the cost of repairing the roadway, pavements, etc. It is NOT a Public Right of Way!!! The Public Right of Way should be highlighted by signs and the Water’s Edge development should have a gate erected on its entrance off</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Mart Lane, to stop the “traffic”. Our concerns are that this “traffic” will increase hugely with the Cheapside redevelopment. How can we get a gate erected?</p> <p>4. The development of the land by Tesco, again for housing. The roadway that comes from Tesco on to Severn Road gets very congested. I have seen the Tesco car park at total grid-lock on many weekends. The traffic lights at the Severn Road and Mitton junction cause a back up of traffic along Severn Road, right past Tesco and round the bend towards the new River Stour crossing. This means no one can get out of Tesco!! More houses will exacerbate these issues. The road from Tesco should have been built with a filter lane to the left, so that traffic wanting to go left could get out. What will be done about this?</p> <p>5. The junction of Discovery Road with the Worcester Road. Again, more thought should have gone into this. Traffic lights or a mini roundabout need to be erected to keep the traffic flowing. You can wait up to 5 minutes trying to get out of Discovery Road to turn right onto the Worcester Road at peak times and weekends.</p> <p>6. What provisions are there going to be made for the occupants of the new housing all over Stourport for schools and Doctors Surgeries?</p> <p>7. 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2229</a>	Object	<p>Objects to AKR/20 due to the following reasons:</p> <p>1. 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?</p> <p>2. There will be a large increase in footfall of people wanting to get from Cheapside into the High Street area of town. At the moment, a large number of walking groups, motorbikes, quad bikes, push bikes and even horses come through Waters Edge, which is a private development, even though there is a public Right of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Way, running parallel only a couple of metres away.</p> <p>3. A number of residents of Waters Edge are very unhappy about the “traffic” coming through Waters Edge a moment, as, because it is a private development, we as owners are responsible for the cost of repairing the roadway, pavements, etc. It is NOT a Public Right of Way!!! The 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”. Our concerns are that this “traffic” will increase hugely with the Cheapside redevelopment. How can we get a gate erected?</p> <p>4. The development of the land by Tesco, again for housing. The roadway that comes from Tesco on to Severn Road gets very congested. I have seen the Tesco car park at total grid-lock on many weekends. The traffic lights at the Severn Road and Mitton junction cause a back up of traffic along Severn Road, right past Tesco and round the bend towards the new River Stour crossing. This means no one can get out of Tesco!! More houses will exacerbate these issues. The road from Tesco should have been built with a filter lane to the left, so that traffic wanting to go left could get out. What will be done about this?</p> <p>5. The junction of Discovery Road with the Worcester Road. Again, more thought should have gone into this. Traffic lights or a mini roundabout need to be erected to keep the traffic flowing. You can wait up to 5 minutes trying to get out of Discovery Road to turn right onto the Worcester Road at peak times and weekends.</p> <p>6. What provisions are there going to be made for the occupants of the new housing all over Stourport for schools and Doctors Surgeries?</p> <p>7. 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.</p>
Barratt Homes West	<a href="#">LPPO802</a>	Object	Carpets of Worth - planning permission has lapsed which calls into question suitability and deliverability of site. Allocation should be removed.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Midlands			
	<a href="#">LPPO2615</a>	Support	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4512</a>	Support	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'.
	<a href="#">LPPO3329</a>	Support	Re: Carpets of Worth AKR/20  There is a large area of land, adjacent to the Tesco store, already allocated for housing but has lain unused for a considerable time. This 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?
	<a href="#">LPPO728</a>	Support	Use site for mixed housing

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/1 – COUNTY BUILDINGS, STOURPORT**

<b>Company / Organisation</b>	<b>Response No</b>	<b>Type of Response</b>	<b>Summary of Responses</b>
	<a href="#">LPPO730</a>	Comment	Rebuild health centre with better facilities on site.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO3406</a>	Object	MI/1 – County Buildings – Ongoing review to relocate to emergency hub, no certainty site will available for development. The allocation should be removed
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO803</a>	Object	County Buildings - range of uses on site - looking to relocate. Until this is complete there is no certainty that site will be available and allocation should be removed.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1447</a>	Object	County Buildings - range of uses on site - looking to relocate. Until this is complete there is no certainty that site will be available and allocation should be removed.
Place Partnership Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO1094</a>	Support	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2619</a>	Support	Should be developed for mixed use - residential with retail. The retail units would complement and enhance the existing retail units within the town.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/3 – PARSONS CHAIN, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPP03407</a>	Object	MI/3 – Parsons Chain – The deliverability of the site is questionable. If ‘no requirement for the embankment to be removed as part of the Stourport Relief Road in the future, then a viable scheme may come forward’. Uncertainty regarding the delivery of this site, should be removed from the Plan.
	<a href="#">LPP02818</a>	Object	<p>I am wishing to raise my concerns about the proposed development of Parsons Chain site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic – Worcester and Hartlebury roads are already heavily congested. I would like assurances that thought has been given to access points for these homes.</li> <li>• Woodland - concerned about any suggested removal of the woodland on the old Railway Line behind The Birches.</li> <li>• Schools – What provision is there for school places?</li> </ul> <p>Although I fully understand the need for houses in the Wyre Forest area the proposals made in the consultation lacked thought and foresight for the infrastructure of Stourport and I would like more robust details released to the public.</p>
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01448</a>	Object	Parsons Chain - deliverability is questionable. Depends on need to remove former railway embankment as part of Stourport Relief Road. Site should be removed.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0806</a>	Object	Parsons Chain - deliverability is questionable. Depends on need to remove former railway embankment as part of Stourport Relief Road. Site should be removed.
	<a href="#">LPP03186</a>	Support	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'.
	<a href="#">LPP02617</a>	Support	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.
	<a href="#">LPP0729</a>	Support	use Parsons Chain for mixed housing and green space

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO M1/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3393</a>	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO743</a>	Comment	Agree that MIP site should be developed for housing but not high density and keep well within boundary line. Access - should give way to traffic on Steatite Way. Bus service - none at present. Provision should be considered.
	<a href="#">LPPO3326</a>	Comment	Core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will increase the traffic at Burlish lights.
	<a href="#">LPPO2904</a>	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield site - post-factory.</li> <li>• Can support the use of this area being used for housing development.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4208</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</li> <li>• Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</li> <li>• Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1797</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of brown belt not Green Belt land</li> <li>• Proposed plans would increase of traffic, pollution, medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Don't let profit be the major factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3566</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available.</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate facilities.</li> <li>• We need to safeguard what we have for future generations.</li> <li>• Only doing it for extra council tax and to provide for Birmingham overspill.</li> <li>• Planners have allowed developments go ahead before without listening to objections.</li> <li>• Building companies are too large and have too much money for objections to be</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3601</a>	Object	L1/6/7: Kingsway traffic is already busy and noisy. More houses would add to this. The schools could not cope with more pupils doctors/local hospitals are already stretched; we do not need more housing in the area due to lack of infrastructure and should protect wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO5143</a>	Object	<p>Objects to MI/6 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Bulrish Est, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> <li>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3519</a>	Object	We object to the collective three sites (referred to figures stated above) being the subject of new developments. When there are a number of Brownfield sites that should take priority over Green Belt sites. We all heartily support the 10 points of objections put forward by the Burlish & Lickhill Green friends against these proposals.
	<a href="#">LPPO3562</a>	Object	Object MI/6
	<a href="#">LPPO3626</a>	Support	Supports Steatite Way proposals with the provision that the exit onto Bewdley Road is improved due to several traffic accidents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3308</a>	Support	Other 'Brown Sites' - old Plastic Co area - untouched! Off 'Steatite Way' (M1/6).
	<a href="#">LPPO725</a>	Support	Use MIP site for mixed housing plus green space
Willsgrove Developments	<a href="#">LPPO1001</a>	Support	<p>Support the allocation of Site Ref MI/6 (Steatite Way) for housing use.</p> <p>Insufficient sites within Stourport on Severn's settlement boundary to accommodate the housing needs of the town.</p> <p>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 well lit footpaths from the site to the town centre. A designated cycle path is also present along the length of Bewdley Road on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Site is within walking distance of town centre, two primary schools and Stourport High School. A convenience store is located to the south east of the site on Bewdley Road, some 120 metres from the site entrance. The main facilities within the local area are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dentist</li> <li>• Doctor's surgery</li> <li>• Primary school</li> <li>• Middle school</li> <li>• Secondary school</li> <li>• Community facilities</li> <li>• Convenience store</li> <li>• Bus stops</li> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Post office</li> </ul> <p>Site has excellent access to public transport, located on a bus route (No.16 service) and a number of bus stops within walking distance of the site. The nearest bus stop is within 80 metres. These bus stops provide a frequent</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY,  
STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>bus service, 6 days a week to Stourport on Severn Town Centre and Bewdley.</p> <p>The site is subject to a current planning application for up to 106 dwellings (reference 15/0623/OUTL). It is in the hands of a development company and is available for development. There are no physical constraints that prevent the site from being released for development.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/18 AND MI/33– LAND AT WILDEN LANE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3548</a>	Object	<p><b>M1/18 North of Wilden Lane industrial site.</b></p> <p>I am hugely opposed to any more industrial units on Wilden Lane. We are surrounded by industrial units in this area, many of which are empty.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A majority of the residents of Wilden Lane live very close to the road and we 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.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Wilden has become unbearable since the sugar beet development. Access out on to the A449 McDonalds island is horrendous at rush hour and beyond. At 6.45pm it took me 25minutes to exit Wilden Lane as the traffic generated on the A449 from the new lights do not give way for Wilden traffic. It is much worse at real rush hour with traffic tailing back.</p> <p>Any industrial units will add to noise, air and road pollution and be detrimental to the road and residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO321</a>	Support	<p><b>MI/18</b> My client's support the zoning of their two sites for employment purposes and the removal of M1/18 from the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2475</a>	Object	<p><b>MI/33</b> - People should care about our wildlife. Their habitats deserve to be protected &amp; not continually destroyed. Greenfield sites, nature reserves, and any other site considered necessary for human beings, can be built on or disposed of whenever National or Local Government bodies say so!</p> <p>Rivers get polluted with land waste affecting &amp; killing fish. Huge turbines are built causing the deaths of thousands of birds. Badgers, who are thought to be carrying bovine TB, are killed indiscriminately.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4202</a>	Support	<p><b>MI/33</b> - My client's support the zoning of their two sites for employment purposes.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3436</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area of outstanding natural beauty.</li> <li>2. Roads are already congested/roads cannot cope at present.</li> <li>3. Not enough infrastructure to cope.</li> <li>4. Lack of privacy.</li> <li>5. Noise levels will increase.</li> <li>6. Effect on wildlife.</li> <li>7. No control on my neighbours/anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>8. Loss of view.</li> <li>9. Loss of productive agricultural land.</li> <li>10. Lack of GP surgeries/dentists etc. /local shops etc.</li> <li>11. Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>12. Rather look at present field rather than housing estate.</li> <li>13. Would you like it next to your home?</li> <li>14. Area chosen not suitable for all above reasons/build somewhere else!</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2147</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the proposed plan due to the loss of Green Belt when there are areas that are empty buildings in Kidderminster than can be used to more effect.</li> <li>• There isn't enough spaces in schools as there is</li> <li>• It takes too long to get any GP, dentists</li> <li>• The road network now struggles with the demand of vehicles let alone extra carbon footprint emissions.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2153</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status. The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected.</p> <p>Traffic at ALL times of the day is extremely busy. Extra 300+ properties centred around this area without additional major roads included in your plans will be very foolhardy. The traffic noise and higher emissions will be insufferable.</p> <p>The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity. GP's, Dentists and all local schools will</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			not be able to cope!
	<a href="#">LPPO2752</a>	Comment	<p>Several years ago this Council considered extending Burlish Park estate but decided not to as they were concerned this estate was already too large to consider further expansion. I believe this is still the case.</p> <p>The roads around Burlish Park are already very busy and have safety concerns, in particular the junction between Windermere Way and the Kidderminster/Stourport main road. The area around the schools has many parked cars at the start and end of the school day causing safety issues. The crossroads at Burlish Crossing suffers from heavy congestion especially at busy times.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3291</a>	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO3391</a>	Comment	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.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO2234</a>	Support	<p><b>Landscape Sensitivity:</b> Western edge of Stourport comprises several housing estates which are relatively exposed with little vegetation for screening. Potential development capacity of site is strongly influenced by landform which rises to NE edge. Western boundary will need careful treatment to define transition to wider landscape. GI is proposed along front of site and will incorporate linear SuDS.</p> <p><b>Accessibility to Amenities:</b> Stourport benefits from wide range of services. Site has good access to town centre with local facilities including schools and doctors within 2km walk.</p> <p><b>Highways and Transportation:</b> Bewdley Road North is subject to 30mph speed limit by most of site on approach to crossroads with footpath. Indicative masterplan shows access via Bewdley Road North. Bus services are close to site. Various facilities are within easy walking distance. A Transport Assessment will be completed.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk and Drainage:</b> Site lies in Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding occurs within site alongside main road. These can be dealt with using cut off ditches or French drains. Bedrock geology is sandstone so soakage</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>rates expected to be good. Further work required to establish best form of attenuation for site.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> Anticipate that dwellings fronting main road may require additional glazing but is unlikely that noise will have significant adverse impact on development.</p> <p><b>Ground Conditions:</b> initial Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment shows it is unlikely site would be classified as contaminated land.</p> <p><b>Utilities:</b> 850mm aqueduct runs within western part of site with 350mm main parallel to it. 6m easements required. Mains also run along eastern and northern boundaries with 3m easements needed. Underground cable along northern boundary of site likely to require diverting. MP gas main may require lowering to allow site access.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Land Classification:</b> Site comprises Grade 3</p> <p><b>Suitability:</b> Site is considered suitable for development.</p> <p><b>Deliverability:</b> Agreement in place with landowner. Technical work shows no constraints likely to render site undeliverable. It is available now. Many potential impacts can be mitigated through design and may achieve positive outcomes through landscaping.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Site is sustainably located. Site is suitable, developable and available. It scores well in GB Review and SA.</p>
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO4912</a>	Support	<p>Taylor Wimpey is in control of site known as Land at Bewdley Road North, Stourport. It is promoted for residential led development including open space and other supporting infrastructure. See Development Vision document attached.</p> <p>Development Framework identifies following key features:</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• around 140 dwellings</li> <li>• vehicular and pedestrian access from Bewdley Road North</li> <li>• open space</li> <li>• SuDS</li> <li>• new enduring Green Belt boundary</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO272</a>	Object	<p>I object to any Green Belt development in or around Stourport. No Green Belt site should be considered until ALL brown belt sites in the area have been exhausted.</p> <p>I had no knowledge of the proposals until a few before closure of the time for objections to be lodged?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Stourport has no bypass, or ring road to deal with increased traffic.</p> <p>Congestion in the area at school times is already a significant problem. Has anyone researched this at the Burlish traffic lights particularly?</p> <p>I can see little to support these proposals - esp. considering Green Belt development, by definition, should be vigorously opposed until proof of exhaustion of brown belt sites has been put forward and accepted.</p> <p>What part of the proposal "relieves pressure on Burlish Top Nature reserve"? What pressure?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1652</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt natural habitat.</li> <li>2. Lack of health care to support a higher population.</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic/pollution.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1655</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no bus routes, more cars will be needed to take children to already overcrowded schools</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Existing traffic issues esp. at school times in Lickhill Road/Windermere Way</p> <p>3. If there is no play area on the estate children will play in streets which could result in an accident</p>
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPP01574</a>	Object	We don't need any more buildings going up in this area. We have enough problems with traffic now coming in and out of Stourport. We don't want our Green Belt spoiled.
	<a href="#">LPP01760</a>	Object	<p>Opposes development sites L1/6/7, L1/5/ AKR/14, AKR/15.</p> <p>Believes that development will have a negative impact on people living in these areas as the values of their properties will drop because it will affect their outlook.</p> <p>Also concerned about traffic increase on Lickhill Lower, Lickhill and Lickhill North roads. Very busy during school run and speeding during weekends already an issue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01785</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any development at Burlish Crossing.</li> <li>• Believes there are plenty of empty buildings in the district that could be redeveloped as an alternative.</li> <li>• Concerned about traffic in an already congested area.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact on wildlife and countryside.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01786</a>	Object	Objects due to concerns about traffic. Believes that Stourport wouldn't be able to cope with the influx of traffic that the proposal would cause.
	<a href="#">LPP01669</a>	Object	Stourport has a very poor road network and more houses will worsen, esp. The Kingsway as a country lane
	<a href="#">LPP01882</a>	Object	Object LI/5
	<a href="#">LPP01885</a>	Object	<p>Reference /5 it the increase in traffic could well be a very big problem. It is bad now.</p> <p>The above would be linked to it. We are so isolated at Severn Bank Park as it is.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			I'm sure there must be more brownfield sites in the area.
	<a href="#">LPP01687</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I understand the need for more homes but the concentration of 3 proposed sites in approximately 1 sqm, in an already populated area is a step too far.</li> <li>• The pressure on schools and doctors/the increase in traffic is unsustainable.</li> <li>• Farm land is valuable for Wildlife</li> <li>• Brownfield sites/former Burlish Golf Course should be utilised to minimise impact on existing houses</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01910</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley Road North is already a very busy road so more building would cause mayhem.</li> <li>• Local government said there would be more building on brownfield sites not on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01913</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development of land at Burlish Crossing due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic with no extra road to deal with an already very busy stretch of road</li> <li>3. Loss of wildlife habitat.</li> <li>4. Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>5. Increased pollution/noise.</li> <li>6. Lack of services to meet the demand of homeowners on proposed site.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01812</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The road and infrastructure cannot cope with any more traffic on the Bewdley Road and crossroads at peak rush hours.</li> <li>2. It is gridlocked most of the time which will also effect on the L/1/2 site proposed. The Kingsway will not be big enough to cope.</li> <li>3. The Nature Reserve is just coming back to how is should be.</li> <li>4. There are plenty of brownfield sites around WFDC area. For example the old school sites of Sion Hill and</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE L1/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Sladen, the Old hospital Wolverhampton Road and the amount of property that could be used for residential around the area is ample for any district.</p> <p>5. The boundaries between Kidderminster and Stourport are just yards apart - it should be kept as it is.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1984</a>	Object	<p>Objects to Burlish and Lickhill development:</p> <p>We object to any development on the Green Belt land and Greenfield sites.</p> <p>There is more than sufficient despoiled land and brownfield sites to accommodate having development – it is vital that Green Belt land is not developed in anyway.</p> <p>We wish to point out this is 2 objections.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO295</a>	Object	<p>Sites L1/5 Burlish Crossing represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. The volume of traffic has increased substantially in the past 7 years, to the point where it can be difficult to leave our property. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Other core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will also increase the traffic at Burlish lights, I don't see how development at L1/5 can be integrated into the area with adequate transport facilities for both existing and new residents.</p> <p>The Option B site L1/5 Burlish crossing represents a loss of good agricultural land. This field and the adjacent</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			fields are an important habitat for birds, particularly in winter when lapwings gather in the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2050</a>	Object	<p>I was unaware of these proposals/deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/prime agricultural land for food production</li> <li>• Preferred option must be brownfield sites.</li> <li>• More traffic = more noise/pollution. Plan will compound area's existing traffic problems.</li> <li>• GP/dental surgeries/local schools already oversubscribed</li> <li>• Negative impact on businesses at top of Lickhill Rd and wild/plant life</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2052</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites e.g. adjacent to Tesco should be used first.</li> <li>• Already long traffic queues and no bypasses unlike Bewdley/Kidderminster</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2014</a>	Object	Having moved to Bewdley to escape the 'rat race' we would never accept plans for a new housing estate on our doorstep, surrounded as we are by green fields/the River Severn. We strongly object to all the new planning proposals outlined which will cause traffic chaos esp. in the Bewdley Road/local area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2026</a>	Object	<p>The two reasons for my objection are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses mean more people and more cars which mean more fumes which is bad for health.</li> <li>• Bewdley Road can't cope with more cars at peak times morning/evening. There are already queues from the lights at Burlish traffic light, some very long.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2113</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Burlish Crossing area is already well populated.</li> <li>• We enjoy our view over Green Belt land and do not want to change it by development.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2114</a>	Object	Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites available.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2116</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools.</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2118</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• increase in already congested traffic</li> <li>• Increase in noise/pollution from extra traffic.</li> <li>• bus service already poor</li> <li>• capacity issue; schools, doctors, dentists, hospital</li> <li>• loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• use brownfield land first</li> <li>• insufficient work</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no provision for road upgrade</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2139</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic noise and pollution</li> <li>Removal of agricultural land have an impact on the wildlife in the area</li> <li>Building of houses behind property will reduce value of her home.</li> <li>Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2075</a>	Object	<p>Objection to development at Burlish Crossing/Lickhill Road North:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>Traffic congestion on already busy B4195.</li> <li>Services e.g. Drs already overcrowded</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2368</a>	Object	<p>Object Kingsway/Burlish crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic congestion, noise pollution/fumes</li> <li>Burlish top nature reserve would be ruined/wildlife lost</li> <li>Capacity of NHS services/Drs/dentists/schools and access by emergency services.</li> <li>Stourport has nothing to cope with extra traffic e.g. a bypass</li> <li>Don't build on the agricultural land instead do something for the community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2433</a>	Object	<p>My objection naturally centres around the building of houses under Option B, specifically relating to Burlish Crossing, just feet away from my own home. The provision of 157 houses on the site when coupled to the core sites of Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2) and Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7) would mean an additional 331 houses, perhaps 600 extra cars, in an area that struggles at times to cope with the volume of traffic currently. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The resultant reduction in air quality, additional noise pollution and increased damage to road surfaces would lead to further strain on local medical and other community services, protracted response times from emergency services and increased dangers to pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>Without adequate provision for additional schools, medical facilities and other community services I believe this option to be ill conceived.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2544</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Although I don't strongly agree with any of the options available but do strongly contest the Core development areas in the Burlish/ Lickhill areas, I do understand, just from the basic maths, that there is a need for additional housing within the district. However, I have raised my main concerns above to highlight the obvious issues that I assume someone within the Planning Policy Team has already considered.</p> <p>Following the drop-in and after having reviewed the documents again online I have a few points/queries to make, in particular in respect of the Core housing sites in the Burlish/Kingsway and Lickhill areas of Stourport and also the Option B sites, in particular the one at Burlish Crossing:</p> <p>In respect of the sites highlighted for Option B (especially within the Burlish/Lickhill area) I have a few concerns which I'd like to raise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Road networks and traffic - Both of the core housing sites at Lickhill and the Kingsway along with the Option B site at LI/5 would have a detrimental effect on the congestion within the local area. These three sites would potentially mean 331 new homes could be built within a 1/4 of a mile of each other, thus raising the concern that there could be potentially 331 more vehicles using the 3 main roads in this area being Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road and The Kingsway. Currently, even without these additional houses, the traffic at Burlish Crossings is already a complete nightmare and inconvenience for all commuters going to/from work and/or school. With these additional (potential) developments I can only assume that this congestion will continue to become a more difficult problem to solve.</li> <li>- Roads networks and safety - Similarly these additional vehicles will be using roads which are direct links</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to the High School and several primary schools within the area, which surely raises a safety concern? Should we be encouraging increased use of The Kingsway, Windermere Way and Lickhill Road given the number of children who use those routes to school every day? Also, if these sites in particular were to be developed where would the access to those 'estates' be? I would assume accessing a large housing development from any of these roads would mean that traffic systems would need to be put in place to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike - would this mean more traffic due to signalling on top of the expected increased in vehicle numbers?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Road networks/ The Bridge - it probably goes without saying that the traffic issues on the Stourport Bridge are already a major problem for the town. The Option B sites, in their vastness, backing onto the Areley Kings area of Stourport would only add to this problem. I have been informed that if a developer were to buy this land then a second bridge and supporting roads would be built - what would the impact of this buildings works be on the town's road infrastructure in the meantime? Also, where would that bridge be located and what would the environmental impacts of that development be?</li> <li>- Schools - The schools within the Burlish and Lickhill vicinity are already over-subscribed each year with many children being rejected from their first choice (and quite often most local) primary school. From the Plan document I can see that there are several options available to deal with the potential increase in children within the area, however 0.5FE proposals are almost a complete waste of time as sustaining a structure within a primary school with an additional 0.5FE is almost impossible with the current funding cuts being made by central government. What 0.5FE increase would do would be to unnecessarily force joint year group teaching in order to deliver efficient and break-even budgets. Your education team will well know that this is not the most effective way of delivering the curriculum and could also have negative effects on future OFSTED ratings, particularly if pressure is going to be put on to teaching staff to deliver to larger group of pupils. This is one of the easiest ways to make Stourport a less attractive town of choice as parents currently have the knowledge that primary schools within these areas are OFSTED good or outstanding! Similarly, 1FE primary schools are as difficult to sustain, especially within such areas where the majority of students receive only basic funding but the normal costs of running a school still have to be met. Have governors of all local primary schools been informed of the suggestions within the plan so that they can think about succession planning if any of these sites were to be developed? Would their budgets be able to handle any potential changes? Where would a new development for a 1FE school be situated if this were the route that was taken in Stourport, I would</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>assume it would be in the over-subscribed areas? If so, Green Belt?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Medical centres - As above for schools. Local medical centres, surgeries and hospitals are already working to capacity - would residents then be expected to travel longer distances into Kidderminster to seek medical attention? Would Kidderminster Hospital A&amp;E department be re-instated by the time all of the development is complete and these 5,400 dwelling have been built?</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion, I strongly object to the sites that have been included in the Core housing plans and Option B which would so strongly affect the Burlish and Lickhill areas of Stourport for all of the above mentioned reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2906</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to this site being used.</li> <li>• It is a greenfield site.</li> <li>• Greenfield sites are subject to Green Belt status - should not be concreted or tarmacked over.</li> <li>• Traffic from site will create more congestion on an already busy road.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO431</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object for the following reasons</li> <li>• loss of an area of natural beauty</li> <li>• there is no infrastructure to support the proposed development</li> <li>• roads are already gridlocked</li> <li>• anti social behaviour from new neighbours</li> <li>• longer waiting times at doctors/dentists etc</li> <li>• extra noise and pollution to what is a quiet neighbourhood</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we bought our house fifteen years ago for the view of the Green Belt not to look at a new housing development</li> <li>• lack of privacy</li> <li>• loss of productive agriculture land</li> <li>• effect on wildlife</li> <li>• increased travel times to and from work</li> <li>• this area is not suitable for the size of the proposed development BUILD SOMEWHERE ELSE</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3335</a>	Object	Enough congestion along Bewdley Road North around the traffic lights as it is. Schools and doctors in the town cannot cope with extra families that are proposed.
	<a href="#">LPPO738</a>	Object	Development at Burlish field threatens nesting birds and rights of way. Major traffic congestion at crossroads without more housing. Lack of capacity in schools, doctors, dentists. Stourport needs a bypass.
	<a href="#">LPPO3433</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quality of life will be affected.</li> <li>2. Bought our house with the added attraction of countryside views.</li> <li>3. Invasion of privacy.</li> <li>4. No control of neighbours including anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>5. Loss of value to my current property!</li> <li>6. Disruption of travel. Already have to plan times to get on and off drive.</li> <li>7. Increased travel time to/from work.</li> <li>8. Road already grid-locked during peak times 'Blackstone' in particular as not enough room for 2 way traffic including heavy goods vehicles.</li> <li>9. Increased noise and pollution levels.</li> <li>10. Not enough room in local schools also affecting GP surgeries and dentists. Most are already to their limits!</li> <li>11. Disruption to wildlife, have an affect on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>12. Loss of Green Belt!!</li> <li>13. Would you like to have all the above next to your home?</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3340</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Traffic noise.</li> <li>• Crowded doctors and schools.</li> <li>• Nature.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3342</a>	Object	Proposals for Burlish/Lickhill areas - traffic already at standstill at peak times. Greenfields are all there is to separate 3 different towns. Doctors/dentists - hard to get appointment. Schools - not enough places.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO807</a>	Object	land at Burlish Crossing - no exceptional circumstances that would justify removal of site from Green Belt. Non-Green Belt sites are available in Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO3386</a>	Object	Object to proposals around Burlish.
	<a href="#">LPPO3397</a>	Object	Concerned at loss of Green Belt land so close to Burlish Top. Roads already very busy. Increased pollution from extra traffic will affect nature and young families. Stourport lacks road infrastructure of Kidderminster. Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth.
	<a href="#">LPPO4112</a>	Object	<p>I object to your proposals to build on Green Belt sites locally in the Burlish area. These proposals have come as quite a shock to the local residents, there has been talk of the council informing us with a leaflet or a mention in the local paper. This appears to have gone unnoticed by the majority of locals, and it seems we now have an unreasonable consultation period in which to voice our concerns and consider in a balanced measure “the people s “objections.</p> <p>It seems you have miscalculated the real requirements for housing preferring the easier option to build on Green Belt rather than brownfield. The infrastructure of Stourport is already struggling to cope with the number of school children, the traffic problems and the requirements on the national health system. I would like to add my strong objections to the deadline you imposed on us for this building project which appears to be a most ill conceived set of plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1793</a>	Object	Objects to development on the field parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North due to the following

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic - Bottle necks around Bewdley Road North/Burlish Crossing</li> <li>2. Environmental impact</li> <li>3. Radical impact on property values</li> <li>4. Disruption to the busy link road between Bewdley and Stourport which is already a problem at the Burlish junction.</li> <li>5. Pressure on local key infrastructure schools and NHS services</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1800</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/6/7, LI/5, LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure (especially roads) needs to be improved before any development can be considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic - the one way system around the town at key times of the day are often gridlocked. Another bridge over the river Severn would alleviate this.</li> <li>3. The crossroads on the Bewdley Road/Kingsway junction often have long queues again at certain times of the day.</li> <li>4. Putting more demand onto an already overloaded town without infrastructure improvements will destroy residents' quality of life aside from pollution issues.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1753</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/5 Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>Asks if there are any Brownfield sites that could be developed. Questions if more housing is really needed and if the population is really growing that much.</p> <p>Concerned that the current support services including doctors, police, schools and local transport won't be able to support a growing population without further investment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1667</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the destruction of Green Belt and resultant increase in already congested traffic/assoc pollution, where is promised bypass?</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Poor bus service</li> <li>3. Schools/Doctors already oversubscribed.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1677</a>	Object	<p>Object as follows:</p> <p><u>Kingsway</u>: traffic - already heavy at peak times/close to nature reserve.</p> <p><u>Garden Centre/Paddocks</u> Traffic/proximity to Nursing home</p> <p>review housing need and provision of schools/medical facilities</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1680</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the plans for building on Burlish crossing LI/5.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A loss of Green Belt and precious open land which will affect wildlife populations.</li> <li>2. The introduction of more traffic on already congested roads (peak periods) i.e. Kingsway, Bewdley Road, Windermere Way.</li> <li>3. More junctions causing even more traffic chaos.</li> <li>4. 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.</li> <li>5. Stourport is notorious for peak time traffic jams which include Bewdley Road, Kidderminster Road, Hartlebury Road, Worcester Road and Dunley Road often causing gridlock.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1851</a>	Object	<p>I object, on the grounds of loss of Green Belt areas/agricultural land, the increase in traffic/(noise) and the loss/impact any development would have on wildlife, to plans to develop the field at the top of Kingsway that runs parallel with Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North and the area currently a garden centre/horse paddocks on Lickhill Road.</p> <p>Development here would also increase class sizes (which are already high) and impact on the quality of education in local schools. Why can't these developments be built on brownfield sites.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1803</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Est., Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> <li>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1764</a>	Object	<p>Objection to option B due to lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. Building on Green Belt LI/5</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2010</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill and Bewdley Road</li> <li>• Health risks from traffic.</li> <li>• Increase in school places and classes getting bigger.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries, emergency services.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests utilising sites old brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1823</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is used for agricultural purposes.</li> <li>• Would lose the enjoyment of back garden.</li> <li>• Better sites to use.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1893</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to using Green Belt land for building purposes bordering Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North.</p> <p>Suggests prioritising the use of brownfield land before greenfield.</p> <p>Concerned about extreme traffic at peak times if the proposed site at Burlish Crossing goes ahead and a danger to the elderly tenants living on Severn Bank Park.</p> <p>Concerned that the doctors, dentists, schools are already full.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2001</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5.due to:</p> <p>Too much traffic - Stourport does not have a by-pass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2008</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Further development between Stourport and Kidderminster in the open area should not be permitted to prevent link-up of these two towns.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. Kingsway is already a dangerous road caused by speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will also affect time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. The impact of building houses would have significant impact on vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			(Kidderminster).
	<a href="#">LPPO2124</a>	Object	<p>I would like to strongly oppose the building on Burlish Park and my reasons are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Burlish Crossing is congested enough now, how will you deal with all this extra congestion potentials 314 cars added to the already congested crossroads? Causing problems for the emergency services and increasing likelihood of accidents.</li> <li>• Schools – insufficient school places at the newly built primary school.</li> <li>• Healthcare – Only 2 doctors in Stourport.</li> <li>• Noise pollution</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt. Sajid Javid communities secretary promised Green Belt would be protected. Has the Council ruled out all brownfield sites or estate regeneration; included unused land and surplus public sector land; looked to neighbouring authorities for provision?</li> <li>• There are enough brownfield sites e.g. Carpets of Worth, Chichester Caravans, SDF, Sugar Beet</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2125</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First heard on news</li> <li>• Retain the 3 towns own identities.</li> <li>• Traffic problems already unlike Bewdley/Kidderminster, Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Accommodate Wyre Forest housing needs on brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2028</a>	Object	<p>My objection is, because Stourport is popular with visitors, the Bewdley Road is busy at weekends and commuting working hours. A journey that normally take 15mins can take over an hour at peak times and I cannot see how the Bewdley Road would cope with more traffic from more homes equalling more congestion/more fumes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2036</a>	Object	<p>I object to the development in Kingsway/Lickhill Road areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads here are not coping with the current amount of traffic esp. at peak times adding more traffic</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>would increase this problem and be dangerous for pedestrians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools/Doctors surgeries are currently stretched</li> <li>• Wildlife/residents will suffer if green spaces lost</li> <li>• Other areas/empty properties could be used</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2051</a>	Object	Use Brownfield sites before agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2373</a>	Object	<p>We had not received any notification of these plans which we think is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of Green Belt Land makes a mockery of Green Belt Status, and is a precedent that will affect existing farmland, public access / rights-of-way.</p> <p>Stourport-on-Severn is expected to support the local allocation of houses but while Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring-road and a proposed new road to cope with both housing and extra traffic, Stourport-on-Severn does not have the existing or planned infrastructure to cope and the significant amounts of proposed traffic. This will have knock on environmental effects, and the traffic affecting existing local traffic and emergency service access at peak times.</p> <p>Local schools and NHS services are already stretched; there is no proposal for how this will be dealt with, and will lead to increased class sizes, longer waiting lists or people having to travel outside of the area which will further add traffic to areas where overspill fills the requirements.</p> <p>The plans will lead to a loss of both good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Skylarks, Linnets and other red-listed birds nest in these proposed sites. The use of the Kingsway field will also, we believe, have a significant impact on the diversity of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no evidence that in the Wyre Forest area the shortfall cannot be met by the use of brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport-on-Severn) and Sugarbeet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3516</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to object to Option B in planning for residential properties being built on L1/5 Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>Stourport is a bottleneck both getting over the bridge and driving from Burlish Crossroads.</p> <p>We do not have the infrastructure in Stourport. The need for a new bridge and road system, more schools, jobs and doctors. These facilities aren't there for the population it already has.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3423</a>	Object	<p>Object to these new developments as collectively the 3 sites would mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also initially affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes or unable to take in local children them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat: there are sky larks, linnets, and other red-listed birds resting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also have a significant impact in the vast variety of plants and wildlife on Burlish Top nature reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. There is no evidence that there is a short fall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugarbeet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3467</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal will cause chaos to the existing area.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion at Burlish Crossing lights is a problem now.</li> <li>• Health care will cause a problem.</li> <li>• Most households now have two or more cars.</li> <li>• School places will be affected</li> <li>• The pollution</li> <li>• Also, our views.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3345</a>	Object	<p>Very concerned about developing sites in the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and Steatite Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing,</li> <li>• Pressure on local schools already at capacity with waiting lists,</li> <li>• Pressure on GP's and NHS dentist,</li> <li>• Retaining Stourport's character and identity,</li> <li>• Threat to wildlife,</li> <li>• Pollution,</li> <li>• Additional traffic and places pressure on road network</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3310</a>	Object	<p>There is a lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries, dentists and public transport in this area.</p> <p>Stourport needs a good public transport infrastructure in place first and a decent and safe cycle path if you are going to increase the amount of houses.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>The field which runs parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North L1/5 Green Belt be built on, the increase in the traffic on the Bewdley Road would cause significant problems for all the residents living in the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area, on peak times now already long tail backs.</p> <p>More traffic noise and higher emissions from the increase of traffic resulting in the risk of health to local residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3331</a>	Object	Burlish Crossing L1/5 - Roads around Burlish Crossing are already heavily congested and additional traffic would cause further congestion at the Swan Hotel/High street junction.
	<a href="#">LPPO3333</a>	Object	I object to development on greenfield sites Burlish Crossing LI/5;
	<a href="#">LPPO2436</a>	Object	<p>I should like to object to the building of houses at Burlish Crossing (L1/5), just feet away from my house. They would mean an additional 331 houses together with the extra cars, in an area that cannot cope now at certain times of the day. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The extra traffic would result in a reduction in air quality and additional noise, plus the unnecessary use of Green Belt land with no provision it seems for medical and educational services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3133</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plans regarding development of Green Belt in the Burlish Crossing area.</p> <p>The first I heard about these proposed developments was approx. two weeks ago, when our local councillor wrote to us. The date of submission of views was not clear, and the information regarding the proposals fell far short of what would have been expected.</p> <p>The size of development is staggering. The population has not increased to any significant degree, the developments planned are a gross over build. Brownfield sites could manage the increase. Green Belt is there to protect from urban sprawl. It is a vital natural habitat. Once it is gone, it is gone. Environmental vandalism. There are not any great employer in the area expanding, there is not going to be a wave of new people coming to the area. In light of the decision to leave the EU, even less migrants are going to arrive. Only affordable housing is required, which is not going to be the case with houses built on fresh Green Belt land. The only winners are the developers, everyone else suffers. Increased traffic, emissions and noise along with a loss of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			habitat for nature are assured.  These are my views and I wish to register my voice of opposition to the plans.
	<a href="#">LPPO2981</a>	Object	Ref L1/5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugarbeet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2984</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugarbeet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3990</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed use for the area LI/5 Table 32.0.2 Stourport-on-Severn, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status. Our Green areas need to be protected at all costs, for existing &amp; future residents, and for the good of the environment and country as a whole. No Green Belt status areas should be up for consideration for housing.</p> <p>Overcrowding. All three of these proposed sites already have more than enough houses situated within a relatively small area. From what I have read, it would seem there is no evidence that this amount of new</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>housing is required in the Wyre Forest area, where the population growth is below the national average.</p> <p>I would hope that plans for housing in this area will be restricted to Brownfield sites only, and kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution. The Burlish Estate/Kingsway/Lickhill roads are more than busy enough as things are. More housing would inevitably increase the volume of traffic, traffic noise, and pollution to an unacceptable level for these areas.</p> <p>Quality of life. Green, unspoilt areas are vital to the health and well-being of all of us. We do not want to lose any more of our precious, green, open views. The three new school/college buildings have already encroached enough on our open landscape in this area of Stourport.</p>
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPPO3561</a>	Object	Use of green/brownfield sites. All areas outstanding Bewdley particularly in Bewdley Road North area/Kingsway. Loss of floral and fauna, already eroded during last 25years.
	<a href="#">LPPO4909</a>	Object	Having lived here just over a year why are you trying to build on green land as all governments say they will not build? The roads are not big enough for extra traffic. If you want to build use brownfield sites of which there are many. As a resident in this area it is bad enough to enter the main road as it is so please think again.
	<a href="#">LPPO1808</a>	Object	Object to LI/5
	<a href="#">LPPO1819</a>	Object	Loss of Green Belt status.
	<a href="#">LPPO1779</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any loss of Green Belt that protects the countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>Concerned about increased noise and pollution due to traffic and the impact on the health of local residents.</p> <p>Suggests not building on the Green Belt but alternatively utilising land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf course L1/2 and the land that runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where children and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>parents are within walking distance. Suggests prioritising these sites before developing on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Concerned about lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries dentists and public transport in this area.</p> <p>Also concerned that Stourport lacks a good public transport infrastructure including a decent safe cycle path. This all needs to be done before any houses should be considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1794</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development due to the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Car crashing</li> <li>2. People may get run over</li> <li>3. Animals may get run over</li> <li>4. Lot busier</li> <li>5. Beeping of horns</li> <li>6. Wildlife like birds may become extinct</li> <li>7. No places for children to go to school</li> <li>8. Late for school and work and get fired.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1750</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>If the field which runs parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North L1/5 Green Belt is to be built on, the increase in traffic on the Bewdley Road would cause significant problems for all residents living in the area. At peak times it's already congested.</p> <p>More traffic noise and emissions will risk the health of local residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1658</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Increase in traffic/pollution</li> <li>• Stourport is already a bottleneck</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local amenities – schools/GP Surgeries full.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1763</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to building houses on the fields at the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road North and on the garden centre and horse paddocks on the Lickhill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a loss of Green Belt areas, a lot more traffic with increased noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes. Stourport lacks a bypass.</li> <li>• There will be loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife habitat and impact on a variety of plants.</li> <li>• More people needing facilities such as school, doctors, dentists etc.</li> <li>• Asks if there are brownfield sites that could be used as an alternative.</li> <li>• Objects to building on Green Belt areas.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2072</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic build up and road system not being able to cope with more traffic</li> <li>• Sewers/water supply will it be able to cope</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2022</a>	Object	We don't want any building on Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2060</a>	Object	<p>Field which runs parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am very concerned about the traffic increase in this area. It is already increasing rapidly making it difficult for cars to join the road. These two applications will cause major problems.</li> <li>• As we enter a change in the country through Brexit I am very concerned to see good agricultural land reduced. We will need to increase all food production and this, however tiny, will reduce the farming land in this area.</li> <li>• I cannot understand why Green Belt land is being used when there are brown belt lands lying vacant around Stourport e.g. near Tesco. PLEASE use this land first.</li> <li>• I am aware of the need of affordable housing – but put it in the right place – near shops or services so</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>people who do have their own transport can be serviced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please think VERY HARD about your plans. Do not take the easy option (for you) and reduce and concrete over our beautiful land.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2020</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why is Green Belt land to be used when areas are available in Stourport? e.g. round Tesco store (currently an eyesore) not being considered.</li> <li>2. How will current roads be adapted to cope with resulting extra usage with likely 2 cars per house minimum and already overcrowded roads/queues stretching back to the by-pass in this area</li> <li>3. Emergency services – how will essential services be prioritised.</li> <li>4. How will extra schools/education, doctors/dentists etc. be provided</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2011</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bewdley Road North (B4195) is already a very busy road</li> <li>2. Traffic queues on most evenings back up from the four way traffic lights at Burlish Crossing, to the Roundabout in the A456.</li> <li>3. Cook’s Nursery opposite this land is often open to the public on many weekends adding to traffic problems.</li> <li>4. Concerned that any road planned to access the site on the B4195 would be a major issue.</li> <li>5. Severn Bank Park residents have problems joining the B4195 at busy periods, it would be a lot worse with this development proposal.</li> <li>6. The land has Green Belt status and should be left as such.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1877</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road.</li> <li>2. Traffic noise and fumes, increased health risk.</li> <li>3. Extra influx on schools, so classes become larger or sent to other schools.</li> <li>4. Extra patients for GP’s, longer waiting times.</li> <li>5. Loss of Green Belt land.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			6. Crime and anti-social behaviour quite low in this area at present, extra influx of people put this at risk.
	<a href="#">LPPO1884</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/5</p> <p>Objects due to traffic congestion as it is already very difficult to approach the main road. When children are at school it is even more difficult.</p> <p>If more houses are built, it would be impossible as residents have to go out 20 minutes early just to get across the main road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1892</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available.</li> <li>• Inadequate facilities.</li> <li>• We need to safeguard what we have for future generations.</li> <li>• Only doing it for extra council tax and to provide for Birmingham overspill.</li> <li>• Planners have allowed developments go ahead before without listening to objections.</li> <li>• Building companies are too large and have too much money for objections to be noted.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1907</a>	Object	<p>I wish to make my comments and raise objections to the plans affecting all age groups living in the vicinity of these three areas.</p> <p>My list as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl and threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads in Burlish Park, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times suffers significantly from long tailbacks at present.</li> <li>• This increase will inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach the residents. Not to forget, for us, non car drivers, the appalling bus service that already exists and will certainly not improve the situation (already difficult getting to appointments).</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The erosion of what makes Wyre Forest special, the three towns keeping their separate identities.</li> <li>• GP surgeries and dentists will struggle to cope with such an influx of patients.</li> <li>• As an ex teacher, schools will definitely suffer – they are not big enough to cope – class sizes will increase and it will be back to mobile classrooms and lack of parking for parents picking up their children – adding to the traffic chaos.</li> <li>• The wonderful addition we have of Burlish Nature Reserve will be affected by loss of wildlife. There are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields and rare plant species too. These spaces are all too rare and must be cherished.</li> <li>• Surely there are many brownfield sites that can be utilised within Wyre Forest. Once again Stourport-on-Severn comes out worst affected.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster a ring road but Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic.</li> <li>• My objections are not of the ‘in my backyard’ syndrome but a plea for an already over crowded little town not to grow anymore. We do not have the infrastructure to grow further and let us keep the cherished parts of put town that make it a place we want to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1994</a>	Object	<p>Objects to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kingsway</li> <li>• Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North</li> <li>• Lickhill Road</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2101</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt.</li> <li>• Traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2130</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic</li> <li>2. Loss of wildlife/Green Belt</li> <li>3. Emergency services access issues</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2553</a>	Object	Bewdley Road North is difficult now and with extra houses all coming onto this road it will make it worse. Stourport has enough traffic going through it and it comes to a stand still with the slightest problem and additional homes will not help this unless backed up by improved infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPPO2556</a>	Object	I feel the extra houses will impact hugely on the roads and things are difficult as it is, and with no news of any relief road Stourport will come to a stand still.
	<a href="#">LPPO2573</a>	Object	I wish to register my objection to further housing development at the proposed plan B site in Burlish park.  I believe a further housing development at this site will cause extreme traffic problems.  Further traffic use of the Kingsway and Windermere Way, routes that are already busy. A strain on the public transport which is struggling to provide an adequate service. Local schools are already at capacity, there appears to be no plans to increase capacity The present infrastructure is not good enough to support extra traffic.
	<a href="#">LPPO2854</a>	Object	Burlish Crossing site has following disadvantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strain on existing facilities/traffic congestion/lack of employment opportunities would result in residents having to commute/access would be dangerous</li> <li>• Buffer between Stourport and Bewdley would reduce</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2900</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road</li> <li>• Will affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools unable to take in local children</li> <li>• Lack of facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of lack of Brownfield sites to utilise.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3306</a>	Object	Object to housing on 'Bewdley Road' (L/15) already too busy, which could lead to further congestion.
	<a href="#">LPPO3322</a>	Object	Building of 157 houses on Burlish crossing will cause tailbacks in all 4 directions from the traffic lights at Burlish cross roads? This junction already suffers large tail backs so these houses and the proposed 94 on Lickhill road will bring traffic to a standstill!
	<a href="#">LPPO4054</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to Burlish Crossing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is agricultural land and should be kept this way.</li> <li>With the growth of population and climate change turning farmland into housing is wrong.</li> </ul> </li> <li>To summarise the increase in housing will bring more traffic, noise and air pollution.</li> <li>Poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion need to be addressed in Stourport.</li> <li>Doctors will not be able to cope with more patients.</li> <li>Plans need to be put in place to alleviate these problems before any developments go ahead.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3441</a>	Object	<p>The roads on Burlish/Lickhill and Bewdley Road are already being used as rat runs and can't cope with any more traffic never mind the population with the inevitable building of houses.</p> <p>Houses mean requirements for schools and doctors and dentists and we are already at overflow point.</p> <p>Let's keep the bit of beauty we have left.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3048</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly object to loss of Green Belt status.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations.</li> <li>Object to the increase in road noise and extra pollution from exhaust fumes.</li> <li>Stourport does not have ring road or by pass like Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>Will more schools, GP and dental surgeries be built?</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3135</a>	Object	<p>The Burlish Crossing is already a busy junction. With the addition of the extra traffic and the problems of entering and leaving this development will cause even greater delays, noise and pollution.</p> <p>A lot of resident don't shop in Stourport. If more non-supermarket parking was planned, instead of being taken away, then this would boost the trade of the town centre and increase jobs. The District council is only interested in houses and not the effect the PEOPLE could have on the town in a positive way if better infrastructure was in place.</p> <p>(A new road for Kidderminster but nothing mentioned for Stourport with the proposed development at Pearl Lane!)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3234</a>	Object	<p>In reference to Policy 32, Site ref LI/5, paragraphs 32.1, 32.5.</p> <p>We chose to move to Burlish Crossing in-part because of its views on to the field and the rear of the property. We felt that this was right choice of town to raise our two young children. The class sizes at Burlish Park Primary are already at capacity. We continue to enjoy the views across the field and it is frequently commented on how nice it must be to have this view. The privacy it affords was a major selling point and as the estate agent informed us, was a reason why the house was more expensive than others in the area. If the field was too built on, we would not only fight it on every level but we would look to move from the Wyre Forest area. The field hosts a wealth of wildlife currently at risk, from bees and butterflies to birds and bats. I understand that we need more housing, but if Option B goes ahead, and there is to be a new housing estate on the field behind Burlish Crossing, we as a family shall fight it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2843</a>	Object	<p>Object to building on the field behind Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>It would urbanise the area and spoil the countryside Traffic issues would be compounded and lack of services,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>e.g. Schools, Health Services.</p> <p>Development of brownfield sites in Kidderminster and an extension to the estates, including link road would be ideal.</p> <p>Traffic would be kept to the major roads heading to Worcester and M5 and the Birmingham Road. Better access for travel, Worcester Hospital and for Fire Services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO617</a>	Object	<p>Traffic at the Burlish traffic lights is already unacceptable. Extra housing on Kingsway, golf course or on Lickhill sites will make this severe issue even worse for everyone. The extra volume of cars will cause even more pollution and will impact on the environment. Building on Green Belt sites is unacceptable. Many brown field sites are not being developed, many parts of Stourport are derelict and run down, why can't these be utilised before destroying the parts of the town that are still attractive, unpolluted and well kept.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3402</a>	Object	<p>Need to protect Green Belt; loss of habitat, increased traffic, pollution, schools full, doctors would not be able to cope, no evidence to justify building on Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2444</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to object to plans which fall under proposal B to build housing on the Burlish Crossing Fields (L1/5).</p> <p>I see on the daily basis the level of traffic build up in this area at the lights, backing up along Bewdley Road North to the roundabout on the Bewdley bypass at Blackstone. Additionally, traffic build up on Burlish Crossing, Kingsway and Windermere Way. This weight of traffic would only be increased with the development of Burlish Fields. In Stourport there is no ring road, no relief road and no by pass. All traffic is forced through the town. This also has an impact on the ability of emergency services to reach those in need.</p> <p>The pressure on local schools will increase with local children unable to access their local school. The GP surgeries already have high numbers of patients and local dentists will all come under added pressure.</p> <p>The loss of Green Belt status is a major concern. Residents chose to live here because of the green space. We enjoy the views, the wildlife and the birds of prey that are seen over the fields. We need green spaces, they protect our countryside from urban sprawl and are home to a diversity of wildlife. Green space between</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Stourport and Bewdley identifies us as separate towns.</p> <p>The other sites identified at Stourport are all in different areas, dispersed, meaning that new provision cannot be centralised. Development in Stourport does not link anyone to major road networks; forcing everyone to commute through Stourport or Bewdley.</p> <p>I hope these issues raised are taken into account in the consultation process.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3336</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even more traffic noise.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• Erosion of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Possibly even more development even nearer to house.</li> <li>• Was never informed of this development – I can not express how strongly we object.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3337</a>	Object	Object to proposed allocations
	<a href="#">LPPO3415</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can't see justification for building at Burlish crossing:</li> <li>• Lack of roads/schools and doctors/dentists already busy</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3425</a>	Object	Object loss of Green Belt and good quality agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO3736</a>	Object	<p>The areas of Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road North and Areley Kings.</p> <p>Building houses in these locations to attract people who choose to commute out of the district to work would be disastrous as they would have to travel through the known congestion points in Kidderminster or Stourport in order to access the main arterial route, and the houses would be unattractive to category two residents as they are too far away from town centres.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3514</a>	Object	Object to L1/5 - congestion, lack of infrastructure of roads, education, jobs and facilities.
	<a href="#">LPPO3972</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urbanisation, threatening the existing</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>public Rights of Way. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. We think that building would have impact on the vast variety of plant and wildlife.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant increased traffic on all roads on Bewdley Road North, Burlish Estate and Lickhill Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs which will effect times for emergency services to reach destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emission of exhaust fumes with results of higher risk to local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a By-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing despite promises of a "By-pass."</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to another area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities i.e. GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4027</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to express my thoughts on the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review document and, in particular, the 2 options proposed for the 'additional' development sites.</p> <p>With regards to future development in Stourport on Severn, whilst I do not agree with all the proposed core development sites 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'. However, the proposal for development at Lickhill Road North does compromise open land and will, without doubt, add extra pressure to a very busy junction (Burlish Crossing traffic lights) which currently sees regular traffic queues outside residential properties.</p> <p>My main concerns centre around the Option B proposal for further development in Stourport in the Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top areas. These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. The fact there is no provision for infrastructure (i.e. road, schooling etc) upgrades alongside these additional buildings, which there is for Option A (additional development in Kidderminster) is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising. If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley? Is this another instance of these, smaller, towns being seen as the 'poor relation' to Kidderminster?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4037</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic,</li> <li>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</li> <li>Loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2068</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kingsway is already a very road between Kidderminster to Bewdley with speeding issues</li> <li>The proposal will impact on schools, doctors/dentists and wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2071</a>	Object	With only 1 bridge over the River Severn, Stourport town could not cope with a huge increase in traffic, a second bridge proposed earlier is still needed to ease congestion during peak times
	<a href="#">LPPO2077</a>	Object	Would make exiting traffics problems worse.
	<a href="#">LPPO2097</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of habitat.</li> <li>Green Belt status.</li> <li>GP surgeries.</li> <li>Increase of traffic.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2063</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way.</li> <li>Burlish Top Nature Reserve under threat/decrease in wildlife</li> <li>Lack of road infrastructure in Stourport/increase in traffic noise/pollution in area/total upgrade of roads in Wyre Forest would be necessary</li> <li>New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers</li> <li>Lead to extreme pressure on – schools, doctors, dentists, gas/electricity and water/sewage suppliers</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2013</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt land</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic pollution caused by more vehicles.</li> <li>3. Impact on wildlife and birdlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1858</a>	Object	<p>Stourport has enough new housing sites, building more would be disastrous. Our roads are too busy now. Kingsway is like a main road, and with new houses built at the field adjacent to Burlish Park, can only make it worse.</p> <p>Getting in and out of Stourport is very difficult because of so much traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2123</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use brownfield sites e.g. old power station site (Stourport) and Sugarbeet (Kidderminster)</li> <li>2. Unlike Bewdley/Kidderminster, Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>3. Increase in local traffic already congested a peak times = increase in noise/fumes</li> <li>4. Capacity issue GPs/dentists</li> <li>5. Loss of Green Belt /rights of way</li> <li>6. Effect on emergency services</li> <li>7. Loss of wildlife/agricultural land</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2143</a>	Object	<p>Increase in Vehicles on Bewdley Road North causing an increase in traffic pollution.</p> <p>Also an increase in traffic in Stourport which can already be grid locked currently has nothing to alleviate the traffic problems.</p> <p>Also a large increase in population would put a strain on local services i.e. doctors, schools which are already struggling.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2525</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to lodge my concerns regarding the proposed plans to build 157 houses on the field in Burlish</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Crossing.</p> <p>Construction of these houses will seriously decrease the current value of neighbouring properties and spoil the uninterrupted views over the lovely fields. Exactly how close would these dwellings be to neighbouring properties?</p> <p>At the Council road show at the Civic Centre I was told that if it went ahead the Council would be unable to ask for funding from the developer towards improving the local infrastructure, I would therefore be very interested to hear what, if any plans the Council have for improving the roads and traffic flow around Windermere Way, Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and The Bewdley Road, ALL of which get grid locked at the moment without the addition of 157 more houses.</p> <p>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. So I ask the question, how is it now acceptable to build so many houses without any plans to improve the road system?</p> <p>I would be very interested to hear the Councils' views on this proposal and how they plan to ease the already severely overcrowded roads and carriageways.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1816</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 and LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stourport does not have the infrastructure to support sufficient increase in traffic.</li> <li>2. Burlish Crossing is already overwhelmed by traffic at peak times causing tailbacks,</li> <li>3. Loss of valuable Green Belt will lead to loss of wildlife.</li> <li>4. Impact on habitat - there are nesting skylarks and tawny owl</li> <li>5. Increase in traffic pollution</li> <li>6. Need to consider schools and Doctor's surgeries as they are already under pressure.</li> </ol> <p>Please reconsider your plans.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1796</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any plans that involve building on Green Belt land for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are sufficient brownfield sites to exploit before needing to consider Green Belt</li> <li>2. Concerned about development around Burlish as the crossing is very busy.</li> <li>3. Concerned about access road to Bewdley for emergency services- at peak times Burlish crossing can be gridlocked.</li> <li>4. Infrastructure in and around Stourport - questions if it will be able to cope with the additional demand on services and roads.</li> <li>5. Green Belt needs to be retained to protect wildlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1674</a>	Object	I object to LI/5 because of already heavy traffic in area and already busy facilities e.g. Drs would not cope.
	<a href="#">LPPO1646</a>	Object	Object loss of Green Belt and good quality agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO1665</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</li> <li>• Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</li> <li>• Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO524</a>	Object	Development of the Green Belt site bounded by Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Elan Avenue would have a negative visual impact over adjacent properties for the second time since the completion of the Burlish Park development 40 years ago. (The previous occasion was the building of houses on the site of the former Stourport on Severn to Bewdley railway line.) The need for additional housing in this area can be met from the use of existing brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO1777</a>	Object	Objects to the building of 157 houses on Burlish L1/5 as this is Green Belt land and also landscape character.
	<a href="#">LPPO708</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Far too much traffic on a very busy road.</li> <li>• Accident waiting to happen.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO715</a>	Object	Bewdley Road North is heavily congested, especially at peak times.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO991</a>	Support	LI/5 Land at Burlish Crossing  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).
	<a href="#">LPPO4536</a>	Support	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2880</a>	Support	I support the release of land at sites LI/5 subject to significant landscape considerations.  The whole of the western edge of Stourport, lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. It is appropriate that all settlements make a contribution to the current housing shortages. Even though the LPR commissioned research defines Wyre Forest as a self-sustaining housing market, it does not mean that, in the plan period, this might not change in different economic or transport circumstances. House prices in Wyre Forest compared to other districts in Worcestershire and nearby metropolitan boroughs are significantly lower and the reasons for this might change. The plan makes little provision for this area becoming more attractive because it is so cheap and commuting becomes easier with improved transport- such as new train station and services.  However the above aspects need to be set out in the Local Plan at this stage so as to secure appropriate development. Green technologies, design codes, landscaping and materials guidance should also be set out at this stage so prospective developers are aware of the significance/importance of the site, It is an opportunity for the Council to set standards for the future as well as contribute to the housing market in an innovative way.
	<a href="#">LPPO5006</a>	Support	The possible site at Burlish Crossing seems to be a sensible option. Access to the town would be straightforward and also from this position access to Kidderminster and Bewdley is simple because it is on the right side of the town.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/17 – STOURPORT MANOR**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO220</a>	Comment	Stourport Manor: 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO1783</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development on the “pitch put course” at Stourport Manor due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site with mature trees and a valuable open space which is not farmland but a rare area of grass and hedges.</li> <li>• The proposed number of houses would be too dense to be sustainable and would be inappropriate so close to Hartlebury Common.</li> <li>• There are few amenities (i) No shop, (ii) Only a small school with limited room for expansion (iii) no bus stop (iv) Narrow road with no pavement (Wilden Top Road is basically single track).</li> <li>• Dangerous Junction- of Wilden Top Road and Hartlebury Road.</li> <li>• Heavy lorries (Talbot Landfill) frequently use Wilden Top Road.</li> </ul>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO808</a>	Object	Stourport Manor - Exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated to remove site from Green Belt. Non-Green Belt sites should be favoured first.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO992</a>	Object	Area characterised by steep scarp above Stour valley. This site is above top of scarp. Hotel should remain as isolated building in Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO25</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Stourport Manor. The current local transport infrastructure cannot support this development.</p> <p>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. At the Kidderminster end, peak traffic queues are already backing up beyond the 40 mph limit. With the additional employment development on the site of the old settling pools this will only increase.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/17 – STOURPORT MANOR**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP01302</a>	Comment	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites 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.</p> <p>Development of this land would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0734</a>	Comment	Rectory/Pearl Lane would require extra roads even another river bridge!
	<a href="#">LPP03220</a>	Comment	<p>The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</p> <p>The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</p> <p>The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock.</p> <p>As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper.</p> <p>Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</p>
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPP01260</a>	Comment	Development of these sites at Areley Kings would encroach into the open countryside and lead to further exacerbate the high level of traffic congestion across the bridge and add to air pollution in the town centre. This point is actually made in section 32.5 of the Review document.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3394</a>	Comment	Can be serviced via public transport.
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPPO1246</a>	Comment	<p>Concerns about significant levels of growth at Areley Kings (550 new dwellings under option B). 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 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. In particular, 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 4.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3276</a>	Comment	<p>It will be essential to be clear about the level of affordable housing and its provision. (Developers should not be allowed to agree a ratio of affordable development only to later reduce that ratio to ensure a higher profit).</p> <p>There are statements about the attraction of the Town Centre, but properties do not appear to be maintained to a high standard and the issue of the 'Buftons' building in Bridge Street has been unresolved for several decades. The development to link The Canal Basins with Bridge Street has yet to take place and is currently a car park.</p> <p>Any additional development in Areley Kings will increase demand on health and education services. The traffic system is under considerable strain. Areley Common is regularly congested and the tail back across the River Bridge backs up to Dunley Road and Areley Common. The Town Centre itself is frequently blocked.</p> <p>Social cohesion and the need to identify with your community is important for quality of life, levels of crime, etc. This should be a primary factor in retaining community boundaries and village identity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3285</a>	Comment	<p><b><u>Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane (AKR/14 and AKR/15)</u></b></p> <p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites and there are limited local facilities in Areley Kings. Housing development here will increase the traffic crossing Stourport Bridge and using the one-</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>way system through Stourport.</p> <p>Development of this land, on such a scale, would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat. Surely the refusal of the development on the Snipes has recognised this, and its principles would apply to other sites of major development in the area?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO235</a>	Comment	<p>The Pearl Lane developers are, we are told by the Officers at the presentation, going to be responsible for the provision of a second bridge and road improvements. Bearing in mind the link road to provide the access to the river on the North side to the bridge was to be the responsibility of the food store developer and Wyre Forest singularly failed to get other than a feeder road to the development there is little chance of getting this improvement at the costs indicated.</p> <p>Congestion from the South across the bridge is causing significant pollution as well as delays. Again we are told that the bridge is adequate with no proof given. If this is so this clearly shows that infrastructure improvements are urgently required North of the bridge without any further development.</p>
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO919</a>	Comment	<p>It is stated: “The site at Pearl Lane also has known drainage issues.” Although this recognises that there is an issue, I think that using the word ‘drainage’ without any further context might wrongly imply that this has to do with household drainage, or even foul drainage. What we are talking about is that in recent years overland flow from this site (currently agricultural) has exacerbated property flooding relating to insufficient capacity in the piped drainage system in the existing residential area. I agree with the final line of this section which states that “It is for the sites' promoters to justify their allocation and demonstrate how these constraints can be mitigated.” It is however fair to say though that the options are limited, namely ensuring that absolutely no additional discharge is being made from the site or making required improvements to the receiving piped system that runs through the existing residential development; neither option is straightforward and in exceedance events (more extreme than design) flood risk remains exacerbated.</p> <p>Suggested wording: “The site at Pearl Lane and the existing residential site adjacent have known surface water drainage and flooding issues which will require careful mitigation.”</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3685</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to option B.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any housing developments across the bridge into Areley Kings will have an effect on the environment and the quality of life of residents.</li> <li>• More vehicles on the road will affect residents in the area as well as causing reduced air quality which could lead to health issues.</li> <li>• Estimate: possibly 100-1500+ extra vehicles which leads to 2000+ extra journeys a day.</li> <li>• Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable and unmanageable.</li> <li>• Funding should be targeted where there is sufficient scope to develop a manageable and workable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</li> <li>• Increase in population and vehicles would need significant change to local infrastructure.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure in Areley Kings is already at full capacity so there's no room for expansion - option B does not provide funding for improvements.</li> <li>• Local roads are primarily country lanes.</li> <li>• Only one local primary school - no room for more pupils.</li> <li>• Additional patients at doctors/dentists will have an affect on the quality of services they provide.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure will not cope with new development as there is no funding to improve what's already in place - creating unreasonable and unsustainable demands.</li> <li>• Development attracts more development.</li> <li>• Stourport/Areley Kings cannot take the levels of additional housing in option B let alone any additional future developments.</li> <li>• Traffic in Stourport already causes gridlock especially at peak times.</li> <li>• Congestion, roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volume of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians.</li> <li>• It is not just the local population which uses Stourport Bridge to cross the river.</li> <li>• Stourport is a tourist attraction as well as having caravan parks causing more people and cars to come to the area.</li> <li>• Very limited employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• Options of creating new job opportunities are minimal even with funding which option B does not offer.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3525</a>	Object	1. There are already houses planned in this area, just over the border into Malvern Hills. Inhabitants of

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>these houses will inevitably be sharing the same services such as education, health etc and their additional vehicles will add to the existing congestion and pollution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Building more housing developments in the Areley Kings area would add even further to this. Congestion would particularly increase. As most of the facilities are not this side of the river, most people have to travel. In turn, this would exacerbate the problems in Stourport, particularly around the river crossing, Gilgal, Lion Hill, York Street. These roads are already particularly busy, gridlocked at times. This would dramatically increase pollution levels, reducing air quality.</li> <li>3. There have already been fatalities at the Pearl Lane/Dunley Road crossroads. Adding more traffic and access points in this locality would be extremely dangerous.</li> <li>4. Residents in Shrawley already have problems with speeding traffic and the roads through Holt and Ombersley are often gridlocked.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3512</a>	Object	Objection - lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. Building on Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3271</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object most strongly to any plans to build housing on greenfield sites in Areley Kings. The infrastructure of the village doesn't lend itself to further housing development. Lack of school facilities, health facilities, roads to the south, west are both narrow and tortuous. THE MAIN POINT IS THAT A SINGLE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIVER is obviously totally inadequate for further traffic feeding as it does a very limited traffic gyratory system in Stourport. Furthermore 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. There are acres of brownfield site within the Wyre Forest area so why destroy our heritage, OUR GREEN AND PLEASANT LAND!! Looking to Kidderminster Town Centre there are streets of empty derelict shops so why not follow the current American pattern of popular 'In-town Living'? Area too of derelict factories south of Tesco's in Stourport.</p> <p>Another facet is the lack of public transport evenings and Sundays. Services gone and never to return.</p> <p>I trust that you will throw out this plan and look again at all the brown field sites around. I feel that no homework has been done yet again!</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3178</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional housing across the river on the Dunley Road side of Stourport would also cause severe traffic congestion as there is only one bridge for traffic to cross leading to and from the town.</li> <li>• The amount of traffic in Stourport has increased greatly in recent years due to additional housing and yet the infrastructure has not improved. There has been no additional schools, medical centres, hospitals in the Wyre Forest area and no improvement with the roads to help alleviate traffic, apart from a set of traffic lights at Burlish Crossing. What a difference that made! Over the years promises have been made by MPs to improve traffic problems by introducing a new relief road and bridge, but these promises have never materialised.</li> <li>• Stourport is already heavily congested and these traffic problems are increased in the summer months as it is popular with tourists.</li> <li>• Rather than improvements to the infrastructure of Stourport, we have witnessed a decrease in our facilities, i.e. Police, Fire Station, Leisure Centre and swimming pool, children's paddling pool in the Memorial Park. These facilities have all been moved to Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Although I object to the large housing estates and social housing on Green Belt land in theory I accept that with increased population and immigration there is a need for additional housing. But with increased population in an area, surely the facilities and infrastructure for that area should also be increased to cater for the increased needs of the populace.</li> </ul> <p>I would add that although I am against these concrete jungles taking over Green Belt land, it would appear that Kidderminster would be better placed to accommodate the additional housing, as its' infrastructure and facilities are far superior to that in place in Stourport. In addition, the proposed new road joining the A456 to the A449 would also help alleviate the additional traffic; whereas I believe there are no such new roads proposed for Stourport.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4110</a>	Object	<p>In relation to the two preferred options being put forwards for development it seems that the obvious option to adopt is option A as opposed to option B. I believe this to be for the following reasons:</p> <p>The infrastructure has to be key to this as the Kidderminster/Stourport/Bewdley area roads are already congested and Option B does not have any plan or allowance to ease this issue. Particularly in relation to the proposed houses west of the River Severn on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings, the area already has a</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>huge issue with people trying to get into Stourport over the bridge. The road layout in Stourport does not and will not ever be particularly traffic friendly and at peak times it can take over half an hour to do a mile journey from Areley Kings, through Stourport. Preferred Option B would plan to add 550 houses to Areley Kings side of the river. On the basis that the average house has 2 cars these days and with the main employment opportunities being offered in Kidderminster area that would be an additional 1100 cars trying to get over Stourport bridge and would make an already bad problem locally, even worse. It would be a nightmare to put 550 new houses on Areley Kings side of the river without a new bridge to account for the traffic.</p> <p>Schools - Option B with particular relevance to the proposed 550 houses in Areley Kings. This area is already overcrowded in schools with children having to take places in schools to Stourport side of the river as there are not enough places in the Areley Kings Schools. This matter will get worse with the proposed increase in housing. This point also links to the above point on traffic as if there is no proposal as part of preferred option B to increase school places to Areley Kings side of the river then this will mean more traffic to get children to Stourport schools, further deepening the issue of the bridge being a huge bottleneck for traffic.</p> <p>Employment — With particular relevance to the proposed housing in preferred option B to Areley Kings side of the river, these people would all 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.</p> <p>Natural Environment — The area to the west of the River Severn being proposed for development currently has a vibrant natural environment which is enjoyed by a lot of the local residents for dog walking, outdoor pursuits and most of all its natural beauty. Developing such an area with increased housing would have a huge impact on local residents' ability to enjoy the natural environment in which they live. The area is also home to a large amount of wildlife including birds whose habitat would be ruined by the preferred option B plan to build 550 houses on the land by Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4124</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Any development to the west of the river Severn would carry such massive infrastructure costs.</li> <li>● Creating approx 1000 new homes to the west of Stourport, must inevitably require a new Severn crossing. Currently going from the west, crossing the river at Stourport can easily take 30 minutes.</li> <li>● The schools, Doctors and other requirements, must surely make the whole concept run into many</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Millions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing traffic would make the situation far, far worse.</li> </ul>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO352</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Most houses have 2 cars outside them. Building over 500 houses on the Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane sites is likely to generate something in the order of 1000 additional vehicles. Some of the journeys made in these vehicles will be in the direction of Worcester (B4196) or in the direction of Great Witley (A451) and so will not directly affect traffic flow in Stourport. However, the majority of journeys will be over Stourport bridge and through Stourport. This area already suffers traffic flow problems and it is not unusual for traffic to queue back along Dunley Road to the crossroads of A451 and B4194. If drivers take the alternative route to cross the River Severn by going along Ribbesford Road, known locally as the Switchback (B4194) to avoid Stourport bridge, they will add to the existing congestion in Bewdley.</p> <p>There is no scope to widen Stourport bridge and we are told that there is no 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> <p>The problem will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Paragraph 32.5 acknowledges the flood risk associated with the Pearl Lane site. The last flooding event was at the end of 2013 when run off from the agricultural land (Site WKR/14) affected houses backing onto Pearl Lane, in Cheviot Close and Abberley Avenue.</p> <p>Following that event, some remedial work was undertaken, but building 420 houses and concreting over WKR/14 can only increase the risk of a similar event happening again, unless significant drainage works are required as an essential part of any development and that these works GUARANTEE there will be no further flooding events.</p> <p>As with the traffic flow issue, the matter will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Areley Kings is a mainly residential area and there is little infrastructure by way of, for example, schools and shops. Building 550 houses in Areley Kings would increase the need for additional school places and shopping. Neither of which can be accommodated to the west of the River Severn and both of which will add to the problems of traffic flow already mentioned.</p>
Shrawley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1393</a>	Object	<p>Representation within Option B for new housing on the southern edge of Stourport, although other proposals within this Option may have some limited impact.</p> <p>Option B for 420 dwellings along Pearl Lane, Stourport, together with a further 130 dwellings at Rectory Lane, Stourport. In addition to the up to 62 dwellings on Pearl Lane approved by MHDC in April 2014, decision notice not issued until 25 February 2015.</p> <p>WFDC and MHDC have each recently refused an application from Gladman Land for up to 125 dwellings at Astley Cross, This could go to appeal which, if successful, could see a total of nearly 750 dwellings proposed along the boundary between WFDC and MHDC.</p> <p>New housing needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure, including roads. There are no current proposals for a second river crossing at Stourport.</p> <p>Implications for neighbouring villages within MHDC. The transport assessment undertaken by Myer Brown in February 2014, in support of the outline planning application for up to 62 dwellings in Pearl Lane, says in paragraph 4.6: Furthermore, the anticipated development traffic distribution is for most peak time trips to be to / from the south, towards Worcester, with only a quarter of trips or less being to / from Stourport. This assessment was to allay fears about increased traffic through the centre of Stourport but nevertheless does mean a large majority of such journeys would be along the B4196 through Shrawley as there is no sensible alternative route to the Worcester hinterland.</p> <p>The traffic assessment produced by Ashley Hemle Associates for the Gladman Land application appears to show</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>(Figure B5) that nearly 75% of the 8.00 to 9.00 am traffic was expected to head in the direction of Stourport, some 60% plus then going over the bridge, whilst only slightly more than 25% was towards Shrawley. It is difficult on an initial reading to understand the reasons why the assessment of two developments so near together should produce such different traffic flow estimates.</p> <p>Impact of Option B housing likely to be significant through too substantial for traffic travelling along the B4196. Peak time congestion along the A4133 from its junction with the B4196 at the Red Lion, Holt through Ombersley and beyond. Further large scale housing developments together with any expansion of the West Midlands Safari Park are likely to exacerbate the existing problems unless there is road infrastructure investment.</p> <p>MHDC and WFDC should work together with Worcestershire County Council to understand fully the traffic flow estimates arising from all the proposed housing developments along the MHDC/Wyre Forest boundary at Stourport together with other significant known and anticipated proposals within the area. They then need to assess the implications for the road network across this part of North Worcestershire before bringing forward proposals for investment to address the issues that such a holistic approach has identified.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO988</a>	Object	<p>AKR/14 Pearl Lane, Areley Kings</p> <p>This again is a viable site, if more housing is needed on that side of Stourport. We would however question its selection as the road on its east side constitutes a clear landscape boundary for the developed area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1768</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option B in planning for residential properties being built on AKR/15 Rectory Lane &amp; AKR/14 Pearl Lane.</p> <p>Stourport is a bottleneck both getting over the bridge and driving from Burlish Crossroads.</p> <p>We do not have the infrastructure in Stourport. The need for a new bridge and road system, more schools, jobs and doctors. These facilities aren't there for the population it already has.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO158</a>	Object	<p>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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>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 Fridays. Any new domestic building would result in major pressure on the existing very fragile infrastructure. Majority of additional traffic would cross the bridge in order to reach services. Without a relief road the west side of the bridge could not survive a further addition of 500 dwellings, and should adjoining local authorities also approve additional dwellings in this area the whole area would result in social meltdown.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction is inevitable if building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how the access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction in inevitable it building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how the access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>The consultation plan already highlights potential problems with drainage on the Pearl Lane site as flooding is already common in Red House Road, any development on the West side of Pearl Lane would only compound this issue unless a very large delaying reservoir was installed, which of course does not come without its own safety risks. Similarly the proposed Rectory Lane site would also exasperate the existing flooding problems of Burnthorne Brook and Gladder Brook, both of which regularly burst there banks.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Both these proposed developments would be invasive to existing green field sites and expand the footprint of Stourport. These sites are adjacent to the District Council boundary, further development to these areas which are within Wyre Forest could simulate a reaction from the Adjacent Local authority to allow development adjacent to the any new residential area, compounding the pressures that have been identified above.
	<a href="#">LPPO187</a>	Object	I object to the proposed housing developments in Areley Kings paragraph32.5. I strongly feel that such housing would have a negative effect on the area including Stourport town, it would cause increased road traffic congestion in the wide area and air pollution. This pollution would certainly reduce air quality, resulting in exacerbation of respiratory ill health conditions. I therefore would ask the council to reject these plans.
	<a href="#">LPPO685</a>	Object	<p>We have visited the Areley Kings village hall for the presentation of the District Council Local Plan which was very well organised and with helpful officials to discuss individual’s comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option B - serious traffic congestion, particularly when trying to cross the river Severn from Areley Kings. Need for a new bridge has already been recognised when development on this side of the river was considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion already a problem in Areley Common, and when using local shops. Car parking for local residents is needed or a one way system or traffic lights. An increase in population would make the situation worse.</li> <li>3. Development along Rectory Lane would spoil a quiet country walk and the unspoilt scenery.</li> <li>4. Narrow Rectory Lane is blocked by traffic coming in opposite directions and is used to try to avoid a queue of traffic in the Dunley Road trying to cross the bridge. To cross the bridge from the Walshes. A traffic light system at the Areley Common- Dunley Road junction needed if development resulted in a significant increase in population this side of the river.</li> <li>5. The area in Option B now threatened with building development does not form part of the Green Belt for Stourport. High density building, on the plot bordered by Rectory Lane, Dunley Road and the Bewdley Road would stand out as an ugly disfigurement of the landscape. Wildlife here- larks singing &amp; pheasants nesting. The larger designated area bordered by Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road does have</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			some shielding by trees and bank to make development less conspicuous.
	<a href="#">LPPO338</a>	Object	Object to the building of new homes in Stourport on Severn, 550 new homes mean a minimum of 1,100 more cars on the roads. We have a job, to get to Stourport now and on a Friday when the car boot is on it's impossible to go out before 1 O'clock with the congested roads into the town and there will be a minimum of 1,100 more people to go to the only 2 doctor's surgeries in the town. More pressure on local schools and more pollution from the cars in the town. Start with doing something about Kidderminster hospital, get that up and running before you start putting more people in Kidderminster and Stourport. We have to go to Worcester or Redditch hospital. Use Option A. The Wyre Forest council was going to build another bridge 18 years ago due to congestion in the town, bypass was promised 8 years ago, we have had a few very bad accidents with a few deaths on the Dunley Road. Need lights or a roundabout on the crossroads at Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road to slow cars and bikes down, it might save someone's life some day.
	<a href="#">LPPO2688</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b><u>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</u></b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b><u>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</u></b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools, shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2834</a>	Object	<p>Development from Stourport to Areley Kings will affect the environment/quality of life due to traffic congestion/pollution and would require significant changes to the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development attracts more development and Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Option B offers NO additional funding for improved local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: i.e. Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly <u>closed</u>), roads, schools, shops, employment etc.</p> <p>Expansion is not a viable option!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2727</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to view my concerns of future Wyre Forest plans to build 6000 homes by 2034.</p> <p>Most homes have three or more cars. This creates problems with streets being blocked with parked cars, which has a knock on effect to emergency vehicles, refuse emptying vehicles etc.</p> <p>My main objection would be the increase in traffic, in particular traffic to cross over the bridge in Stourport.</p> <p>When the saplings were planted around the perimeter of the field adjacent to Pearl Lane, I questioned the reason why, were told planning permission would only be granted if there is another bridge built to cross the Severn, as the current bridge in Stourport would not cope with the extra traffic.</p> <p>The traffic sometimes stretches back as far as the Pearl Lane crossroads, and on occasions even further. I can imagine it would be like that every day with the amount of houses being suggested and majority of the traffic going in that direction.</p> <p>I do fear what impact it will have on residents and their children who live in Areley Kings.</p> <p>We choose to live in a more semi rural area, and don't want to sit in queues of traffic every day. Therefore I will</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			oppose option B until you can come up with a plan i.e. the construction of a new bridge to ease the congestion over the current bridge in Stourport. The road infrastructure is already in place, at the site of the old power station
	<a href="#">LPP01864</a>	Object	Local facilities/services already nearly at capacity without adding to it.
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPP01863</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about development and the loss of floral and fauna. Also mentions history of flash flooding in Rectory Lane area.</li> <li>2. Concerned about lack of infrastructure (gas, sewerage, water) not available, particularly in Rectory Lane. Also lack of amenities, i.e. schools and doctors.</li> <li>3. Access over river bridge to Areley Kings area, 'Do we book a weekly slot for crossing?'</li> <li>4. Concerned at the lack of industrial/commercial sites to employ all extra residents.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01788</a>	Object	<p>Objects to site references AKR/14 and AKR/15 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on wildlife and questions if ground surveys have taken place</li> <li>2. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>3. Concerned about the impact of up to 1,000 more cars having to access Stourport over the single bridge.</li> <li>4. Additional pollution from vehicles</li> <li>5. No space in existing schools, hospitals, Doctors surgeries without extra funding.</li> </ol> <p>Believes that Areley Kings is already the poor part of Stourport as far as WFDC are concerned and Stourport is the poor part of Wyre Forest. Bewdley and Kidderminster are the main beneficiaries for everything concerned with WFDC and these proposed additional buildings will make matters worse.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01903</a>	Object	Any development will have an adverse affect on the area.
	<a href="#">LPP02356</a>	Object	Comment on Option B - 550 houses to be built on Pearl Lane/Rectory Road. This would create extra traffic and cause even more problems getting through already congested Stourport. The other options seem far more

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			sensible.
	<a href="#">LPPO2618</a>	Object	<p>I live in Areley Kings and it frequently takes far too long to get across the bridge over the River Severn on Bridge Street as it is. During the rush hour the queue can back up along Dunley Road past Church Walk. It must be a nightmare for people trying to turn right out of Areley Common and another 550 houses will only exacerbate the situation. Your document states that the narrow Georgian road system in central Stourport is already borderline Air Quality Management. More greenfield development in the town will finally push it over the limit. I would be happy to see the brownfield sites developed, such as the old Chichester Caravan outlet in Vale Road and Parsons Chain in Hartlebury Road. Surely the core housing sites already agreed, together with the old Carpets of Worth site, would be more than enough to satisfy current residents who wish to stay in the town.</p> <p>In short 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2689</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b><u>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</u></b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b><u>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</u></b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools, shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02742</a>	Object	<p>If all the planned sites in the Areley Kings area were passed it would cause major problems ref the infrastructure. The bridge and current road systems are currently struggling with the traffic already using them without the addition of an extra few thousand vehicles that these proposed developments would bring. There would also be an extra strain on resources such as local schools, doctor’s surgeries, dental practices etc.</p> <p>Until funding is supplied to support a ring road/ second bridge I would strongly suggest that you as our District Council strongly oppose any major building applications on the Areley Kings side of Stourport. Not opposed to any new builds as we do need more affordable housing in Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04530</a>	Object	<p>Having attended the drop in session in Arley Kings &amp; the viewing the proposed development of the above references I am writing to lodge my OBJECTION to the proposal for this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional traffic from this proposed site will have to proceed onto the Dunley Road if wanting to access direction to Stourport or Bewdley, having to negotiate the already accident prone area cross road junction</li> <li>• Additional traffic will have to proceed over the river bridge which at peak travelling times can be banked up almost back to the crossroad junction-I write having experienced this on many, many occasions trying to get to my place of work on the Kidderminster Road, there being no other option than to travel over the bridge.</li> <li>• When repairs to structure or road surface over this bridge can add a further 20-30mins to any journey</li> <li>• Should Goldthorne Lane, commonly referred to as ‘switchback’ be closed off for any reason, flooding/road surface repair again traffic again has to be directed down towards Stourport via the Bridge.</li> <li>• Pearl Lane has become evermore popular for traffic cutting through to Bewdley/Stourport sounding at times like a Formula One race track.</li> <li>• There is no plan to change the existing road system, the existing is just NOT good enough to cope.</li> <li>• There are NO plans to increase &amp; add additional schools, (present being sited on The Walshes &amp; Astley) doctor surgeries within the proposed vicinity, surgeries are all within Stourport town, accessible only via ‘The Bridge’.</li> <li>• It cannot possibly bring any employment over ‘The Bridge’ within the Areley Kings area, just an</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>additional increase of people which must be in excess of 2000, with an additional increase of vehicle movement in excess of 1000 using an already overstretched route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To accommodate this number of homes is just not logistically feasible given the infrastructure as it exists now.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3151</a>	Object	<p>Construction of houses at the sites in Areley Kings, Stourport, is inappropriate and disastrous for Stourport with only one bridge giving access to the town and Kidderminster beyond, extra vehicles would add to the existing congestion over Stourport bridge, Bridge street and High street where long queues of traffic are commonplace, and a journey of half a mile can take fifteen minutes or more.</p> <p>Dunley road is a busy road, even if traffic lights or a roundabout were installed to reduce the possibility of accidents the problem with traffic on the bridge would still not be alleviated. If the construction of another bridge was feasible the main objection to the proposed sites would be removed.</p> <p>Increase in population could overstretch local schools and doctors' surgeries whereas a large, new medical centre has recently opened in Kidderminster which could help to accommodate the increased population for option A.</p> <p>Road links to the main areas of employment Droitwich, Worcester and Malvern are inadequate and public transport for employment purposes are poor whereas the proposed construction of a new road for option A would improve traffic flow and reduce congestion in the Kidderminster area.</p> <p>No provision for improving traffic flow through Stourport with option B,</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3610</a>	Object	<p>AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth to be used for housing before AKR/14 Pearl Lane or AKR/15 Rectory Lane sites which have no infrastructure and would increase traffic on Stourport bridge and destroy farmland/wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food & entertainment.
	<a href="#">LPP03521</a>	Object	<p>You have to queue in traffic as far back as the entrance to my road. On a sunny day it can take over 30 mins. just to get over the river bridge into town. To build 100's of houses is crazy on this site that would mean 100 more cars. Stourport would become a 'GRIDLOCKED' Town.</p> <p>I myself have tried public transport to get to work (Diamond number 3 bus) which are totally unreliable, so that for most people is not an option.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04750</a>	Object	<p>There are drainage issues associated with the Pearl Lane site. On several occasions in the past Pearl Lane itself and houses in Abberley Avenue have been flooded by runoff from the agricultural land which is now proposed as a building site. The risk of future flooding will only increase if this area is covered in concrete and asphalt.</p> <p>Furthermore the LPR makes no mention of the remains of the Roman villa which lie under the Pearl Lane site. The LPR maintains that one of its overarching environmental principals is to protect important historic buildings, monuments, sites of archaeological significance ..." (LPR; paragraph 5.4c, p22).</p> <p>This villa is "important as one of the very few Roman agricultural sites to have been excavated in Hereford and Worcester. In particular there is very little evidence for aisled buildings in the West Midlands" (Hemmingway, J and Buteux V. 1992: <i>A Roman Site at Dunley Rd, Areley Kings</i>: HWC 1136, p6) Any development would need to ensure that these remains are preserved for research and development by archaeologists in the future.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02402</a>	Object	<p>Option B must not be considered for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overriding factor above all else is the Stourport Bridge bottleneck. Living in Areley Kings we find that most days we are in a queue just to access the town. Every Friday this becomes an exceptional delay as the local car boot empties. Until a bypass is built any development should be refused in the Areley Kings area.</li> <li>2. How is the local school going to manage. Even if it is possible to be extended the access up Princess Way it is already overloaded and dangerous.</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. How will the High School cope?</p> <p>4. Part of the proposed development is upon highly productive farmland.</p> <p>5. How will the local Doctors cope with additional patients in their fixed cramped and dilapidated old premises. (We note Kidderminster and Bewdley are both in possession of new Doctors premises).</p> <p>In view of all the development in the local areas how can Worcester Royal be expected to cope?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2445</a>	Object	<p>I am a resident of Stourport-on-Severn and I would like to make the following points as a result of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possible development sites at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane will not affect me directly but they will add a huge amount of traffic through Stourport. The town is already very congested at times and this amount of new housing would just add to an existing problem. If you try to get through the town from Areley Kings you can easily wait for 10 or 15 minutes to get across the bridge. The queues often stretch along Dunley road well past Areley Common. Additionally there are queues down Areley Common and trying to get out of Hermitage Way can be a nightmare!</li> <li>• Why not conduct a study on Thursday and Friday mornings to get a quantified measure of the issue? It is not only the rush hour traffic but mid morning can be particularly bad.</li> <li>• This will also add pressure to already stretched medical services with the 2 doctors' surgeries and other infrastructure necessary within any town.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2627</a>	Object	<p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2305</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in the Areley Kings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extra traffic and pollution potential. Most of this extra traffic will be trying to get to work and shop in Kidderminster going over one bridge through the one way system of Stourport. Traffic tailing back from the bridge up to Areley Kings, with waiting times of up to half an hour to get into Stourport, even worse to get to Kidderminster.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Pearl Lane site has drainage issues. Our house backs on to Pearl Lane, we nearly flooded in July 2007 and did flood three times in November 2012. Following the flooding in 2012 we had to move out of our house for 6 months whilst the house was dried out and made habitable again. The flood water poured directly from the fields where this proposed development site is, straight across the road and through our house.</p> <p>3. Local schools are getting full or are already oversubscribed, with no physical room to expand. .</p> <p>4. Increased need for Doctor’s surgeries and the hospital, too much pressure on already overstretched services.</p> <p>Most new development should be between Stourport and Kidderminster or on the outskirts of Kidderminster where there is better transport links around the wider area. No proposal for infrastructure improvements in Areley Kings, so for any significant development to take place on this side of the river there would need to be major infrastructure improvements including a second bridge.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2121</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Pearl Lane and Ribbesford Road/Dunley Road sites:</p> <p>Already under pressure services would be need improvement - roads, sewerage/waste disposal, schools and health facilities. Stourport already v. congested, by-pass needed</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2557</a>	Object	<p>Stourport is a good place to live apart from the traffic going over the main Stourport bridge into Stourport centre from the Dunley Road. Our concerns are at times we can’t even get off our own driveway due to the traffic build up going into Stourport centre causing total gridlock.</p> <p>Therefore with the proposed plans to build more houses on plan B which I have already gave our opinion to planning officer at the civic hall. With nowhere for traffic to exit the town with out a build up of traffic causing a grid lock this is totally unacceptable for the local residents and local emergency services who already suffer traffic grid lock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2598</a>	Object	<p>We currently experience long delays along the Dunley Road leading into Stourport. The problem if further exacerbated by the parking of cars along Stourport High Street which slows the traffic down whilst they manoeuvre into the parking bays. With pedestrians also crossing the High Street of this busy little town the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic frequently grinds to a halt.</p> <p>The LPR does not allow for any additional Doctors Surgeries in Stourport. It is currently very difficult to get an appointment to see a Doctor. Again this can only get worse with the additional developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3144</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option B as we do not have the facilities to cope with any more houses or people in Stourport (Arley Kings). The roads are constantly grid locked at present, how would we cope with more traffic.</p> <p>There are no longer school places as our schools have been closed with the exception of one school, which would mean children going to school the other side of the river, which then again impacts massively on the traffic over the bridge.</p> <p>At present our doctors' surgeries are unable to accommodate the people in the area, it can be weeks before you can get an appointment – how will they cope with more.</p> <p>We have had discussions regarding the field on Pearl Lane before and were informed that this cannot be built on as it was an area of natural beauty – not sure why this has now changed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3196</a>	Object	<p>The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</p> <p>The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</p> <p>The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock. As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>houses which will be financially cheaper.</p> <p>Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04025</a>	Object	<p>My main concerns centre around the Option B proposal for further development in Stourport in the Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top areas. These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. The fact there is no provision for infrastructure (i.e. road, schooling etc) upgrades alongside these additional buildings, which there is for Option A (additional development in Kidderminster) is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising. If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley ? Is this another instance of these, smaller, towns being seen as the 'poor relation' to Kidderminster ?</p> <p>Areley Kings currently sees traffic queues into, and out of Stourport, on a daily basis which is increased at weekends and holiday times. The proposal to build in excess of 500 new homes will bring a huge increase in traffic over the single river crossing. This traffic will have to proceed through Bridge Street, which is a narrow street that frequently suffers from inconsiderate, and illegal, parking and onto the High Street. The increased volume of traffic will result in a drop in the air quality of the Bridge Street and High Street, whilst also adding greatly to the congestion. Increasing traffic congestion will also seriously hamper the access by emergency services vehicles, potentially, putting lives at risk. In the event of the Stourport bridge, the single river crossing, being unusable this increased traffic will have no option but to travel down narrow lanes to find an alternative route.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01766</a>	Object	Object to AKR/14 and AKR/15 due to congestion and lack of infrastructure of roads, education, jobs and facilities.
	<a href="#">LPP01776</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Pearl Lane AKR/14 and Rectory Lane AKR/15 build of 550 houses. Reasons for objection:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-infrastructure cannot meet the increased traffic flow over one access (the Stourport bridge).</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			-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.
	<a href="#">LPP0232</a>	Object	The proposed developments on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane along with the approved development in Malvern Hills district (Pearl lane) would put extra strain on the poor infrastructure in all directions and would cause more pollution in Bridge Street and the High Street. Areley Common is getting more congested. There is virtually no employment in the area. Areley Common First School was demolished in 2007 and replaced with houses. Astley School is difficult to access and is over subscribed. Children have to cross the congested bridge every day for school. No Doctors Surgery on this side of the bridge.
	<a href="#">LPP0247</a>	Object	Building 550 houses on Pearl Lane / Rectory Lane is a really ill thought out option. Potentially increase the traffic crossing the bridge in Stourport by up to 500 to 800 cars twice daily. This crossing is already grinding to a halt twice daily and the additional traffic will result in tremendous hold ups in the town its self.  Major effect of these additional houses is the effect on infrastructure, i.e. Doctors and Schools both of which are not coping, without the addition of potentially 1567 new houses, potentially 4700 residents if plan B is adopted using facilities that are already failing.
	<a href="#">LPP01840</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't want any development in Areley Kings.</li> <li>• Should build on brown sites where possible to protect countryside and wildlife as well as having land to produce food.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0154</a>	Object	Proposed development on Pearl lane and Rectory 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 600 houses will increase gridlock to an unsustainable level. Rectory Lane is a one car width lane with no passing points or pavements, highly unsuitable for a housing estate. 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?
	<a href="#">LPP0237</a>	Object	To develop west of Areley Kings (Pearl Lane, Rectory Lane) would place even more traffic stress on the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			congested River Severn crossing into Stourport, on local transport and services, as well as encroaching on open countryside and outstanding natural undulating views from Rectory Lane.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO809</a>	Support	Pearl Lane - Suitable and sustainable site for housing. Meetings held with officers re development potential. Landscape strategy can be put into place. Drainage information submitted and no further comments raised. Site is less sensitive than Green Belt sites to north of town. Detailed highways information submitted by site promoter to County Council. Awaiting response. (see attachment). LPA has detailed promotional document explaining how site can come forward and technical constraints can be addressed.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO5058</a>	Comment	Rectory/Pearl Lane would require extra roads even another river bridge!
	<a href="#">LPPO3219</a>	Comment	<p>The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</p> <p>The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</p> <p>The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock.</p> <p>As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper.</p> <p>Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</p>
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO5031</a>	Comment	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites 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.</p> <p>Development of this land would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat.</p>
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO5049</a>	Comment	Development of these sites at Areley Kings would encroach into the open countryside and lead to further exacerbate the high level of traffic congestion across the bridge and add to air pollution in the town centre. This point is actually made in section 32.5 of the Review document.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO5054</a>	Comment	<p>It will be essential to be clear about the level of affordable housing and its provision. (Developers should not be allowed to agree a ratio of affordable development only to later reduce that ratio to ensure a higher profit).</p> <p>There are statements about the attraction of the Town Centre, but properties do not appear to be maintained to a high standard and the issue of the ‘Buftons’ building in Bridge Street has been unresolved for several decades. The development to link The Canal Basins with Bridge Street has yet to take place and is currently a car park.</p> <p>Any additional development in Areley Kings will increase demand on health and education services. The traffic system is under considerable strain. Areley Common is regularly congested and the tail back across the River Bridge backs up to Dunley Road and Areley Common. The Town Centre itself is frequently blocked.</p> <p>Social cohesion and the need to identify with your community is important for quality of life, levels of crime, etc. This should be a primary factor in retaining community boundaries and village identity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5055</a>	Comment	<p><b><u>Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane (AKR/14 and AKR/15)</u></b></p> <p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites 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.</p> <p>Development of this land, on such a scale, would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat. Surely the refusal of the development on the Snipes has recognised this, and its principles would apply to other sites of major development in the area?</p>
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPPO5059</a>	Comment	<p>Concerns about significant levels of growth at Areley Kings (550 new dwellings under option B). 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 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. In particular, 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</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Relief Road in Local Transport 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO5045</a>	Comment	The Pearl Lane developers are, we are told by the Officers at the presentation, going to be responsible for the provision of a second bridge and road improvements. Bearing in mind the link road to provide the access to the river on the North side to the bridge was to be the responsibility of the food store developer and Wyre Forest singularly failed to get other than a feeder road to the development there is little chance of getting this improvement at the costs indicated.  Congestion from the South across the bridge is causing significant pollution as well as delays. Again we are told that the bridge is adequate with no proof given. If this is so this clearly shows that infrastructure improvements are urgently required North of the bridge without any further development.
	<a href="#">LPPO5056</a>	Comment	Can be serviced via public transport.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO4949</a>	Support	Site is outside Green Belt and identified as option B site. Taylor Wimpey are promoting land beyond the area currently identified to ensure that sufficient open space and supporting infrastructure. See attached plan at Appendix 1. The site has been extended beyond the existing tree belt.  A Development Vision document has been prepared (appendix 2) which pulls together a wide range of technical information. Key features include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 150 dwellings</li> <li>• vehicular and pedestrian access from Dunley Road</li> <li>• Approx. 7.62Ha public open space</li> <li>• Provision of SUDs</li> <li>• comprehensive pedestrian network</li> </ul> Analysis concludes that site is suitable, deliverable and developable.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO4951</a>	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landscape Sensitivity:</b> Site directly abuts existing western residential edge of Areley Kings. Southern part of site is adjacent to A451. To SW,W and NW landscape opens towards wooded valleys and rolling hills. Site forms W facing slope between settlement edge and wider landscape. The development strategy will help integrate proposals into landscape and mitigate potential impacts.</li> <li>• <b>Accessibility to Amenities:</b> Site has good access to local services and Stourport town centre via number of routes. Areley Kings has primary school, village hall, churches, newsagents, post office, convenience store, pharmacy and public houses.</li> <li>• <b>Highways and Transportation:</b> Preliminary Indicative Masterplan shows that site 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. A Transport Assessment will be completed to assess wider impacts.</li> <li>• <b>Flood Risk and Drainage:</b> Site in flood zone 1. Burnthorn Brook runs along N boundary but topography means any potential flooding would have minimal impact as site slopes to its N boundary. On site attenuation likely to be in form of balancing pond along N boundary.</li> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> It is anticipated that any dwellings along W and S boundary would need to face existing roads in order to protect rear gardens. Noise is unlikely to have significant adverse impact.</li> <li>• <b>Ground Conditions:</b> Majority of site underlain by Wildmoor Sandstone Formation. Minimal risk of contamination shown by initial assessment.</li> <li>• <b>Utilities:</b> Any costs required to upgrade existing network will be met by developer.</li> <li>• <b>Agricultural Land Classification:</b> Site comprises mostly Grade 3 with some Grade 2.</li> <li>• <b>Deliverability:</b> Agreement in place with landowner.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3513</a>	Object	Objection - lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. Building on Green Belt
	<a href="#">LPPO5014</a>	Object	In relation to the two preferred options being put forwards for development it seems that the obvious option to adopt is option A as opposed to option B. I believe this to be for the following reasons:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>The infrastructure has to be key to this as the Kidderminster/Stourport/Bewdley area roads are already congested and Option B does not have any plan or allowance to ease this issue. Particularly in relation to the proposed houses west of the River Severn on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings, the area already has a huge issue with people trying to get into Stourport over the bridge. The road layout in Stourport does not and will not ever be particularly traffic friendly and at peak times it can take over half an hour to do a mile journey from Areley Kings, through Stourport. Preferred Option B would plan to add 550 houses to Areley Kings side of the river. On the basis that the average house has 2 cars these days and with the main employment opportunities being offered in Kidderminster area that would be an additional 1100 cars trying to get over Stourport bridge and would make an already bad problem locally, even worse. It would be a nightmare to put 550 new houses on Areley Kings side of the river without a new bridge to account for the traffic.</p> <p>Schools - Option B with particular relevance to the proposed 550 houses in Areley Kings. This area is already overcrowded in schools with children having to take places in schools to Stourport side of the river as there are not enough places in the Areley Kings Schools. This matter will get worse with the proposed increase in housing. This point also links to the above point on traffic as if there is no proposal as part of preferred option B to increase school places to Areley Kings side of the river then this will mean more traffic to get children to Stourport schools, further deepening the issue of the bridge being a huge bottleneck for traffic.</p> <p>Employment — With particular relevance to the proposed housing in preferred option B to Areley Kings side of the river, these people would all 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.</p> <p>Natural Environment — The area to the west of the River Severn being proposed for development currently has a vibrant natural environment which is enjoyed by a lot of the local residents for dog walking, outdoor pursuits and most of all its natural beauty. Developing such an area with increased housing would have a huge impact on local residents' ability to enjoy the natural environment in which they live. The area is also home to a large amount of wildlife including birds whose habitat would be ruined by the preferred option B plan to build 550 houses on the land by Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5017</a>	Object	I live in Areley Kings and it frequently takes far too long to get across the bridge over the River Severn on Bridge

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Street as it is. During the rush hour the queue can back up along Dunley Road past Church Walk. It must be a nightmare for people trying to turn right out of Areley Common and another 550 houses will only exacerbate the situation. Your document states that the narrow Georgian road system in central Stourport is already borderline Air Quality Management. More greenfield development in the town will finally push it over the limit. I would be happy to see the brownfield sites developed, such as the old Chichester Caravan outlet in Vale Road and Parsons Chain in Hartlebury Road. Surely the core housing sites already agreed, together with the old Carpets of Worth site, would be more than enough to satisfy current residents who wish to stay in the town.</p> <p>In short 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5019</a>	Object	Comment on Option B - 550 houses to be built on Pearl Lane/Rectory Road. This would create extra traffic and cause even more problems getting through already congested Stourport. The other options seem far more sensible.
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPPO5021</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about development and the loss of floral and fauna. Also mentions history of flash flooding in Rectory Lane area.</li> <li>2. Concerned about lack of infrastructure (gas, sewerage, water) not available, particularly in Rectory Lane. Also lack of amenities, i.e. schools and doctors.</li> <li>3. Access over river bridge to Areley Kings area, 'Do we book a weekly slot for crossing?'</li> <li>4. Concerned at the lack of industrial/commercial sites to employ all extra residents.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO5022</a>	Object	Local facilities/services already nearly at capacity without adding to it.
	<a href="#">LPPO5029</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are already houses planned in this area, just over the border into Malvern Hills. Inhabitants of these houses will inevitably be sharing the same services such as education, health etc and their additional vehicles will add to the existing congestion and pollution.</li> <li>2. Building more housing developments in the Areley Kings area would add even further to this. Congestion would particularly increase. As most of the facilities are not this side of the river, most people have to travel. In turn, this would exacerbate the problems in Stourport, particularly around the river crossing,</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Gilgal, Lion Hill, York Street. These roads are already particularly busy, gridlocked at times. This would dramatically increase pollution levels, reducing air quality.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. There have already been fatalities at the Pearl Lane/Dunley Road crossroads. Adding more traffic and access points in this locality would be extremely dangerous.</li> <li>4. Residents in Shrawley already have problems with speeding traffic and the roads through Holt and Ombersley are often gridlocked.</li> </ol>
Shrawley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO5032</a>	Object	<p>Representation within Option B for new housing on the southern edge of Stourport, although other proposals within this Option may have some limited impact.</p> <p>Option B for 420 dwellings along Pearl Lane, Stourport, together with a further 130 dwellings at Rectory Lane, Stourport. In addition to the up to 62 dwellings on Pearl Lane approved by MHDC in April 2014, decision notice not issued until 25 February 2015.</p> <p>WFDC and MHDC have each recently refused an application from Gladman Land for up to 125 dwellings at Astley Cross, This could go to appeal which, if successful, could see a total of nearly 750 dwellings proposed along the boundary between WFDC and MHDC.</p> <p>New housing needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure, including roads. There are no current proposals for a second river crossing at Stourport.</p> <p>Implications for neighbouring villages within MHDC. The transport assessment undertaken by Myer Brown in February 2014, in support of the outline planning application for up to 62 dwellings in Pearl Lane, says in paragraph 4.6: Furthermore, the anticipated development traffic distribution is for most peak time trips to be to / from the south, towards Worcester, with only a quarter of trips or less being to / from Stourport. This assessment was to allay fears about increased traffic through the centre of Stourport but nevertheless does mean a large majority of such journeys would be along the B4196 through Shrawley as there is no sensible alternative route to the Worcester hinterland.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>The traffic assessment produced by Ashley Hemle Associates for the Gladman Land application appears to show (Figure B5) that nearly 75% of the 8.00 to 9.00 am traffic was expected to head in the direction of Stourport, some 60% plus then going over the bridge, whilst only slightly more than 25% was towards Shrawley. It is difficult on an initial reading to understand the reasons why the assessment of two developments so near together should produce such different traffic flow estimates.</p> <p>Impact of Option B housing likely to be significant through to substantial for traffic travelling along the B4196. Peak time congestion along the A4133 from its junction with the B4196 at the Red Lion, Holt through Ombersley and beyond. Further large scale housing developments together with any expansion of the West Midlands Safari Park are likely to exacerbate the existing problems unless there is road infrastructure investment.</p> <p>MHDC and WFDC should work together with Worcestershire County Council to understand fully the traffic flow estimates arising from all the proposed housing developments along the MHDC/Wyre Forest boundary at Stourport together with other significant known and anticipated proposals within the area. They then need to assess the implications for the road network across this part of North Worcestershire before bringing forward proposals for investment to address the issues that such a holistic approach has identified.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5033</a>	Object	<p>Developments from Stourport into Areley Kings will affect the environment/quality of life due to traffic congestion/pollution and would require significant changes to the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development attracts more development and Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Option B offers NO additional funding for improved local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly <u>closed</u>), roads, schools, shops, employment etc.</p> <p>Expansion is not a viable option!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5037</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools, shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers’ charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO5041</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We have visited the Areley Kings village hall for the presentation of the District Council Local Plan which was very well organised and with helpful officials to discuss individual’s comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option B - serious traffic congestion, particularly when trying to cross the river Severn from Areley Kings. Need for a new bridge has already been recognised when development on this side of the river was considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion already a problem in Areley Common, and when using local shops. Car parking for local residents is needed or a one way system or traffic lights. An increase in population would make the situation worse.</li> <li>3. Development along Rectory Lane would spoil a quiet country walk and the unspoilt scenery.</li> <li>4. Narrow Rectory Lane is blocked by traffic coming in opposite directions and is used to try to avoid a queue of traffic in the Dunley Road trying to cross the bridge. To cross the bridge from the Walshes. A traffic light system at the Areley Common- Dunley Road junction needed if development resulted in a significant increase in population this side of the river.</li> <li>5. The area in Option B now threatened with building development does not form part of the Green Belt for Stourport. High density building, on the plot bordered by Rectory Lane, Dunley Road and the Bewdley Road would stand out as an ugly disfigurement of the landscape. Wildlife here- larks singing &amp; pheasants nesting. The larger designated area bordered by Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road does have some</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			shielding by trees and bank to make development less conspicuous.
	<a href="#">LPPO5043</a>	Object	Object to the building of new homes in Stourport on Severn, 550 new homes mean a minimum of 1,100 more cars on the roads. We have a job, to get to Stourport now and on a Friday when the car boot is on it's impossible to go out before 1 O'clock with the congested roads into the town and there will be a minimum of 1,100 more people to go to the only 2 doctor's surgeries in the town. More pressure on local schools and more pollution from the cars in the town. Start with doing something about Kidderminster hospital, get that up and running before you start putting more people in Kidderminster and Stourport. We have to go to Worcester or Redditch hospital. Use Option A. The Wyre Forest council was going to build another bridge 18 years ago due to congestion in the town, bypass was promised 8 years ago, we have had a few very bad accidents with a few deaths on the Dunley Road. Need lights or a roundabout on the crossroads at Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road to slow cars and bikes down, it might save someone's life some day.
	<a href="#">LPPO5051</a>	Object	Object to Option B in planning for residential properties being built on AKR/15 Rectory Lane & AKR/14 Pearl Lane.  Stourport is a bottleneck both getting over the bridge and driving from Burlish Crossroads.  We do not have the infrastructure in Stourport. The need for a new bridge and road system, more schools, jobs and doctors. These facilities aren't there for the population it already has.
	<a href="#">LPPO5053</a>	Object	I wish to object most strongly to any plans to build housing on greenfield sites in Areley Kings. The infrastructure of the village doesn't lend itself to further housing development. Lack of school facilities, health facilities, roads to the south, west are both narrow and tortuous. THE MAIN POINT IS THAT A SINGLE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIVER is obviously totally inadequate for further traffic feeding as it does a very limited traffic gyratory system in Stourport. Furthermore 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. There are acres of brownfield site within the Wyre Forest area so why destroy our heritage, OUR GREEN AND PLESANT LAND!! Looking to Kidderminster Town Centre there are streets of empty derelict shops so why not follow the current American pattern of popular 'In-town Living'? Area too of derelict factories south of Tescos in

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Stourport.</p> <p>Another facet is the lack of public transport evenings and Sundays. Services gone and never to return.</p> <p>I trust that you will throw out this plan and look again at all the brown field sites around. I feel that no homework has been done yet again!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5060</a>	Object	I object to the proposed housing developments in Areley Kings paragraph 32.5. I strongly feel that such housing would have a negative effect on the area including Stourport town, it would cause increased road traffic congestion in the wide area and air pollution. This pollution would certainly reduce air quality, resulting in exacerbation of respiratory ill health conditions. I therefore would ask the council to reject these plans.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO989</a>	Object	Again this is a viable site, but we would question its selection as it would constitute a salient of the town into the countryside, where the edge of the town is defined by roads, which are a clear landscape barrier.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO810</a>	Object	Rectory Lane - not Green Belt but is visually sensitive as adjoins Conservation Area. Pearl Lane site relates better to settlement as should be preferred.
	<a href="#">LPPO5015</a>	Object	<p>Objects to site references AKR/14 and AKR/15 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on wildlife and questions if ground surveys have taken place</li> <li>2. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>3. Concerned about the impact of up to 1,000 more cars having to access Stourport over the single bridge.</li> <li>4. Additional pollution from vehicles</li> <li>5. No space in existing schools, hospitals, Doctors surgeries without extra funding.</li> </ol> <p>Believes that Areley Kings is already the poor part of Stourport as far as WFDC are concerned and Stourport is the poor part of Wyre Forest. Bewdley and Kidderminster are the main beneficiaries for everything concerned with</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			WFDC and these proposed additional buildings will make matters worse.
	<a href="#">LPPO5023</a>	Object	Any development will have an adverse affect on the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO5027</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to option B.</li> <li>• Any housing developments across the bridge into Areley Kings will have an effect on the environment and the quality of life of residents.</li> <li>• More vehicles on the road will affect residents in the area as well as causing reduced air quality which could lead to health issues.</li> <li>• Estimate: possibly 100-1500+ extra vehicles which leads to 2000+ extra journeys a day.</li> <li>• Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable and unmanageable.</li> <li>• Funding should be targeted where there is sufficient scope to develop a manageable and workable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</li> <li>• Increase in population and vehicles would need significant change to local infrastructure.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure in Areley Kings is already at full capacity so there's no room for expansion - option B does not provide funding for improvements.</li> <li>• Local roads are primarily country lanes.</li> <li>• Only one local primary school - no room for more pupils.</li> <li>• Additional patients at doctors/dentists will have an affect on the quality of services they provide.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure will not cope with new development as there is no funding to improve what's already in place - creating unreasonable and unsustainable demands.</li> <li>• Development attracts more development.</li> <li>• Stourport/Areley Kings cannot take the levels of additional housing in option B let alone any additional future developments.</li> <li>• Traffic in Stourport already causes gridlock especially at peak times.</li> <li>• Congestion, roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volume of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians.</li> <li>• It is not just the local population which uses Stourport Bridge to cross the river.</li> <li>• Stourport is a tourist attraction as well as having caravan parks causing more people and cars to come to the area.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• Options of creating new job opportunities are minimal even with funding which option B does not offer.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5030</a>	Object	<p>Any development to the west of the river Severn would carry such massive infrastructure costs.</p> <p>Creating approx 1000 new homes to the west of Stourport, must inevitably require a new Severn crossing. Currently going from the west, crossing the river at Stourport can easily take 30 minutes.</p> <p>The schools, Doctors and other requirements, must surely make the whole concept run into many Millions.</p> <p>Increasing traffic would make the situation far, far worse.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5034</a>	Object	<p>If all the planned sites in the Areley Kings area were passed it would cause major problems ref the infrastructure. The bridge and current road systems are currently struggling with the traffic already using them without the addition of an extra few thousand vehicles that these proposed developments would bring. There would also be an extra strain on resources such as local schools, doctors surgeries, dental practices etc.</p> <p>Until funding is supplied to support a ring road/ second bridge I would strongly suggest that you as our District Council strongly oppose any major building applications on the Areley Kings side of Stourport. Not opposed to any new builds as we do need more affordable housing in Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5035</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to view my concerns of future Wyre Forest plans to build 6000 homes by 2034.</p> <p>Most homes have three or more cars. This creates problems with streets being blocked with parked cars, which has a knock on effect to emergency vehicles, refuge emptying vehicles etc.</p> <p>My main objection would be the increase in traffic, in particular traffic to cross over the bridge in Stourport.</p> <p>When the saplings were planted around the perimeter of the field adjacent to Pearl Lane, I questioned the reason why, were told planning permission would only be granted if there is another bridge built to cross the Severn, as</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>the current bridge in Stourport would not cope with the extra traffic.</p> <p>The traffic sometimes stretches back as far as the Pearl Lane crossroads, and on occasions even further. I can imagine it would be like that every day with the amount of houses being suggested and majority of the traffic going in that direction.</p> <p>I do fear what impact it will have on residents and their children who live in Areley Kings.</p> <p>We choose to live in a more semi rural area, and don't want to sit in queues of traffic every day. Therefore I will oppose option B until you can come up with a plan i.e. the construction of a new bridge to ease the congestion over the current bridge in Stourport. The road infrastructure is already in place, at the site of the old power station</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO5036</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5044</a>	Object	<p>Most houses have 2 cars outside them. Building over 500 houses on the Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane sites is likely to generate something in the order of 1000 additional vehicles. Some of the journeys made in these vehicles will</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>be in the direction of Worcester (B4196) or in the direction of Great Witley (A451) and so will not directly affect traffic flow in Stourport. However, the majority of journeys will be over Stourport bridge and through Stourport. This area already suffers traffic flow problems and it is not unusual for traffic to queue back along Dunley Road to the crossroads of A451 and B4194. If drivers take the alternative route to cross the River Severn by going along Ribbesford Road, known locally as the Switchback (B4194) to avoid Stourport bridge, they will add to the existing congestion in Bewdley.</p> <p>There is no scope to widen Stourport bridge and we are told that there is no 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> <p>The problem will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Paragraph 32.5 acknowledges the flood risk associated with the Pearl Lane site. The last flooding event was at the end of 2013 when run off from the agricultural land (Site WKR/14) affected houses backing onto Pearl Lane, in Cheviot Close and Abberley Avenue.</p> <p>Following that event, some remedial work was undertaken, but building 420 houses and concreting over WKR/14 can only increase the risk of a similar event happening again, unless significant drainage works are required as an essential part of any development and that these works GUARANTEE there will be no further flooding events.</p> <p>As with the traffic flow issue, the matter will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Areley Kings is a mainly residential area and there is little infrastructure by way of, for example, schools and shops. Building 550 houses in Areley Kings would increase the need for additional school places and shopping. Neither of which can be accommodated to the west of the River Severn and both of which will add to the problems of traffic flow already mentioned.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5052</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional housing across the river on the Dunley Road side of Stourport would also cause severe traffic</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>congestion as there is only one bridge for traffic to cross leading to and from the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amount of traffic in Stourport has increased greatly in recent years due to additional housing and yet the infrastructure has not improved. There has been no additional schools, medical centres, hospitals in the Wyre Forest area and no improvement with the roads to help alleviate traffic, apart from a set of traffic lights at Burlish Crossing. What a difference that made! Over the years promises have been made by MPs to improve traffic problems by introducing a new relief road and bridge, but these promises have never materialised.</li> <li>• Stourport is already heavily congested and these traffic problems are increased in the summer months as it is popular with tourists.</li> <li>• Rather than improvements to the infrastructure of Stourport, we have witnessed a decrease in our facilities, i.e. Police, Fire Station, Leisure Centre and swimming pool, children's paddling pool in the Memorial Park. These facilities have all been moved to Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Although I object to the large housing estates and social housing on Green Belt land in theory I accept that with increased population and immigration there is a need for additional housing. But with increased population in an area, surely the facilities and infrastructure for that area should also be increased to cater for the increased needs of the populace.</li> </ul> <p>I would add that although I am against these concrete jungles taking over Green Belt land, it would appear that Kidderminster would be better placed to accommodate the additional housing, as its' infrastructure and facilities are far superior to that in place in Stourport. In addition, the proposed new road joining the A456 to the A449 would also help alleviate the additional traffic; whereas I believe there are no such new roads proposed for Stourport.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO5062</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>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 Fridays. Any new domestic building would result in major pressure on the existing very fragile</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>infrastructure. Majority of additional traffic would cross the bridge in order to reach services. Without a relief road the west side of the bridge could not survive a further addition of 500 dwellings, and should adjoining local authorities also approve additional dwellings in this area the whole area would result in social meltdown.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction is inevitable if building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how this access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction in inevitable it building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl  Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how this access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>The consultation plan already highlights potential problems with drainage on the Pearl Lane site as flooding is already common in Red House Road, any development on the West side of Pearl Lane would only compound this issue unless a very large delaying reservoir was installed, which of course does not come without its own safety risks. Similarly the proposed Rectory Lane site would also exasperate the existing flooding problems of Burnthorne Brook and Gladder Brook, both of which regularly burst there banks.</p> <p>Both these proposed developments would be invasive to existing green field sites and expand the footprint of Stourport. These sites are adjacent to the District Council boundary, further development to these areas which are within Wyre Forest could simulate a reaction from the Adjacent Local authority to allow development adjacent to the any new residential area, compounding the pressures that have been identified above.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO2225</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Objection to Rectory Lane (AKR/15)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop alternative site this is not a brownfield site and is in agricultural use - important after Brexit.</li> <li>• Local schools/hospitals lack capacity</li> <li>• Traffic congestion on local road network</li> <li>• Danger to pedestrians</li> <li>• Additional flood risk</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5016</a>	Object	<p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5025</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in the Areley Kings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extra traffic and pollution potential. Most of this extra traffic will be trying to get to work and shop in Kidderminster going over one bridge through the one way system of Stourport. Traffic tailing back from the bridge up to Areley Kings, with waiting times of up to half an hour to get into Stourport, even worse to get to Kidderminster.</li> <li>2. Pearl Lane site has drainage issues. Our house backs on to Pearl Lane, we nearly flooded in July 2007 and did flood three times in November 2012. Following the flooding in 2012 we had to move out of our house for 6 months whilst the house was dried out and made habitable again. The flood water poured directly from the fields where this proposed development site is, straight across the road and through our house.</li> <li>3. Local schools are getting full or are already oversubscribed, with no physical room to expand. .</li> <li>4. Increased need for Doctor’s surgeries and the hospital, too much pressure on already overstretched services.</li> </ol> <p>Most new development should be between Stourport and Kidderminster or on the outskirts of Kidderminster where there is better transport links around the wider area. No proposal for infrastructure improvements in Areley Kings, so for any significant development to take place on this side of the river there would need to be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			major infrastructure improvements including a second bridge.
	<a href="#">LPP05038</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</li> <li>• The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</li> <li>• The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock. As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper.</li> <li>• Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP05039</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option B as we do not have the facilities to cope with any more houses or people in Stourport (Arley Kings). The roads are constantly grid locked at present, how would we cope with more traffic.</p> <p>There are no longer school places as our schools have been closed with the exception of one school, which would mean children going to school the other side of the river, which then again impacts massively on the traffic over the bridge.</p> <p>At present our doctors' surgeries are unable to accommodate the people in the area, it can be weeks before you can get an appointment – how will they cope with more.</p> <p>We have had discussions regarding the field on Pearl Lane before and were informed that this cannot be built on as it was an area of natural beauty – not sure why this has now changed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05042</a>	Object	To develop west of Areley Kings (Pearl Lane, Rectory Lane) would place even more traffic stress on the congested River Severn crossing into Stourport, on local transport and services, as well as encroaching on open countryside

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			and outstanding natural undulating views from Rectory Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO5046</a>	Object	The proposed developments on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane along with the approved development in Malvern Hills district (Pearl lane) would put extra strain on the poor infrastructure in all directions and would cause more pollution in Bridge Street and the High Street. Areley Common is getting more congested. There is virtually no employment in the area. Areley Common First School was demolished in 2007 and replaced with houses. Astley School is difficult to access and is over subscribed. Children have to cross the congested bridge every day for school. No Doctors Surgery on this side of the bridge.
	<a href="#">LPPO5050</a>	Object	Object to AKR/14 and AKR/15 due to congestion and lack of infrastructure of roads, education, jobs and facilities.
	<a href="#">LPPO5012</a>	Object	<p>Stourport is a good place to live apart from the traffic going over the main Stourport bridge into Stourport centre from the Dunley Road. Our concerns are at times we can't even get off our own driveway due to the traffic build up going into Stourport centre causing total gridlock.</p> <p>Therefore with the proposed plans to build more houses on plan B which I have already gave our opinion to planning officer at the civic hall. With nowhere for traffic to exit the town with out a build up of traffic causing a grid lock this is totally unacceptable for the local residents and local emergency services who already suffer traffic grid lock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5018</a>	Object	<p>Option B must not be considered for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overriding factor above all else is the Stourport Bridge bottleneck. Living in Areley Kings we find that most days we are in a queue just to access the town. Every Friday this becomes an exceptional delay as the local car boot empties. Until a bypass is built any development should be refused in the Areley Kings area.</li> <li>2. How is the local school going to manage? Even if it is possible to be extended the access up Princess Way it is already overloaded and dangerous.</li> <li>3. How will the High School cope?</li> <li>4. Part of the proposed development is upon highly productive farmland.</li> <li>5. How will the local Doctors cope with additional patients in their fixed cramped and dilapidated old</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>premises? (We note Kidderminster and Bewdley are both in possession of new Doctors premises).</p> <p>In view of all the development in the local areas how can Worcester Royal be expected to cope?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5020</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't want any development in Areley Kings.</li> <li>• Should build on brown sites where possible to protect countryside and wildlife as well as having land to produce food.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5024</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Pearl Lane and Ribbesford Road/Dunley Road sites:</p> <p>Already under pressure services would be need improvement - roads, sewerage/waste disposal, schools and health facilities. Stourport already v. congested, by-pass needed</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5026</a>	Object	<p>My main concerns centre around the Option B proposal for further development in Stourport in the Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top areas. These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. The fact there is no provision for infrastructure (i.e. road, schooling etc) upgrades alongside these additional buildings, which there is for Option A (additional development in Kidderminster) is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising. If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley? Is this another instance of these, smaller, towns being seen as the 'poor relation' to Kidderminster?</p> <p>Areley Kings currently sees traffic queues into, and out of Stourport, on a daily basis which is increased at weekends and holiday times. The proposal to build in excess of 500 new homes will bring a huge increase in traffic over the single river crossing. This traffic will have to proceed through Bridge Street, which is a narrow street that frequently suffers from inconsiderate, and illegal, parking and onto the High Street. The increased volume of traffic will result in a drop in the air quality of the Bridge Street and High Street, whilst also adding greatly to the congestion. Increasing traffic congestion will also seriously hamper the access by emergency services vehicles, potentially, putting lives at risk. In the event of the Stourport bridge, the single river crossing, being unusable this increased traffic will have no option but to travel down narrow lanes to find an alternative route.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO5028</a>	Object	<p>AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth to be used for housing before AKR/14 Pearl Lane or AKR/15 Rectory Lane sites which have no infrastructure and would increase traffic on Stourport bridge and destroy farmland/wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</p> <p>Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food &amp; entertainment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5040</a>	Object	<p>Construction of houses at the sites in Areley Kings, Stourport, is inappropriate and disastrous for Stourport with only one bridge giving access to the town and Kidderminster beyond, extra vehicles would add to the existing congestion over Stourport bridge, Bridge street and High street where long queues of traffic are commonplace, and a journey of half a mile can take fifteen minutes or more.</p> <p>Dunley road is a busy road, even if traffic lights or a roundabout were installed to reduce the possibility of accidents the problem with traffic on the bridge would still not be alleviated. If the construction of another bridge was feasible the main objection to the proposed sites would be removed.</p> <p>Increase in population could overstretch local schools and doctors' surgeries whereas a large, new medical centre has recently opened in Kidderminster which could help to accommodate the increased population for option A.</p> <p>Road links to the main areas of employment Droitwich, Worcester and Malvern are inadequate and public transport for employment purposes are poor whereas the proposed construction of a new road for option A would improve traffic flow and reduce congestion in the Kidderminster area.</p> <p>No provision for improving traffic flow through Stourport with option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5047</a>	Object	<p>Building 550 houses on Pearl Lane / Rectory Lane is a really ill thought out option. Potentially increase the traffic crossing the bridge in Stourport by up to 500 to 800 cars twice daily. This crossing is already grinding to a halt twice daily and the additional traffic will result in tremendous hold ups in the town its self.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Major effect of these additional houses is the effect on infrastructure, i.e. Doctors and Schools both of which are not coping, without the addition of potentially 1567 new houses, potentially 4700 residents if plan B is adopted using facilities that are already failing.
	<a href="#">LPPO5048</a>	Object	<p>I am a resident of Stourport-on-Severn and I would like to make the following points as a result of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possible development sites at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane will not affect me directly but they will add a huge amount of traffic through Stourport. The town is already very congested at times and this amount of new housing would just add to an existing problem. If you try to get through the town from Areley Kings you can easily wait for 10 or 15 minutes to get across the bridge. The queues often stretch along Dunley road well past Areley Common. Additionally there are queues down Areley Common.</li> <li>• Why not conduct a study on Thursday and Friday mornings to get a quantified measure of the issue? It is not only the rush hour traffic but mid morning can be particularly bad.</li> <li>• This will also add pressure to already stretched medical services with the 2 doctors surgeries and other infrastructure necessary within any town.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2564</a>	Object	<p>Having attended the drop in session in Arley Kings &amp; the viewing the proposed development of the above references I am writing to lodge my OBJECTION to the proposal for this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional traffic from this proposed site will have to proceed onto the Dunley Road if wanting to access direction to Stourport or Bewdley, having to negotiate the already accident prone area cross road junction</li> <li>• Additional traffic will have to proceed over the river bridge which at peak travelling times can be backed up almost back to the crossroad junction-I write having experienced this on many, many occasions trying to get to my place of work on the Kidderminster Road, there being no other option than to travel over the bridge.</li> <li>• When repairs to structure or road surface over this bridge can add a further 20-30mins to any journey</li> <li>• Should Goldthorne Lane, commonly referred to as 'switchback' be closed off for any reason,</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>flooding/road surface repair again traffic again has to be directed down towards Stourport via the Bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pearl Lane has become evermore popular for traffic cutting through to Bewdley/Stourport sounding at times like a Formula One race track.</li> <li>• There is no plan to change the existing road system, the existing is just NOT good enough to cope.</li> <li>• There are NO plans to increase &amp; add additional schools, (present being sited on The Walshes &amp; Astley) doctor surgeries within the proposed vicinity, surgeries are all within Stourport town, accessible only via 'The Bridge'.</li> <li>• It cannot possibly bring any employment over 'The Bridge' within the Areley Kings area, just an additional increase of people which must be in excess of 2000, with an additional increase of vehicle movement in excess of 1000 using an already overstretched route.</li> <li>• To accommodate this number of homes is just not logistically feasible given the infrastructure as it exists now.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2597</a>	Object	<p>We currently experience long delays along the Dunley Road leading into Stourport. The problem is further exacerbated by the parking of cars along Stourport High Street which slows the traffic down whilst they manoeuvre into the parking bays. With pedestrians also crossing the High Street of this busy little town the traffic frequently grinds to a halt.</p> <p>The LPR does not allow for any additional Doctors Surgeries in Stourport. It is currently very difficult to get an appointment to see a Doctor. Again this can only get worse with the additional developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5057</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Pearl Lane AKR/14 and Rectory Lane AKR/15 build of 550 houses. Reasons for objection:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-infrastructure cannot meet the increased traffic flow over one access (the Stourport bridge).</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>-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.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5061</a>	Object	<p>Proposed development on Pearl lane and Rectory lane will have an adverse impact on the neighbourhood, the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			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 600 houses will increase gridlock to an unsustainable level. Rectory Lane is a one car width lane with no passing points or pavements, highly unsuitable for a housing estate. 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?

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO979</a>	Object	Travelling west on bypass, SVR bridge is gateway to open countryside. South of Riddings Brook the only buildings are the Leisure Centre so the land is relatively open. Our view is that the Green Belt should not change.
	<a href="#">LPPO2921</a>	Support	WA/BE/1 – Stourport Road Triangle – I support this allocation
Willsgrove Developments	<a href="#">LPPO1027</a>	Support	<p>Support WA/BE/1 (Stourport Road Triangle) for housing uses.</p> <p>There are insufficient sites within Bewdley's settlement boundary to accommodate the housing needs of the town.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The site is currently on the market and as such is available for development. There are no physical constraints that prevent the site being released for development.</p> <p>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</p>
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO839</a>	Support	<p>The Council supports the following sites which are included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and have the support of the local community:</p> <p>WA/BE/1 Stourport Rd Triangle (support removal from Green Belt)</p> <p>Early negotiations with potential developers have been and should be undertaken which would include negotiations over infrastructure, water management and community facilities such as school places/physical</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			extensions and road improvements
	<a href="#">LPPO252</a>	Comment	<p>I support the case for new housing developments to be located to avoid increased congestion and pollution in the centre of the town. I am concerned about the site on Stourport Road being identified for new housing. I have two particular concerns on this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact it will have on already chaotic traffic congestion and parking problems experienced in the road generated by the two schools, Children's Centre, Sports Centre, Tennis Club and SVR and especially at school entry and finishing times.</li> <li>2. This land should be retained for community use to deal with the lack of facilities and shortage of developable land in the town centre including the need for adequate long stay car and coach parking.</li> </ol> <p>If the triangle is to be developed for housing, then it is imperative that other sites on the river side of the road, i.e. the schools, Leisure Centre and piece of land up to the new Bridge be earmarked for community use. The addition of new housing may benefit the school in terms of numbers attending, but it may mean that expansion of their facilities will be required including additional classrooms and increased parking provision. There has also been talk of siting a theatre at the school for combined community use. 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. These measures to include: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The establishment of a long stay car park for the town including coach parking, preferably with toilet facilities that might also be used for the school, sports centre, tennis club and SVR visitors.</li> <li>b) 20mph zone from the By-Pass through to the town centre.</li> <li>c) Improvements to the riverside walks from the town through to the By-Pass bridge with ramped access suitable for wheelchair users onto the bridge from both sides of the river.</li> </ol>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>d) Investigation of possible relocation of Tennis Club to new site close to sports centre to share in use of community long stay car park. Existing site to become available for housing. Possible grants for new/ improved tennis facilities.</p> <p>e) Improvements in public transport and infrastructure to encourage walking, cycling and alternative access arrangement to the schools and other facilities in the road to reduce impact of car use, congestion and pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4163</a>	Comment	The only reasonable proposals seem to be on the ground opposite the leisure centre in Bewdley. Even then would have to use a road that is already a seriously dangerous road especially during school entering and exiting times. It creates congestion, foolish parking and difficulties for residents. I'm sure the police would verify this.
	<a href="#">LPPO579</a>	Object	<p>Bewdley High School is full.</p> <p>Worcester Hospital cannot cope, will Kidderminster Hospital return to its original status, including A&amp;E, Kids Ward, etc.?</p> <p>With hundreds of houses being built where is the Green Belt going to end, are we just going to join with Stourport and Kidderminster. The Government keeps saying build houses, are we going to lose all our character (fields, hedges etc.)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO590</a>	Object	Stourport Road Triangle has already been bought by a land bank company who knows the Government is relaxing the laws on Green Belt. A plot of land with an average price on it, has now been brought for a considerable amount of money.
	<a href="#">LPPO31</a>	Object	I have great concerns to building 100 properties on this site. My concern is the addition to the chaos and danger to school children on Stourport Road. Current parking and congestion has not been solved around this area. An addition of 100 dwellings will only add to the danger and risk that is currently faced by the parents and children.
	<a href="#">LPPO129</a>	Object	100 new homes is far too many for this part of Bewdley. Presumably multi storey dwellings, completely out of

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>character of Georgian town.</p> <p>I hope that the old redbrick wall that runs alongside the proposed site and next to the public footpath be preserved. Is it 'listed'?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO575</a>	Object	<p>WA/BE/1 Stourport Road Triangle,</p> <p>We appreciate houses need to be built but if anyone tries to travel between 8:15 and 9:00 on a school morning they will see this is a traffic nightmare, with possibly another 2-300 cars from the 100 units. This will cause even more chaos, with also the safari park new hotel and coach drop off point, this could add 100s of cars and vehicles to this stretch of the Stourport Road and surrounding area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1580</a>	Object	<p>The roads will be terrible right by the school. I am sure they will not cope with these children.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2760</a>	Object	<p>Policy 6B notes the need to safeguard and enhance open countryside, maintain openness to Green Belt and the provision of infrastructure and Policy 25C allows development on Green Belt only for small scale affordable housing in special circumstances.</p> <p>The developments on site reference WA/BE/1, WA/BE/5 AND WA/BE/3 are contrary to the policies noted above. For example site WA/BE/1 is development of 100 homes in an area of only 3.67 ha of Green Belt is not small scale. It is a very concentrated development.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6B.</p> <p>Concerning infrastructure, all Wribbenhall sites will be affected by the bottleneck of the Bewdley bypass where it ends at the Kidderminster end and traffic connects with the Habberley Road. The addition of a potential Traveller site on the Habberley Road would further add to this congestion. Plus the development of the Safari Park and the increase in tourist traffic related to this. I cannot see where the plan addresses adequately the issues that the increased traffic would create.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3138</a>	Object	<p>As a Bewdley resident who lives on Kidderminster Road, the proposals to build 100 on the triangle adjacent to the roundabout is an awful proposal which will put extra pressure on an already 'full' small town. The schools are full. The medical centre is very busy. This part of Bewdley is already grid locked at rush hour and busy all day.</p> <p>The Safari Park's water park, when it is built, will already be adding a huge amount of traffic to the road. When paired with the possible development by Burlish crossing, again a road which has long queues, in Stourport which links with the bypass roundabout -no one will be getting anywhere!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2132</a>	Object	Disruption to the eco system/wildlife, may affect Riddings Brook footpath.
	<a href="#">LPPO2414</a>	Object	Object to the proposed developments south of the Habberley Road, the Stourport Road triangle and at Catchems End. Without extensive improvements to road, transport and other elements of infrastructure and services, none of these developments could be supported without damaging Bewdley and the amenities of its current residents. As these improvements are not proposed, the housing developments should not be allowed.
	<a href="#">LPPO2473</a>	Object	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt land: I understand from the recent questionnaire completed by residents that one of the main concerns was the protection of Green Belt land. This proposal highlights a number of areas that are protected as Green Belt, in particular the land behind Sandbourne Drive (ref: WA/BE/1). I have concerns that any plans to develop this site will bring additional noise and will affect privacy. There would also be a significant impact on the neighbourhood with the loss of open aspect from the properties.</p> <p>In addition any development of this site will increase traffic in an areas which is already a concern due to the schools traffic. The proximity to the by-pass will make any access roads to the site difficult and an increased road hazard, impacting on highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>The Green Belt is what makes Bewdley and the Severn Valley so desirable and a conservation area, any reduction at the main access points to the town will be out of character and a considerable visual impact.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2692</a>	Object	<p>Please reconsider siting 100 houses on land Stourport Road /Bewdley Bypass.</p> <p>Expanding the school population has already has caused horrible congestion problems for residents, parents and general traffic, especially buses and coaches.</p> <p>Another service road access will cause further problems for Bewdley and the Bypass access particularly at busy times. Increasing development at this point is inappropriate.</p> <p>The whole plan needs more research in my view.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3482</a>	Object	<p>100 new houses will increase the traffic on Stourport Road in the rush hour.</p> <p>Double yellow lines should be extended on the school side of the road the full length of the road from the traffic lights to the school entrance and also at the corner of the road accessing the new houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3988</a>	Object	<p>Our views with regard to Green Belt review and Local Plan 2019.</p> <p>A) Why are 3 out of 4 sites proposed in Wribbenhall. Unfair allocation and there must be other options the other side of the river. If we can find space for caravans there, why not housing?</p> <p>B) Disparity with the number of dwellings. i.e. 30 dwellings on 4.27 Ha (Highclere) and 100 on 3.67 Ha (Stourport Road).</p> <p>C) Landscape ruined on one of the gateways to Bewdley. Without care you will be destroying what attracts the visitors in the first place.</p> <p>D) Precedent set for 'incursion' into Green Belt when permission given for Safari Park. Why not continue allowing development for housing - local peoples needs - on land to the side of it.</p> <p>E) Wrong to think of by-pass as new boundary. Consider Bromsgrove, Evesham (we could go on, and on).Do we</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>really want Wyre Forest to look like those. We can do better, let's show the way!</p> <p>F) Environment map shows WA/BE/1 to be at risk of flooding. Having lived near for 30 years we can confirm that that risk is very real.</p> <p>G) Suggest you take a look at the congestion on Stourport Road between 3pm and 3.30pm term time. (WA/BE/1). There appears to be little or no solution to this at the moment or indeed for the future. Another 100 houses would mean total gridlock.</p> <p>H) Last but not least as far as we are concerned. There are slow worms living on WA/BE/1. These are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4193</a>	Object	Specifically in relation to Bewdley the identified site on the Stourport Road would represent a significant intrusion into the green gap between Bewdley and Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO4850</a>	Object	We object to the use of this land for any type of development on the basis that it is part of the Green Belt which was put in place to put a gap between town settlements.
	<a href="#">LPPO565</a>	Object	<p>I object to 100 houses being built on the Stourport Road Triangle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• this area is prone to flooding, the river Severn can flood right up to the brook by Sandbourne Drive, where will all the extra water &amp; waste go?</li> <li>• the land is Green Belt. There is lots of wildlife around the area including bats &amp; owls</li> <li>• the local schools are already full to capacity</li> <li>• the medical centre &amp; local hospitals are already overworked &amp; not able to cope with the current number of residents</li> <li>• between 8.15-9.00 &amp; 2.30-3.30 every day during school opening it is absolute chaos, the road cannot cope with the school traffic as it is. It is an accident waiting to happen, the addition of 200+ cars from the housing development would only add to this chaos.</li> <li>• the roads are already full to capacity with safari park traffic especially during the spring/summer &amp; this</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>will be considerably worse with the future hotel &amp; leisure development at the safari park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>we want to attract visitors to Bewdley, this is one of the main entrances into our town, 100 houses built onto this beautiful area of Green Belt would certainly not have the same attraction.</li> </ul>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO833</a>	Support	<p>WA/BE/1 Stourport Road triangle: Qualified support: For housing and its removal from the Green Belt. The housing should be a mix of affordable homes, home for the elderly and private housing. If this triangular piece of land is to be developed for housing, then it becomes imperative that other sites on the river side of the road, i.e. the schools, leisure centre and piece of land up to the new bridge are earmarked for community uses. The addition of new housing may well benefit the school in terms of numbers attending but it might also mean that some expansion of their facilities will be required, including additional classrooms and increased parking provision. In the past there has also been talk of siting a theatre at the school for combined community use. A comprehensive assessment of community need is required before land in this area is committed for housing and that in any event, mitigating measures should be included to offset the current and potentially worsening traffic and parking issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4091</a>	Support	<p>Agree with Stourport Road triangle suggest that anything west of the river is not chosen for building due to traffic congestion/pollution/ violation through Bewdley Town Centre which is not acceptable.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02922</a>	Support	WA/BE/5 – Land South of Habberley Road – I support this allocation
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0981</a>	Support	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.
	<a href="#">LPP0184</a>	Comment	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, in addition to 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.
	<a href="#">LPP01926</a>	Comment	It was with great regret that as residents in New Road for the past 46yrs we heard of the proposed developments for this area. Over those years the traffic flow has increased greatly with the Safari Park, The Mercure Hotel and extra housing. The work due to be carried out in time by the Safari Park will cause congestion. All traffic going into Bewdley, off the Habberley Road has to turn left causing congestion at the island. Habberley Road is not big enough to take larger vehicles especially on the bend past Habberley Valley. WE do hope you will reconsider your plans.
	<a href="#">LPP01968</a>	Comment	<p>The proposals for general domestic homes in the area are again set out to cover very considerable tracts of Green Belt land. Again why not build within the brown belt confines of Kidderminster. Where there is land that is in need of regeneration. Help a town that has suffered a downturn from lack of industry and the building of excess supermarkets, poor authority funding and decaying dwelling and old crumbling shops.</p> <p>The buildings at Wribbenhall that are proposed on an already very busy and often dangerous road that gets congested to a point that causes problems for residents and other road users. The poorly thought out junction at Catchem’s End creates many traffic hold ups and encourages drivers to take dire risks by turning right instead of left to go round the already fully congested island. These proposals are certainly putting lives at further serious risk.</p> <p>The only reasonable proposals seem to be those of building at the back of St Ann's school and on the ground opposite the leisure centre in Bewdley. Even then the latter would have to use a road that is already a seriously dangerous road especially during school entering and exiting times. It creates congestion, foolish parking and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>difficulties for residents. I'm sure the police would verify this.</p> <p>All of the proposals will have a devastating effect on the already overloaded infrastructure of a small and at present attractive town. It doesn't have enough parking as it is. The schools will be overloaded, at increased class sizes. The medical centre has just been improved to cope with demands and this will create further problems. The road system barely copes as it stands and will no longer be a small country town. With the only main hospital being Worcester which it takes a good hour to reach, and already puts lives at risk, the granting of such proposals for large scale building will only increase the dangers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2375</a>	Comment	Many not aware of consultation until day before and not all have email preventing them responding in time.
	<a href="#">LPPO3979</a>	Comment	<p>The new flood defence should have been fitted as the temporary one before did not work. Water came from river upstream round through the houses flooding behind the barrier.</p> <p>The footing for a new flood defence would need a new fence like the one on Severn Side South.</p> <p>The ring road island and the ring road should have gone through.</p> <p>This short section, be done, the government have now to give money to get road works improvements, this land should still be highway.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4063</a>	Comment	Specifically In relation to Bewdley the sites on the Habberley road -one for housing the other possibly for travelling showpeople would represent a significant intrusion into the green gap between Bewdley and Stourport and Kidderminster respectively and in the case of the latter the proposed squeezing of 200 houses onto the former site would not exactly enhance or facilitate entry into the town.
	<a href="#">LPPO4167</a>	Comment	WA/BE/5 Land South of Habberley Road, in Green Belt albeit proposed removal is suggested. The site sounds to be problematic due to drainage issues. Where is the guarantee that this will be addressed and to the optimum level?
	<a href="#">LPPO654</a>	Object	There are very few good reasons to object to the development of this site for housing although there are some

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>acknowledged technical difficulties and highway issues that must be resolved.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I object to the use of this road as access to WA/BE/5, as the junction of New Road, the main Kidderminster Road and the cul-de-sac is already fraught with danger. Likewise, an access on to the Habberley Road is far from ideal.</p> <p>I believe that any access on to this site should be directly from the roundabout on the A456.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO837</a>	Object	<p><b>WA/BE/5 land south of Habberley Road. Qualified Objection.</b> Very concerned with the impact this development may have on the openness and the important Green Belt tenet of preventing the coalescence and maintain the visual gap between the towns. Its development should only be allowed in very exceptional circumstances i.e. to provide/fund/enable an extension of the By-pass to the Habberley Road to mitigate the traffic chaos at Catchems End.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1579</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - more houses will make it worse.</li> <li>• Schools/GPs won't cope</li> <li>• It's Green Belt land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2814</a>	Object	<p>I would like to raise my objection to the proposal for the site for travelling showpeople and housing south of Habberley Road in Bewdley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effect of proposal on thriving businesses in the area</li> <li>• Effect on wildlife</li> <li>• Joining of Bewdley to Kidderminster</li> <li>• Junction at Catchems End is not suitable for large heavy vehicles and there is already traffic congestion from the Safari Park.</li> </ul> <p>There are many proposed options but I think many more solutions could be found and used rather than just going</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			straight to Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO3159</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed site does not meet the requirements for such sites as defined in PPTS (2012) referred to in para 8.35. The site has no residential development on it. The structures that are in existence are temporary and located right near the road.</li> <li>2. The proposal goes against the requirement of PPTS (2012) that sites located on Green Belt land are “inappropriate development”. Given the availability of other sites not in Green Belt we see no grounds for an exception to be made especially considering the negative impact that such a site would make to the “open access” requirement for Green Belt.</li> <li>3. Previous development proposals have been rejected with a planning inspectors ruling that there should be no encroachment on this area.</li> <li>4. Further development adjacent to our drive that serves three properties would increase the problem of traffic.</li> <li>5. Impact on the exceptional wildlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1782</a>	Object	<p>Objects to WA/BE/5. The proposed land is a Green Belt area</p> <p>Habberley Road is an extremely busy road providing infrastructure to local business leisure and hotel needs.</p> <p>The site proposed is nearby to Bewdley's largest hotel and would not enhance the area to prospective clients.</p> <p>The local highways governing this road would surely oppose the constant movement of large articulated vehicles on this B category road creating a potential safety risk to other road users.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1928</a>	Object	<p>We are extremely concerned about the proposed developments that converge onto the B4190 Habberley Road. Traffic leaving the Heath Hotel and Pines Golf Club have to be very careful when entering this B road due to the series of bends on it. Plans for the Safari Park hotel will increase traffic in this area.</p> <p>The proposed development is also being on Green Belt land.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2218</a>	Object	<p>Local Plan Review (2016-2034) Consultation Policy 33 - Bewdley Site Allocations - WA/BE/5</p> <p>Objects to the proposal for the development of Green Belt land between the Habberley Road and the A456.</p> <p>The main reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <p><b>1. Areas of Separation</b></p> <p>If the policy is not to encroach on Green Belt land unless the most exceptional circumstances exist, I cannot see any logic in the selection of this location.</p> <p>New Road is effectively the line of the boundary beyond which open countryside stretches to the outskirts of Kidderminster. I can only assume that the selection has been made on the basis that this could be regarded as an “in-fill” site and therefore the impact would be negligible. I would strongly suggest that this is an inaccurate description and would only be accurate if the Mercure site was itself heavily built up and could therefore be regarded as the outermost point of built-up Bewdley.</p> <p>In fact, the hotel is in attractive rural grounds and blends well into the countryside. None of the entire north-eastern boundary of the designated area can in any sense be described as directly adjoining developed, i.e. built up, land. The vast majority of the adjoining area is open countryside/parkland, privately owned and maintained by the hotel but generously made available to local residents for recreational and social purposes. The developed area of the hotel, including car-parking and exercising facilities, only represents a very small proportion of the entire area. My contention therefore is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the designated plot of land is effectively part of the countryside surrounding the town of Bewdley and is no different from the other, designated “green space” between Bewdley and Kidderminster. The rear of New Road is the edge of the town and there is effectively nothing from there up to the first Kidderminster houses at the top of Bewdley Hill, other than greenery.</li> <li>- there is no man-made boundary, in the form of the A456 road, towards which any extension of the town might, on the basis of certain logic, extend</li> <li>- it is therefore an area which, on the above grounds alone, should be excluded from any long-term plan which might otherwise invite developers to try their hand at filling in the space between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Suitability of the area for building.</b></p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The Bewdley Neighbourhood Plan which included a similar proposal for this site contained areas of possible flooding in the neighbourhood. I was somewhat surprised to notice that the area in question was not mentioned within this category. When I bought my Bewdley property I was apprehensive in noting what Seven Trent thought about these fields: namely that they are subject to significant risk of flooding. Looking at your document, it appears that this risk has been noted and “that the site would require careful design to take into account the need for a channel to take surface water run-off to the site in times of heavy rainfall. This would be incorporated into a larger area of open space “ This need does however have further implications for the way in which the site is used — please see Density below.</p> <p><b>3. Road access</b>                      It is hardly necessary for me to point out the existing problems with the roundabout on the A456 and the adjoining roads and therefore the undesirability of adding to them by additional residential development. The fact that this development is described as “Habberley Road” infers that there would be no access to the A456. It is hard to see in any case how the latter would be practicable. But access into Habberley Road is not without its implications: again, with the existing road layout, any traffic from the new development into Bewdley would add to the problem of the A456/Safari Park roundabout as of course all traffic coming down the Habberley Road into Bewdley is routed around it.</p> <p><b>4. Agricultural Land</b>                      The designated land is historically agricultural. Of all the miles of boundary surrounding Bewdley which adjoin agricultural land, why should it be just this one (and a couple of others) where a change of use is to be considered and where developers are thereby to be encouraged?</p> <p><b>5. Density</b>                      On looking the intended density of the several Bewdley sites which are currently under consideration, I noted that the site in question is at a level of about 26/27 per hectare. This is, at first sight, similar to WA/BE 5 (Stourport Road) and at a level considerably higher than BR/BE/6 (Highclere) which seems to be favoured with the density of only about 7/ha. There may be good reasons for this significant discrepancy (by a factor of almost 4) but I am not aware of them. This question of density is of course an important point since on it depends, to a large degree, the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>impact on adjoining residential property.</p> <p>Another significant way in which this land is being unfavourably treated with regard to density is associated with the flood risk. As mentioned above, there is a problem potential flooding and the way around this is a channel to take away surface water. “This would be incorporated into a larger area of open space.” The implication of this is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectively, less than the stated 1.71 hectares will be available for building, and so the sharing of the burden of new developments on existing householders becomes even more uneven and unfair. Looking at Bewdley as a whole.</li> <li>• The building development will be concentrated on the south-western part of the site which unfortunately is that which joins existing properties most closely. It may also be worth noting that the existing properties include bungalows where the effect of new, probably two-storey (or even higher) housing on adjacent properties is even more damaging. Your reaction to that may well be: well, that is something which can be taken into account at the detailed planning stage. As a resident however, I have little confidence that in the heat of that planning stage, when there are pressing political and financial questions at stake for all concerned, the needs of just a few existing residents are going to count for much.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2376</a>	Object	<p>I object to Habberley Road site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It goes against all previous planning advice.</li> <li>• Constant movement of traffic on/off the site. The B4129 is busy rural road extra traffic would make it very dangerous.</li> <li>• Hotel/golf club will suffer</li> <li>• Damage to the local environment/wildlife.</li> <li>• Residents would be affected by noise/ability to sell property</li> <li>• There is no legal obligation to provide land for any further housing in Bewdley.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3280</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the plans for WA/BE/3 and WA/BE/5 houses development.</p> <p>My reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The increase in parking and other highway issues this would bring.</li> <li>• How this will affect the schools, which are already over subscribed.</li> <li>• Waiting times and care at the dentist and doctors with an increase in the population.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3499</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposals for the <b>Habberley Road site (WA/BE/5)</b> for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• previous planning applications have been rejected and a study of its planning history shows a potential bronze age burial mound and a planning inspectors ruling that there should be no encroachment of the area between Kidderminster and Bewdley.</li> <li>• The B4129 is already a very busy road and this would lead to further traffic problems and potential accidents.</li> <li>• Negative effect on two established thriving businesses.</li> <li>• Harm to the environment</li> <li>• Effect on housing prices.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3644</a>	Object	<p>The development I understand would include circa 45 new homes but has the potential to ruin the surrounding country area, cause increased traffic at the already congested Catchems End junction and have an impact on local tourism and trade.</p> <p>The Hotel will look over this new development and this has the potential to damage their business and reduce visitors to the area who would want the feel of escaping to the country.</p> <p>The residents on New Road and Habberley Road would be severely impacted in terms of their view, potential traffic</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and parking issues (there's never enough parking on a new housing development) but also the area is popular with local people for dog walking, runners and walkers alike let alone the amount of wildlife seen in the area. The wildlife and environment would suffer significantly.</p> <p>There would be many more neighbours who would lose out if we lose this beautiful piece of land than there would be gain because of this development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3235</a>	Object	<p>We DO NOT support the proposal for development at the rear of New Road, Bewdley.</p> <p>Traffic at the road island at the end of New Road.</p> <p>The pollution and road safety dangers presented are obvious.</p> <p>When the West Midlands Safari Park have completed their new development plans and an 'open all year' Water Park, 1000 seater Conference Hall etc has been built and a new entrance installed whereby traffic will enter and leave from this small island, the traffic will be at a permanent standstill - with backlogs affecting both Kidderminster Ring Road and traffic approaching from Bewdley Town Centre and beyond.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4093</a>	Object	<p>I feel the planned building of over 100 new houses in the area is far more than the area can stand. The extra strain on the roads in the area which are already at breaking point is unacceptable. The loss of Green Belt land should be avoided at all cost as once it has gone that is it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4152</a>	Object	<p>South of Habberley Road WA/BE/5</p> <p>My reasons for objections are for all 3 sites and are as follows;</p> <p>I inquire what the special circumstances are to justify the areas concerned as being an exception to the rule regarding building on rural land? I feel sure all of this would be taken into account as a reason for refusal if a local member of public applied for the same building permission on these sites</p> <p>* In my personal view the character of the approach to the well known Georgian town of Bewdley, which attracts</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>many tourists to the region will potentially be detrimentally affected and that an erosion of Green Belt/ rural areas can lead to a 'sprawl ' of built up environments.</p> <p>* I recognize that “there is no right to a view" in legal terms, however loss of a view (whether it be by local residents or approaching visitors to the town of Bewdley) is not necessarily irrelevant when it comes to planning permission. The enjoyment of the current natural view and the rural character it maintains is an important part of the amenity and aesthetics of this area I feel that the effect of the proposed development on the character of the neighbourhood will be altered in opposition to its existing established historical and rural character that is enjoyed.</p> <p>Bewdley is a town known for its outstanding beauty, from a public view point and in keeping with the present government’s promotion of 'Localism', I would hope that such matters are taken into consideration when they are raised by local people.</p> <p>* I am concerned about ongoing enforcement of correct status of use for the proposed sites. How will the local authority ensure present/ future owners &amp; users of the development meet showground/ traveller status. Could I inquire as to the rigor, status criteria and check resources that would be put in place? I assume that these would have to be clearly presented and budgeted for with presentation of any planning permission.</p> <p>* Living in the area for the amount of time that I have, I'm aware of the amount of fatal and near fatal road traffic incidents on the Habberley Road. I feel that it is important to prevent any increase in traffic which could be generated by the establishment of a site using haulage type/ size vehicles onto and off this road. I fear an increasing adverse affect on current highway safety with larger vehicles 'swinging in/out of the site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4173</a>	Object	<p>This relates to the overall plans for Bewdley as set out in the Wyre Forest Local Plan review: in particular section 33</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p><u>Building on Green Belt land:</u> I understand from the recent questionnaire completed by residents that one of the main concerns was the protection of Green Belt land. This proposal highlights a number of areas that are protected</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>as Green Belt.</p> <p>The Green Belt is what makes Bewdley and the Severn Valley so desirable and a conservation area, any reduction at the main access points to the town will be out of character and a considerable visual impact.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4186</a>	Object	<p>The proposals to build potentially 45 houses in the land south of Habberley Road is an awful proposal which will put extra pressure on an already 'full' small town. The schools are full. The medical centre is very busy. Assuming most homes have 2 cars, this would bring an extra 250 plus cars onto Kidderminster Road. This part of Bewdley is already grid locked at rush hour and busy all day. Queues build down toward the safari park and along the bypass as cars approach roundabout. This begins at 3.30pm every day and goes on until after 6pm. This extra pressure on the road would be a nightmare for all Bewdley residents who queue to get in and out of Bewdley every day as it is. The Safari Park's water park, when it is built, will already be adding a huge amount of traffic to the road. When paired with the possible development by Burlish crossing, again a road which has long queues, in Stourport which links with the bypass roundabout -no one will be getting anywhere!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4189</a>	Object	<p>Having read the proposals for the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, I am objecting to WA/BE/5.</p> <p><b>Highways Problems</b> - The A456 and B4129 in Wribbenhall are already very busy, and to build new homes in this area would cause even more congestion.</p> <p><b>Loss of Green Belt</b> - All this area is Green Belt land and previous planning inspectors have ruled there should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster. Planning history shows a site of historical interest on the Habberley Road.</p> <p><b>Services</b> - 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.</p> <p><b>Environmental Issues</b> - All of these plans raise many environmental issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4513</a>	Object	<p>The field behind New Road the road at the top has been closed to stop traffic abusing it. Narrow roads again it will affect the environment.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4615</a>	Object	Object to the proposed developments on the other side of the river in Bewdley, i.e. south of the Habberley Road, the Stourport Road triangle and at Catchems End. Without extensive improvements to road, transport and other elements of infrastructure and services, none of these developments could be supported without damaging Bewdley and the amenities of its current residents. As these improvements are not proposed, the housing developments should not be allowed.
	<a href="#">LPPO4704</a>	Object	<p>Policy 6b notes the need to safeguard and enhance open countryside, maintain openness to Green Belt and the provision of infrastructure and Policy 25 c allows development on Green Belt only for small scale affordable housing in special circumstances.</p> <p>The developments on site reference WA/BE/1, WA/BE/5 AND WA/BE/3 are contrary to the policies noted above. For example site WA/BE/1 is development of 100 homes in an area of only 3.67 ha of Green Belt is not small scale. It is a very concentrated development. Site</p> <p>All of these sites are currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6b.</p> <p>Site WA/BE/3 in option B currently incorporates the run off rain water from the Queensway estate and there are obvious environmental concerns of developing on this site</p> <p>Concerning infrastructure, all Wribbenhall sites will be affected by the bottleneck of the Bewdley bypass where it ends at the Kidderminster end and traffic connects with the Habberley Road. The addition of a potential traveller site on the Habberley Road would further add to this congestion. Plus the development of the Safari Park and the increase in tourist traffic related to this. I cannot see where the plan addresses adequately the issues that the increased traffic would create.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO314</a>	Support	My clients welcome the inclusion of their land (Site WA/BE/5) as a Core Housing Site. The site is available for development within the first 5 year phase of the new local plan. My clients support the removal of their local plan from the Green Belt. Subject to the re-zoning via the new local plan, my clients will, with others as required work as a draft Master Plan for their land. This will be discussed with the LPA and others as required.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO4098</a>	Support	<p>The Council supports the following sites which are included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and have the support of the local community:</p> <p>WA/BE/5 Land south of Habberley Road (support removal from Green Belt)</p> <p>Early negotiations with potential developers have been and should be undertaken which would include negotiations over infrastructure, water management and community facilities such as school places/physical extensions and road improvements</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4851</a>	Support	<p>We object to the use of this land for any type of development on the basis that it is part of the Green Belt which was put in place to put a gap between town settlements. However there are extenuating circumstances here since a road is badly needed to link the Habberley Road with the Bewdley By-Pass to avoid the ridiculous situation we have at Catchem’s End where all traffic must turn left. As a result we have an area which is heavily affected by vehicle fumes. Indeed we understand that this area is one of the most heavily polluted areas in the Wyre Forest District. Funds should therefore be found for a link road. On this basis we would agree to residential dwellings being constructed on this site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5135</a>	Support	<p>Bewdley: OK to build on Catchem’s End site WA/BE3 and Habberley Road providing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drainage pipes are installed (preventing flooding from brook by Queensway).</li> <li>2. Parking space is allowed (for vehicle using Lodge Close from pub).</li> <li>3. Green park/play area is installed.</li> <li>4. Bus stop provided</li> <li>5. Local store/newsagents.</li> </ol> <p>No building on other sites in Bewdley.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2655</a>	Comment	<p>1.) Access. Main access from the town to the site will be Park Lane. I am sure you are aware that 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.</p> <p>2.) Ecological Importance of the site. I am sure you are aware that Ancient Woodland is present to the south of 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. Should you still deem it necessary for the site to be included on the plan, and should development be proposed, it will be imperative to carry out a full Ecological Appraisal of the site, prior to the submission and/or determination of any planning application.</p> <p>As a young person, I understand the need for increased housing, particularly in Bewdley (I myself find it frustrating that I have had to move out of my home town simply because of the lack of affordable / available housing!). However, I do believe that building on this site (or to the west of the River for that matter) is not a sensible or sustainable option for the growth of Bewdley and that an alternative solution should be sought.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2913</a>	Comment	<p>I see the proposal is for single-storey housing, which I take to mean it is being considered for retirement housing.</p> <p>In some ways this would be a lovely spot in which to have a retirement bungalow – attractive and peaceful and very close to town. However, people looking ahead to their retirement will be thinking of the time when they can no longer drive. 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If, on the other hand, the houses are taken by car drivers, how is the narrow road network in this area to cope with even a modest increase in the traffic flow?</p> <p>So although I can see the thinking behind allocating a site close to the town centre for such housing, I don't believe it is a practical option.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0978</a>	Comment	We thought that the upper portion of the site might be used, as the assessment sheet suggests, but are told that Bewdley Civic Society (who know the area better than we do) consider the site wholly unsuitable, relying on the views of a Planning Inspector several decades ago that the site should never be developed. Here we have to defer to local knowledge.
	<a href="#">LPP0718</a>	Object	Development off Highclere would lead to serious accidents on roads - narrow and twisty, no pavements. Unsuitable proposal.
	<a href="#">LPP0744</a>	Object	Object to proposed development on Highclere Fields for following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• steeply sloping with no bus or local shop</li> <li>• limited parking in area - roads narrow, no pavements, poor visibility</li> <li>• well used for recreational pursuits - dog walking, informal play</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0687</a>	Comment	Highclere downgrade to Option B but preferably not built on at all. Agree with Stourport Road triangle suggest that anything west of the river is not chosen for building due to traffic congestion/pollution/ violation through Bewdley Town Centre which is not acceptable.
	<a href="#">LPP0386</a>	Comment	Access is suggested as available via existing hammerheads but these roads are narrow with several partially blind bends. They may be able to cope with increased domestic traffic but the passage of delivery and emergency vehicles could be a problem.
	<a href="#">LPP0584</a>	Comment	Want BR/BE/6 removed from the core sites and replaced with part of the site in option B at Catchem's End. This would avoid the increase in traffic through Welch Gate that any development at Highclere would cause.  Other than very small scale, 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.
	<a href="#">LPP03093</a>	Comment	I would prefer site WA/BE/3 Catchems End to be designated as a Core Site instead of site BR/BE/6 Land off Highclere. The reason for this is that any 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>additional air pollution in this area should be avoided and additional traffic would only make the air quality worse. In addition the extra traffic passing through this area and then over Bewdley Bridge would only increase the regular congestion in Bewdley Load Street. I believe that there should only be very small scale development on this side (west) of the River Severn and any necessary, more major developments should take place on the Wribbenhall (east) side.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPP02517</a></p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Bewdley's character is bound in by its geographic layout and history. Its uniqueness is worthy of preservation and any restrictions on further developments being built near the town could ensure its preservation.</p> <p>I can appreciate both sides of the problem - growth and expansion as opposed to preservation. A dilemma and can see there is no easy resolution to this and the many similar situations that will arise for the area in the future.</p> <p>Having lived in Birmingham, due to expansion and immigration, many districts that were regarded as being respectable and under the control of authority have now become less desirable. Bewdley and its surrounds are far from being in a similar state, but my experiences should convey a warning of the changes that can happen in a lifetime.</p> <p>Your greatest dilemma, as I see it, is in deciding whether to take a short or long term view of the problem whilst taking into consideration the beautiful area we live in and how quickly it can all change.</p> <p>With regard to Highclere I am in favour of a good result for the protesters and can only await the outcome of the committee's decision on the matter. Before a final decision is taken, I trust the committee will seriously consider the effects this and any other building projects planned for Bewdley will have on its historical heritage. Apart from this aspect, the serious traffic problems that will result within the town and all of the very difficult to negotiate roads adjoining the town need to be studied. Bewdley, with its obvious restrictions is very limited in the number of residents easily accommodated in the part of town under discussion. There are problems accessing the town via Park Lane or Wyre Hill by either foot or vehicle. Visitors will comment on the problems of trying to pass oncoming vehicles. Wyre Hill with its many cottages and parking problems is extremely narrow to negotiate and is relatively free of accidents due to care taken by familiar users of it and, in the main, its limited use.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02536</a>	Comment	<p>Highclere is not suitable for land development. If access is from the current infrastructure of Park Lane / Wyre Hill this will cause numerous traffic bottlenecks and dangerous access. Wyre Hill becomes exceptionally narrow around the school and, in reality, people going to Kidderminster will use Park Lane which again is very narrow. In addition, there is already a bottleneck around the church with cars exiting Park Lane merging in with traffic from all sides.</p> <p>I firmly believe that we require the correct development in the right place in Bewdley. We need nice bungalows for the older residents who will then release their 4 bed houses to families releasing smaller houses for younger residents. Highclere is not suitable for a development for the elderly - there is no bus access and residents requiring access to the medical centre, if unable to walk (and Park Lane is steep for the elderly) will have to drive - no parking spaces!</p> <p>I have no objection to development but this land is wholly unsuitable and will cause more problems that it solves.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04162</a>	Comment	The only reasonable proposals seem to be those of building at the back of St Ann's school.
	<a href="#">LPP04166</a>	Comment	For many years this has been a potential site and in fact was proposed for planning in the 1970s, hence the layout design of Highclere and Highclere Drive to accommodate this.
	<a href="#">LPP0688</a>	Object	<p>A) Traffic increase on Park Lane which is steep with poor visibility and is used by school children where there is no footway</p> <p>B) Shops are ½ mile away but down a steep path, new houses are very likely to use cars to access.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0755</a>	Object	<p>Object to land off Highclere being a core site. Development anywhere West of the river is not an option. Increased traffic flow will exacerbate pollution in Welch Gate.</p> <p>Core site of Highclere is said PARAGRAPH 33.1 “ to have easy access to services and facilities” This may be so in mileage terms, the roads to town, Park Lane and Wyre Hill are narrow and tricky already and increase in traffic will worsen this. They are already difficult for pedestrians and dozens of children use Park Lane as a route to and from the High School &amp; St Annes. There is no bus route for non drivers who cannot walk up and down the steep</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			hills to services or facilities.
	<a href="#">LPP0673</a>	Object	<p>I object strongly to this part of the plan.</p> <p>Very concerned at proposal for housing development adjacent to Highclere. This is inconsistent with other objectives and policies in the plan which support the retention of Bewdley's valuable open spaces and the reduction of traffic. The development of infill sites can be accepted, but see no justification for the use of valuable Greenfield open space on this side of Bewdley.</p> <p>Development would generate significant additional traffic on Park Lane. This road, used by school children and pedestrians, is narrow with blind bends and no pavement, no bus route, no local shop, detrimental to the air quality improvement zone and increased congestion. Additional traffic on this road is unacceptable.</p> <p>The natural beauty of these fields and their value for recreational purposes will be lost as stated in the last Government Inspectors' report which rejected any development of this area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0675</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal that Highclere be considered for core housing site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The road network- access only via Highclere (Drive)- Park Lane/Wyre Hill already congested</li> <li>2. Safety to children- St Annes School as a result of additional traffic</li> <li>3. Not on a bus route</li> <li>4. Area used by local residents for walking</li> <li>5. Area of beauty adjacent to Golden Valley</li> <li>6. More suitable areas- Wribbenhall and Stourport Road- easy to access to by-pass</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP035</a>	Object	Object to development of Highclere fields.
	<a href="#">LPP040</a>	Object	I am extremely concerned about the effect any housing development will have on the surrounding road network around Highclere Fields. Park Lane and Wyre Hill are very narrow, and the congestion, particularly at rush hour and school start and finish times, is already unacceptable. There is no transport infrastructure in place, so all

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>movements will be in private cars. Walking is not an option, particularly for older people, as the site is at the top of a steep hill above the town, whichever way you access it.</p> <p>The bypass is not the answer, evidenced by the fact that it is not used by the majority of people currently, so why should that situation change.</p> <p>There are also strong arguments against the site being developed from an environmental viewpoint, both in terms of deterioration in air quality and the destruction of yet more urban green land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO44</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Highclere. The land is used by walkers and is habitat for wildlife - leading down to ancient woodland. The increase in volume of traffic with access from Wyre Hill or Park Lane would be dangerous. Proposals for small development of retirement bungalows not appropriate because of access to town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO45</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Highclere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the site has high landscape value</li> <li>• the water run off into Snuff Mill Brook would have a detrimental effect</li> <li>• Access in / out of the site is unsuitable for any increase in traffic</li> </ul> <p>Bewdley Town Council has agreed that this site is unsuitable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO53</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my views on the proposed development. I live in Park Lane and use these fields daily for walking my dogs as do many other people living locally, to walk them elsewhere would mean taking them out in the car. Any development would increase the traffic going up and coming down Park Lane. Park Lane is very steep and narrow in places two vehicles can not pass and some vehicles travel up far too fast. I frequently walk up and down as do many school children, I tend to avoid this when it is icy because it is so easy to slip and be hit by a vehicle, however the school children still do, any increase in traffic will put them at risk.</p> <p>For every property built there will be a minimum of two vehicles and no bus service as the access is unsuitable for large vehicles.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			On balance I think the proposal is unsuitable.
	<a href="#">LPPO54</a>	Object	<p>Bewdley Town Council agrees with residents that the land known as Highclere Fields is unsuitable for the proposed development.</p> <p>My objections are as follows.</p> <p>Previously refused for development - reason was it was an area of outstanding natural beauty plus other reasons which have not changed and many of them have got worse.</p> <p>The access to this land would be via Park Lane and or Wyre Hill, these roads cannot take more traffic and are extremely dangerous to motorists and pedestrians and in particular school children. Car ownership has increased since the last application and parking on the roads has made hazards behind belief. This increase in traffic will make air pollution even more of a problem and would again impact on people's health.</p> <p>There are suitable sites in the area which would be more beneficial to all parties concerned and I would ask you to reject this planning application.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO66</a>	Object	<p>I am concerned that the development would cause a number of problems in the local area:</p> <p>The increased volume of traffic around Park Lane, Wyre Hill and by the local school St Anne's. It would be difficult to get good access to the site from the existing road structure. I am sure there are much better options available to the local planners, I understand that this particular field was some years ago designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty by the planning inspector, if permission was granted this would be the thin end of the wedge and more applications would be forthcoming to extend the site. I hope you will consider my comments when making your final decision.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO71</a>	Object	<p>Area congested with traffic, no pavement down the steepest part of the hill and barely room for cars to pass. More houses will lead to more traffic. Dangerous enough, why make it even more so? Wyre Hill unsuitable for even the amount of traffic that there is.</p> <p>Highclere area used for walking and relaxing. Council should reduce the amount of traffic in Bewdley</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			The attraction of Bewdley is that it allows easy access to the countryside, has pleasant views and clean air.
	<a href="#">LPPO81</a>	Object	Objects to development at Highclere. The increase in traffic along Park Lane would be dangerous to pedestrians, many of whom are school children.
	<a href="#">LPPO114</a>	Object	<p>Infrastructure will not cope with further development. Already problems with school parking. Already bungalows in the area up for sale that could be utilised.</p> <p>Already too much pollution around Welsh Gate, further development will only increase that.</p> <p>With the bus system around here and the roads being so narrow during school times there is already too much congestion &amp; with more vehicles being around this area it will be putting our children &amp; older residents at more risk of accidents</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO117</a>	Object	<p>Problem with this site is vehicular access. The three means of accessing Bewdley Town Centre from this site are a) Winbrook/Welch Gate, b) Wyre Hill and c) Park Lane. Neither of these routes can take an increase in traffic.</p> <p>Route a) Winbrook/Welch Gate is a narrow road up to the junction with Dog Lane, it is difficult for buses to manoeuvre and impossible for a lorry to pass a bus. Congestion already occurs in that area. Additional traffic generated by development in Highclere would cause gridlock in this area. There are already air quality issues at this point due to stationary traffic - this would be exacerbated by development at Highclere.</p> <p>Route b) Wyre Hill is very narrow and with parked traffic down one side is already reduced to a single carriageway. This route can not take the additional traffic that would be generated by development at Highclere.</p> <p>Route c) Park Lane is steep and narrow with no pavement. It already suffers congestion and is not suitable for additional traffic. This route is walked by people coming from the town to the present housing in Park Lane and Highclere INCLUDING SCHOOL CHILDREN. There is already conflict between traffic and pedestrians. Additional traffic generated by further development at Highclere will inevitably lead to pedestrian injuries or death.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Please note that Bewdley Town Council consider the Highclere site unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Reject the Highclere site for further development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0119</a>	Object	<p>I object to the inclusion of this greenfield site behind existing houses at Highclere for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extra traffic generated by the proposed new housing development has 'nowhere to go'.</li> </ol> <p>Park Lane is narrow, twists, blind bends, is steep, it is hard to pass two vehicles and most importantly it has no pavement. Dangerous for pedestrians. The elderly, schoolchildren Mums with pushchairs and people working and shopping in Bewdley have to hope that the traffic coming around a blind spot can stop.</p> <p>Moving the extra traffic away from Park Lane and putting it down Wyre Hill is not much better, parked cars effectively reduce the road to a single carriageway.</p> <p>The area of Welch Gate would also be badly affected by extra vehicles from Wyre Hill producing more pollution and forming a bigger queue at the junction with Dog Lane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There are no facilities in the Park Lane/Highclere area. No Bus Stop, No shop, No children's playground, not even a postbox. Consequently people have to use their cars all the time to go shopping and for trips to the medical centre, library and everything that Bewdley offers. See point 1. above about the deleterious effect of extra car journeys.</li> <li>3. Loss of the greenfield site behind Highclere would mean that the existing local residents would lose the amenity of being able to walk on footpaths there. There is no other area of park anywhere near Highclere.</li> </ol> <p>My objection to the inclusion of Highclere as a potential housing site can be included in the draft Local Plan consultation.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0120</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of local land for recreational/amenity, inc environmental and nature aspects.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibility of future development</li> <li>• Loss of many public footpaths/wildlife</li> <li>• Develop the area as a nature reserve, as an asset to Bewdley.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0143</a>	Object	The plan does not comment on the issue of extra traffic travelling down Park Lane. This is a key issue, especially at peak times. A traffic impact study is needed. Great caution is required before any action that increases traffic flow up and down this road, especially the steep and winding section. Extra Highclere traffic will use this route!
	<a href="#">LPP0175</a>	Object	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.
	<a href="#">LPP0334</a>	Object	<p>I oppose the preferred scheme. Any building in Bewdley is unwise due to the layout. I am particularly concerned with the proposed building on Highclere fields.</p> <p>My reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already very high air pollution in the town</li> <li>• Gridlocked roads at peak times (Park lane and Wyre Hill narrow and without pavements)</li> <li>• Increased car usage as there are no near bus stops or shops</li> <li>• Highclere fields have many ash trees- aren't these endangered though ash dieback in other areas? If so shouldn't they be protected?</li> <li>• Highclere is Green Belt! A beautiful spot used by many of the local community</li> <li>• Several bird species and butterflies would loose their habitat</li> </ul> <p>Many other reasons to refuse planning on this site. Please consider them. Without major road improvements, any large building projects would greatly add to the existing problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0340</a>	Object	I strongly object to the inclusion of Highclere Fields as a possible housing development site. My reasons are as

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>follows.</p> <p>Unsuitability- Access via Park Lane/ Wyre Hill, both of which are narrow roads, poor visibility, dangerous for those walking as no proper footpaths, blind bends, additional traffic will cause chaos.</p> <p>Natural Beauty- This field has always been considered an area of outstanding natural beauty, development of any sort will destroy this forever. The landowner has her own development ideas which are impractical and would set a precedent for future development and be difficult to resist. Your policy statement includes 'not an area of significant value for recreation, beauty, tranquillity, wildlife.' All these criteria apply to Highclere fields. These fields should be a priority for protection.</p> <p>Bewdley town- Relies heavily on tourists, so destroying its attractiveness to visitors by turning it into a commuter town, would destroy the very essence of why people visit.</p> <p>Alternatives- Have you considered land opposite/ adjacent to the Mercure Hotel, Defunct site of Medical Centre/Library, land opposite Bewdley High School.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO383</a>	Object	<p>Object. This site did not form part of the Bewdley Town Council Development Plan.</p> <p>Land west of the river is not as suitable for development due to the increased congestion this will cause as people travel through the town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO171</a>	Object	<p>Development off Highclere: 30 bungalows would increase the existing developments (Highclere &amp; Highclere drive) by 40%, so quite significant. Nearest shops are in the town centre - although only 0.5 mile away, there is a very steep hill (50 m height difference), which elderly people are unlikely to manage. Therefore an increase in road traffic of at least 30 cars would be inevitable. The nearest route is Park Lane, which is single lane in places with poor visibility. Park Lane is frequented by many pedestrians (especially school children), and has no foot way on the narrow parts. The junction with Load street is also an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>St Anne's primary school use Highclere drive as a suitable place to teach cycling, as it is a cul-de-sac. It's unlikely</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this can continue if it becomes a through road.</p> <p>If included for development, it must be unconditionally max 30 bungalows - any planning applications for a larger number or larger houses must be rejected.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO302</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned with regard to the inclusion of the land off Highclere within the core site allocation.</p> <p>Difficult to comprehend the inclusion of this land being driven by local landowners offering the land for development or the reasoned justification for inclusion. To my mind the reasoned justification is not considered and without good justification.</p> <p>I would point out the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Table 33.0.1 makes reference to 30 dwellings and 33.2 ‘very limited single-storey development’. Discussions with the officers related this to elderly person bungalows. What elderly person will select a bungalow at the top of a hill with the nearest bus route a good distance and severe incline walk away with no local shops. Once accepted, this proposal would soon be converted into at least 50 two/three storey dwellings. This would then lead to precedence for the development of land adjacent to Dry Mill Lane.</li> <li>2. Traffic pollution is already at potentially high risk levels within the town. Entrance and exit from the site would be via the town adding potentially an additional 100 vehicles through the town twice a day. The access to and from Park lane in both directions is hazardous and conflicts with the Town Council’s Policy INF1&amp;2 as the majority of traffic flow will be through the town centre.</li> <li>3. The junction of Park Lane and Birch Tree Road, which is a very sharp right / left hand bend is of insufficient width and hazardous to both motorists and pedestrians especially at work / school times. The steep stretch of Park Lane towards the town centre is again hazardous to motorists and without a pavement. School children during autumn and winter are at high risk, the footpath cut throughs are not used as they are not maintained, unlit and, in parts, very steep and slippery.</li> <li>4. Any increase in traffic from the town centre or by-pass into Highclere is unacceptable.</li> <li>5. There is only one access available from Highclere onto Park Lane, the access shown off Hernes Nest is a</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>private road and should not be shown as such.</p> <p>6. The site is totally unsuitable for development and should not have been considered initially.</p> <p>7. Any development will destroy the landscape, take away valuable urban green land and its recreational use. It will be seen from the by-pass and from the higher vantage points such as Wharton park and be an intrusion into the local landscape.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0759</a>	Object	<p>Para 33.1 Site does not have easy access to services and facilities e.g. No bus service, No shops within ½ mile (then downhill/uphill to town centre). A car will be essential for trips.</p> <p>Para 33.2 Reference to 30 single story dwellings This implies bungalows and bungalows imply older residents, up to 60 extra cars, courier vans and grocery deliveries will be made - the traffic flow will be immense and add to the existing dangers on Park Lane and Birch Tree Road. Air quality will be compromised.</p> <p>The existence of extra dwellings on site will destroy the recreational value of the field.</p> <p>The plan will run from 2018 to 2034, in that period development of the site BR/BE/6 will lead to pressure from the landowner to develop further landholdings to the West along Cleobury Road and the by pass. This will prolong anxiety, if granted it would destroy the unique location that is currently enjoyed.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0826</a>	Object	<p>Object to any large-scale housing west of the river for reasons of poor infrastructure and sustainability (including a lack of public transport possibilities), exacerbation of traffic and pollution/air quality problems in the town, visual impact of the landscape quality of the area and surface water drainage issues.</p> <p>Site BR/BE/6 land off Highclere: The factors mentioned in the above paragraph apply here. The natural beauty of this site is well-documented in the government’s report when its development was rejected at the appeal hearing in 1989. While there have been changes in the planning framework the value of this landscape has not altered, so the comments are still valid.</p>
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP0841</a>	Object	<p>The Council strongly opposes the site at Highclere and it will not be included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Justification for this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is of high landscape value on the West side of Bewdley where development is not supported by the community;</li> <li>• Water run off would put undue pressure on Snuff Mill Brook;</li> <li>• Road access via Park Lane/Wyre Hill into and out of the site is very restrictive;</li> <li>• No easily accessible public transport provision;</li> <li>• Development on the west side of the town is unsustainable due to the traffic congestion and subsequent air pollution which will have an adverse effect on the existing AQMA;</li> <li>• Accessing services from sites on the west of the town would be difficult due to the restricted access via the Welch Gate AQMA. This would result in any development becoming "divorced" from the town and unlikely to contribute to the town's economy or enhance community cohesion.</li> </ul> <p>The Council have received strong local opposition to the inclusion of this site and it is our opinion that 30 units can be catered for elsewhere through windfall development, or by allocating 30 dwellings over the three remaining preferred sites.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1078</a>	Object	<p>Proposed allocation BR5/BE6 – Although we note the comments set out in paragraph 33.2 of the reasoned justification we still have significant concerns regarding the allocation of this site. Particular care will be required if the unimproved grassland and nearby LWS are to be effectively protected from the adverse effects of development and we would strongly recommend further work be done to determine whether this is feasible prior to the final allocation being accepted. In particular we would emphasise the difficulties associated with maintaining species rich grassland in public open space.</p> <p>In addition we reiterate the need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist on any of the sites using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been fully considered in the evidence base or SA for the plan. This may have the effect of rendering the plan unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for sites listed in Table 33.0.1 and 33.0.2 is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP01663</a>	Object	I would like to object to the redevelopment of Highclere fields for housing. The fields are used by dog walkers and there is easy access for all. Building on this site would be detrimental to the wellbeing of the residents in that there would be increased traffic on the narrow roads and more air and noise pollution.
	<a href="#">LPP02885</a>	Object	The roads to and from the town to this area are barely accessible now – Park Lane is unsuited for more traffic – an extensive length has no footpath and is very narrow as well as being the preferred route for local children to walk to school. Wyre Hill – absolutely unable to take increased traffic. Up Wyre Hill – past the local primary school which will be even busier with increased population, or down Merricks Lane and into Welch Gate, already known ‘Black Spot.’
	<a href="#">LPP02967</a>	Object	<p>As a resident of Highclere I feel compelled to register my objection to any proposal to build on the Highclere site. Apart from the fact that it would destroy the natural landscape and beauty of this area, I would also point out the very obvious traffic problems that it would generate.</p> <p>Access via Park Lane or Wyre Hill would present a lethal cocktail of problems for both pedestrians and traffic. Much of which is too narrow to accommodate passing traffic, and off course the lack of a public footpath in much of these 2 roads could have devastating consequences.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03003</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to the development of the Highclere fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area provides an amenity for walkers as can be seen in the many footpaths crossing the fields.</li> <li>• It is a green lung between the by-pass and the houses already built.</li> <li>• There would be poor access to narrow roads in the area and would put a further strain on the already overcrowded street of Bewdley.</li> <li>• It would greatly increase the problems around the school, increasing the risk to the children.</li> <li>• As there is no bus route covering the site it would considerably add to the number of cars as can be seen by the number of cars per household already, usually at least two per house, which adds to the congestion of the roads as few houses can accommodate them all. It also leads to more gardens being covered with hard surfaces which causes more water run off.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPO3063</a>	Object	<p>For us, the main concern is Highclere Field, and so we wish to register our strongest objection to it being part of “Plan A” for the erection of new homes in the area, in fact, to be considered at all.</p> <p><b>Traffic volume and infrastructure:</b> If you have ever been to the Wyre Hill area and spent a bit of time there, you will be aware of the sheer volume of traffic that already runs through what was conceived as a quiet, residential area. On an ordinary day, the amount of cars that make their way up and down the likes of Park Lane, Wyre Hill, Hales Park, Merrick’s Lane, even Sandybank goes way beyond what the area was set out to cope with.</p> <p>Adding more cars to this with the development of Highclere would have a catastrophic effect to an already incredibly congested area. Even if you did create a direct access to the by-pass (which wouldn’t be easy given the ravine that separates Highclere Field and the bypass), the reality is that most new residents would choose a route via Park Lane, Wyre Hill etc. This would present the most direct route into town, for amenities such as shops, pubs etc that Wyre Hill doesn’t offer.</p> <p>Roadworks in the area have been a rather frequent occurrence in recent years, and every time one of the feeder roads to Wyre Hill and Park Lane or the roads connected to the former is shut (as has been the case this last weekend), traffic on Wyre Hill turns into complete mayhem. This would be made worse still if another 30, 40 houses (and up to 100 cars) were added to the built up area in that part of Bewdley.</p> <p><b>Health and safety:</b> On school days, especially during drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic situation on Wyre Hill is quite precarious. There have been many near misses and even some accidents involving school children. Many parents living close by already feel it’s not safe for their children to walk the short distance from home to St Anne’s School – a situation that would be further aggravated by additional traffic from Highclere Field.</p> <p>Park Lane and Sandybank, too, present real H&amp;S issues that would increase further. Both are used by many pedestrians (most notably students of Bewdley High School) but both lack in suitable footpaths. Children are required to walk along the often busy roads before they reach the town centre and any increase in traffic will increase the potential for accidents on roads which were never designed for this kind of high volume of traffic.</p> <p>For many dog walkers, Highclere Field is the only accessible area that in the long winter mornings and evenings</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>isn't completely dark. It is possible to walk but at the same time feel safe, with nearby houses offering low levels of light. The adjacent big field does not offer anything similar and dog walkers would be restricted to walking on the pavements.</p> <p><b>Environment:</b> Many people come to Bewdley as it has a reputation of being an area of outstanding natural beauty. Set in the middle of the countryside of the Wyre Forest, it could be assumed that there are many, easy accessible country walks available to residents and visitors. However, that's not the case, in particular on the Wyre Hill side of Bewdley. One of the few areas easy to reach for residents for recreational purposes is Highclere Field, which is used by many for dog walking and play (it's safe for kids due to its proximity to houses) and be in touch with nature.</p> <p>Highclere Field has been untouched in many, many years and this means that a number of rare species of plants and especially animals have been able to thrive. Species I have observed myself are amongst others: buzzard, kestrel, nightingale, goldcrest, cuckoo, waxwing, bat, bumblebees (different kinds), butterflies (different kinds), foxes, hedgehogs, slowworm and grass snakes.</p> <p>Building on Highclere Field would mean valuable terrain for rare species would be irretrievably lost. This is not the kind of Bewdley residents of the town and the Wyre Forest envisage their children and grandchildren to grow up in.</p> <p><b>Conclusion ;</b> Like many other residents and visitors, we have the strongest of objections to any kind of building work to be carried out on Highclere Fields. In a survey from 2 years ago, residents made it clear that Highclere Field should not be on the list of proposed building sites. We were therefore very surprised that it had been placed on the list by WFDC, not only that, but that it is, in fact, part of Plan A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03065</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to object to the planned building on the field behind Highclere in Bewdley.</p> <p>This is a terrible location as not only is it Green Belt land, but the accessibility to the site for both firstly the building firms and ultimately the residents will impact incredibly badly on the surrounding area. The road down to Bewdley is a single lane and the opposite way is a busy primary school. The pollution surely is a price too high to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>pay alone without the dangers being taken into consideration.</p> <p>I trust you will turn this proposal down.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01872</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not build on Highclere.</li> <li>• Two dangerous narrow roads plus a B road leading to two bottlenecks, Welch gate and Bewdley bridge.</li> <li>• Extra traffic would be a nightmare of traffic and car fumes.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01873</a>	Object	<p>From a Member of Highclere Fields Residents. Objects to housing development on Highclere Fields.</p> <p>Main reason for objection is because of impossible access. Both Park Lane and Wyre Hill roads are dangerous and narrow and cannot do with increased traffic of any kind.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01931</a>	Object	<p>I wish to Lodge my objection against the proposed development of the Highclere Fields. It would be dangerous to increase traffic flow on the narrow access roads to the area and increase harmful oxides of nitrogen and carbon into an already highly polluted environment of Welch Gate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02175</a>	Object	<p>It is very clear that these will not be very affordable houses for Bewdley families as the number of houses is small when compared to the numbers proposed on the other suggested sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02274</a>	Object	<p>Vehicular and pedestrian access via Wyre Hill and Park Lane, Areas of Park Lane and Wyre Hill have no public footpaths.</p> <p>Lack of services: The nearest shops are in Bewdley or The Lakes Road, local bus service operates from Wyre Hill forcing potential residents to use their own transport.</p> <p>Golden Valley is a beautiful area, separating existing residential from the Bewdley by-pass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02302</a>	Object	<p>I endorse Bewdley Town Council that if Option A is rejected in favour of Option B, no more development should be on the west bank of the River Severn. There are few local employment opportunities in Bewdley and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>amenities, further houses would increase traffic and pollution.</p> <p>Highclere was rejected in 1989 as totally inappropriate for development, the reasons remain. Plans for retirement bungalows is a daft idea as site is steep and access from the town up steep and narrow footpath-less Park Lane or Wyre Hill. More vehicles adding to the air pollution in the town centre. Land used by locals, its loss would reduce Bewdley being a desirable tourist attraction for visitors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2303</a>	Object	<p>Object to Highclere fields site in Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steep slope with bad drainage problems.</li> <li>• Local Primary school is full.</li> <li>• Park Lane is a two lane road with two wide footpaths that goes into a very steep one lane road with no footpaths. Road is steep and dangerous when icy. We don't need any more traffic diverting through Welch Gate to avoid it</li> <li>• School children and others use this road daily.</li> <li>• Highclere fields are an amenity which should not be built on.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2331</a>	Object	<p>There are 3 more suitable sites East of the river in terms of 1) access to Kidderminster and Stourport, 2) not encroaching on Green Land. Transfer Highclere Site to an Option not a Core site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access used by schoolchildren is already dangerous with lack of pavements.</li> <li>• The map wrongly shows a road link between Hernes Nest/Highclere; there is no through road</li> <li>• No bus route/local shop, would increase car use/air pollution/risk of accidents.</li> <li>• Concentrate new building East of the river, esp. regeneration of brownfield sites in Kidderminster</li> <li>• Even if land available should be about planning not convenience.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2340</a>	Object	<p>I wish to respond to the local plan review, with respect to the plans for Bewdley. I attended the consultation event in St George's Hall, Bewdley on Wednesday 19th July. In particular, I wish to comment on what I will call the 'Highclere' site, which is the field beyond Highclere and Highclere Drive at the western extremity. I note that this</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>site is a 'core' site, and so I understand that whatever the objections and rational arguments, building of some sort on this site will go ahead. I hope this is a misapprehension on my part.</p> <p>In planning terms, I think this would be utter stupidity.</p> <p>Let me be clear:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am not a habitual dog-walker, and losing this site to tarmac, bricks and concrete will be to the detriment of my access to countryside, but not to a very large extent.</li> <li>2. Developing the site for housing will, of course increase the traffic passing my house at the junction of Highclere and Park Lane, but I doubt I will notice much difference compared with the amount of traffic already passing.</li> </ol> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is foolish to extend the urban sprawl further west into open countryside.</li> <li>2. The increased traffic resulting from such a development will significantly increase the danger of accidents down the narrow part of Park Lane, where there is a dangerous absence of footpaths.</li> <li>3. There will be increased traffic passing St Anne's School where the road is already dangerously narrow.</li> <li>4. There will be increased traffic passing through Bewdley, where pollution from existing levels of traffic is already at dangerous levels</li> <li>5. As with most current residents of Bewdley, car journeys towards Kidderminster and Stourport for shopping, work, leisure facilities and cultural events far outweigh journeys towards Tenbury, Leominster and Ludlow.</li> <li>5. It is a fundamental planning error to develop sites at the maximum westward distance from these facilities while closer sites are available, just think of the extra car-miles involved!</li> <li>6. It is not worth protecting totem Green-Belt sites between Bewdley and Kidderminster when at present they provide so little if any public access. The expression 'Green Belt'...a 70 year old phrase, is preventing rational thought.</li> <li>7. The 3 sites on the eastern boundaries of Bewdley would be far more sensible from a planning point of view because they are less open to the objections given above</li> <li>8. The 3 sites on the eastern boundary of</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Bewdley would have far easier access to the main roads than the Highclere site.</p> <p>8. I am not sure that the planning staff are aware of the dangerous lack of footpaths in Park Lane.</p> <p>9. I suspect that at least some of the planners labour under the mistaken impression that there is an access to Highclere via Hernes Nest. This access was shown on some maps. It does not exist. The thoroughfare is blocked.</p> <p>10. In the current jargon, the Highclere site is clearly NOT a 'sustainable location' in terms of what I understand by the expression.</p> <p>Furthermore, when I visit Kidderminster, and see the dire state of commercial property in Worcester Street, now that shopping facilities have gravitated towards the new centre at Weavers Wharf, and then consider the vast area above and behind Worcester Street whose current use is merely for (often very sparse) car parking, I cannot understand why our planners are considering sites around Bewdley at all. Revitalise Kidderminster !!</p> <p>At the very least, the Highclere site should NOT be a core site. It should at the very least be an option, and, given the other options, nobody with any sense would want to build on the Highclere site at all!</p> <p>But you probably will!!! And why? Out of expediency, and simply because the owner of the site happens to be willing to sell. So much for 'planning'.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2359</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept the need for more housing in Wyre Forest, but access/increased traffic on narrow roads is a concern; there is no pavement in Park Lane</li> <li>• Loss of a valuable recreational asset</li> <li>• Would sloping land affect building?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2381</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beautiful area, well used by the local community</li> <li>• No local shop/bus route so any building would increase car usage and impact on pedestrian safety; road access is poor and there is a lack of pavements.</li> <li>• Negative impact on air pollution.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2405</a>	Object	<p>Any development to the rear of Highclere, Bewdley would increase traffic on Park Lane which is used by schoolchildren despite being narrow and steep with no footway in parts.</p> <p>Potential occupants of new 1 storey housing could be elderly and would have to use cars as there is no public transport causing more pollution. Opposed by BTC.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2431</a>	Object	<p>Specifically I object to the inclusion of the fields adjoining Highclere in Bewdley as a potential site for building.</p> <p>A major concern relating to this location must be the inadequacy of the road infrastructure in Bewdley to cope with further development west of the river. This is particularly relevant to this site, as both Park Lane and Wyre Hill are dangerous with the present levels of traffic, for motorists and especially for pedestrians, and will not allow for increased volumes. In my years as a Director of Bewdley Development Trust I held many meetings with Highways Planners from the County Council, and they made clear that Bewdley west of the river was their greatest problem area across the county, and posed intractable problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2447</a>	Object	<p>Highclere Fields should NOT be included in the draft local plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access would be via Highclere and Park Lane which are not suitable for more traffic.</li> <li>• Morning and afternoon local children walk up or down Park lane to school and it is a steep narrow twisting road with no footpath so not suitable for more traffic.</li> <li>• The fields are a local amenity.</li> <li>• Development on this side of the town is not a good idea as inevitably it would result in more traffic through the town</li> <li>• There are more suitable sites for development for local housing.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2459</a>	Object	<p>We strongly object to the neighbourhood plan as it applies to Highclere in Bewdley.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Park lane and Wyre Hill are unsuitable roads to sustain any further development in this area. Both roads are narrow, restricted and have poor visibility. As a non driver I frequently use Park Lane to walk into Bewdley and I have to manoeuvre traffic each time. Uncertain drivers already have difficulty with the</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>narrow, steep, unpaved section. Further congestion would only add to the problem. These two roads also form major walking routes for the pupils at the junior and high schools</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There are no shopping facilities or transport routes to service this site. Residents would have to use their cars to go anywhere.</li> <li>3. This site raised serious objections the last time it was mooted and was rejected by the Government Inspector`s report.</li> <li>4. This particular site can be seen right across the valley and any development would impinge greatly on the views.</li> </ol> <p>It is the main area for current residents to take exercise to allow their children to run and play in safe traffic free surroundings to walk their dogs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02485</a>	Object	<p>I very strongly disagree with the proposal to build housing on the fields adjoining Highclere, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All access routes to this area are via narrow, windy roads, in places without a pavement. If more housing was built, these roads would become even more dangerous for pedestrians, especially young children attending the nearby primary school.</li> <li>2. These fields considerably enhance the natural beauty of Bewdley and are enjoyed every day by many local people and visitors to Bewdley.</li> <li>3. Building on these fields would be visible over a wide area, thus spoiling the natural beauty of Bewdley.</li> <li>4. There are many public footpaths within and adjacent to this area and these are used and enjoyed by many local people and visitors to the town.</li> <li>5. These fields are a valuable area for a wide variety of wildlife. It is our duty to protect this habitat.</li> <li>6. Access to the area for emergency vehicles would be further impeded by the consequent increase in traffic.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP02492</a>	Object	<p>I wish to lodge my strong objection to the inclusion in the District New Local Plan of the land adjoining Highclere</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and Highclere Drive Bewdley on the following grounds.</p> <p>Anyone who has to travel up &amp; down either Park Lane or Wyre Hill, knows how difficult it can be .There are very few passing places for two cars &amp; the visibility particularly on Park Lane hill is very bad in places, thus at times leading to a few close shaves. Dangerous road access via Park Lane and/or Wyre Hill. Narrow roads with restricted access and poor visibility. Any development in this part of Bewdley will increase the traffic flow still further.</p> <p>Any additional traffic could also worsen the air quality problems in Bewdley.</p> <p>School children going down to the High School have to use the hills twice a day, there are no pavements for them or other pedestrians to walk on. If traffic is increased both walking into town or driving down will become a lot more dangerous. In bad weather, the hills become very icy thus adding to the problems. There are always big queues of traffic with people trying to get onto the bypass in these conditions. The residents living at the bottom of Highclere have to park their cars on the second hammerhead in order to get a run up the hill in Highclere in snowy conditions.</p> <p>The fields are well used by local residents &amp; the value to the community would be lost by development there. These fields can be seen easily from the bypass in winter, when the leaves are off the trees, thus increasing the beauty of Bewdley. There is no other area this side of Cleobury Road for people to use.</p> <p>We lost the only shop up here a good twenty years ago. So the only way to get anything you run out of is to either walk or use the car to get down the hills. No one would use the bypass to get to Bewdley town centre, people would just carry on &amp; go to Kidderminster or Stourport, so you would be harming the local shop keepers if this plan goes through. The other consideration re traffic is that all traffic going from this area to the bypass will have to go past St. Ann's Primary school.</p> <p>This attractive countryside site is crossed by well used public footpaths and is a valued piece of green land. Any development will be seen from a wide area and the natural beauty of these fields and their value for recreational purposes would be lost. The last Government Inspectors report totally rejected development of these fields. The</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>beauty of the fields and impact on the landscape surrounding Bewdley has not changed since that report.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the agreement of any development on this land would set a precedent for further developments in the future to the west of Bewdley. The nearby land adjacent to Park Dingle was rightly left out of the WFDC Plan after being quoted in the HELAA (Ref BR/BE/7) as 'The site is very open when viewed from the bypass and any development would potentially have an adverse impact on the landscape character' The Highclere site has the same characteristics .</p> <p>The site is not suitable for any development as it is steeply sloping down to the Golden Valley and is on top of a hill. It does not have easy access to facilities or services without using a car which will exacerbate the traffic problems as mentioned above. There is neither an immediate bus route nor any local shop. Water run off from the site may well put undue pressure on Snuff Mill Brook.</p> <p>The Bewdley Neighbourhood Plan has been in process for some time and the Steering Committee has taken the views of the people of Bewdley. Following this they have now taken the Highclere site out of the Neighbourhood Plan. In view of this and the adverse facts set out above I feel that the District Council should now follow suit and also take the Highclere site out of the District plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02538</a>	Object	<p>I am total against any further development west of the River Severn for all of the many reasons that have been aired publically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ &gt;Dangerous road access to all areas, particularly Park Lane and Wyre Hill</li> <li>➤ &gt;School children at risk</li> <li>➤ &gt;The Highclere site being unsuitable - as recorded in previous reviews going back many years.</li> <li>➤ &gt;Congestion and health and safety risks in the Welch Gate area - as pointed out and recorded by DOE research back as far as 1986</li> </ul> <p>So - to be clear, I wish to formally register my opposition to the inclusion of the Highclere Fields in the WFDC and urge you to remove this from your development plan, before it is finalised.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02541</a>	Object	I formally register my opposition to the inclusion of the Highclere Fields in the WFDC plan and urge you to remove this from your development plan before it is finalised.
	<a href="#">LPP02580</a>	Object	<p>I am extremely concerned about access to the proposed site and consider that any increase in traffic flow will be dangerous to public safety especially pedestrians including children for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the proposed site via Highclere will mean more traffic via Bewdley Town using Park Lane where there is a steep narrow section with no footpath whatsoever.</li> <li>2. Access to the proposed site via Birch Tree Road will mean increased traffic flow past the school in Wyre Hill and the adjacent pinch point in the road.</li> <li>3. Access via Merricks Lane and Wyre Hill are both very steep and/or narrow.</li> </ol> <p>In addition these fields enhance the natural beauty of Bewdley and are visible over a wide area. Building on this land will destroy this valuable and irreplaceable feature.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02593</a>	Object	<p>Strongly object to the proposals at Highclere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dangerous road access via Park Lane and/or Wyre Hill. Both roads are very narrow with restricted access and poor visibility. Any development in this part of Bewdley will increase traffic flow still further which is unacceptable. It will also impact on the air quality improvement zone in the Welch Gate part of Bewdley. In addition, the town centre frequently gridlocks and any further development in Bewdley west of the Severn will only exacerbate this problem.</li> <li>• Substantial numbers of school children and other pedestrians use Park Lane and Wyre Hill and are at risk because of the narrow roads, no pavements and volume of traffic. Any increase in traffic flow resulting from this proposed development will add to the danger.</li> <li>• This proposed site is not suitable or sustainable for retirement style bungalows or indeed any other type of development. It is a steep site sloping down to the Snuff Mill brook valley and is on top of a hill. It does not have easy access to facilities or services. There is neither a frequent bus route that serves the immediate area nor a local shop. Therefore increased car use will be encouraged.</li> <li>• The attractive countryside site is crossed by well used public footpaths and is a valued piece of urban</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>green land. The natural beauty of these fields and their value for recreational purposes will be lost. The last Government Inspector's report rejected development of these fields. Part of the inspector's comments were: "Development of this land would extend the urbanised area of Bewdley into an area of great landscape value and would adversely affect the setting of Bewdley and the attractive environment to the west of the town. Its development, therefore, would create a precedent for extending development of the town towards the by-pass, over land readily visible from a wide area would represent a considerable physical and psychological intrusion into the open landscape." The inspector also stated that development of this land should be a very last resort when all other alternatives had been exhausted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of this site would set a precedent for larger developments in the future to the west of Bewdley right up to Wharton Park. Retaining the Highclere site in the draft WFDC Local Plan could also strengthen the case for the Gladman planning application adjacent to Dry Mill Lane in any future appeal process.</li> <li>• The inclusion of the Highclere site also appears to contradict many other policies and objectives outlined in the draft Local Plan including safeguarding land of recreational and amenity use; improvement to the landscape; protection of watercourses; reduction in traffic levels; and air quality improvement.</li> <li>• It is not included in the Bewdley Town Council Neighbourhood Plan which has recently been consulted upon. The consultation undertaken in 2016 on the Bewdley Town Council Neighbourhood Plan strongly indicated that the people of Bewdley did not favour development in this area. The recently completed latest consultation exercise which gathered even more responses indicated even stronger opposition to building on the Highclere site.</li> </ul> <p>I do understand the need for more housing in Wyre Forest District but I do not consider the significant development of any land on the west bank of Bewdley to be sustainable. As most economic activity takes place to the east of Bewdley in Kidderminster or in the West Midlands conurbation I consider that any development in Bewdley would be more sustainably located east of the River Severn, closer to these areas of economic activity.</p> <p>A more suitable site could be the site already identified by the Council in its option B proposals opposite the Rising Sun public house in Kidderminster Road, Wribbenhall. This site is flat, more easily developable and not used for recreational purposes. It is on a main road with frequent bus services, good road access and close to a local</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>shop and other local community amenities. I also consider the other sites proposed for housing development in Bewdley east of the River Severn to be able to be far more sustainably developed than the Highclere site. These include both core proposals and option A and B proposals. All are closer to more frequent public transport services and other local facilities.</p> <p>Taking all these matters into account I request that the Council should not include the Highclere site for any development in the Local Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02605</a>	Object	<p>The route to town via Park Lane is already very narrow and quite dangerous for everyone.</p> <p>The children use this route to access their schools and facilities in town. More cars on this stretch of road would only make this situation even more hazardous.</p> <p>I would like to add that to build on such a prominent green field site, which is used by the local community as a recreational area for all to enjoy, would be very sad to witness.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02630</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road access is very bad via Park Lane which would be the favoured access. Parts of Park Lane are very narrow, steep and with a blind bend in an area where there is no pavement. It is substantially used by schoolchildren. Access via Wyre Hill is equally bad especially bearing in the mind the location of the Primary School.</li> <li>2. There have been applications turned down in the past to build on this site. The H M Government Inspector at the time had no hesitation in dismissing the appeal on the grounds that the land in question had high landscape value due to its natural beauty. The site is much valued by local residents for this reason and the well worn public footpaths over the land show that it is well used by many people.</li> <li>3. I understand from minutes made public that Bewdley Town Council is recommending to WFDC that the site is taken out of both its own Neighbourhood Plan and also the WFDC Local plan. I hope that WFDC will take note of what local people are saying.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP02667</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is a Green Belt site of significant natural beauty and well used by local people.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure is constricted in this area. Used by school children, access via Park Lane would be</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>dangerous to pedestrians and drivers alike and would be opposed by local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposals to include Highclere Fields in previous plans have been rejected by Government Planning Inspectors (on a number of grounds). There is no evidence to suggest that others would reach a different conclusion with the current proposal. Why alternative sites have not been examined in more detail shows a lack of creativity by local planning departments. The site would not be extendable and it is difficult to see why it would make much of a contribution to local housing needs. And the noise from the bypass since resurfacing could affect demand for property in such a poor location.</li> <li>• The landscape value of the existing site is well appreciated and it is likely that this will be severely affected by the project which can be seen from the road.</li> </ul> <p>Please can we carry out an in-depth study of this very poor proposal to devise an alternative which is more suited to Bewdley's needs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2700</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed development of housing on the land behind Highclere, Bewdley. This is currently a picturesque site enjoyed by many that provides recreation, environmental protection and local animal habitation. It is unsuited to housing development due to already struggling local roads and the absence of either a bus route to the area or a local shop.</p> <p>I trust that these considerations will be taken into account when determining the local plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2701</a>	Object	<p>My objections come in 2 parts:</p> <p>Site factors: There are a number of issues related to this site that make any housing development unsuitable. I detail these later.</p> <p>The WFDC Planning Process: I believe that the WFDC Planning Process with regard to Highclere has many inconsistencies. The net result is that the validity of the reasons to include this site in the Local Plan is highly questionable. I spell out some of these inconsistencies later.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Site Factors</p> <p><b>Road access:</b> Being a Bewdley resident I know that most people will access this site via Park Lane. This is narrow, steep, with a blind bend and for most of its length there is no pavement. It is heavily used by school children and is an accident waiting to happen. Do you want to increase this risk? You could use Wyre Hill which is just as bad and would add to the pollution problems in Welch Gate. If you use the by-pass that would mean driving along Wyre Hill down a narrow congested road past a Primary School. In short, access is a nightmare, I dread to think about heavy construction vehicles trying to get onto the site. The landowner herself in a recent leaflet she distributed in the area stated they impact on traffic of housing on these fields would be chaotic.</p> <p><b>Suitability:</b> The latest idea, among many others, of the landowner is to build retirement bungalows. The site does not have easy access to buses or shops. The site is on top of a hill and there will be drainage problems that will affect the Golden Valley.</p> <p><b>Landscape:</b> These fields are a very attractive part of Wyre Forest visible for miles around. This is why a government inspector rejected plans to develop this site. They are used by people over a wide area for recreation. Furthermore, since these fields have not been touched for many years they are an important wild life corridor. Bats, lizards, slow worms, grass snakes, dormice and ground nesting birds use these fields as their habitat. We all know that any construction will cause long term damage to this ecosystem.</p> <p>The WFDC Planning Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I want a level playing field. WFDC has rightly objected to the Gladman development on the Dry Mill Lane site. One of the points put forward by WFDC was that the National Policy and Planning Framework in paragraph 80 make it clear that historic towns have a setting. Bewdley Conservation Area was granted heritage status in 1968. The 2015 appraisal stated:</li> </ul> <p>“It is important to conserve the rural setting of the town and Conservation Area and in doing recognise the interrelationships between the Area and the overall setting.”</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>“These hills rise to a significantly higher level than the town centre and provide it with a strong sense of natural containment.”</p> <p>These very points apply to the Highclere site. Any proposed development on the Highclere site will strengthen the case for Gladman.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley Town Council went through a thorough consultation process to formulate its Neighbourhood Plan. Following this Bewdley Town Council decided that the Highclere site was not suitable for development. If WFDC keep the Highclere site in the local plan then the Independent Inspector would ask questions regarding the robustness of the WFDC Local Plan.</li> <li>• Under the HELAA “Call for Sites” exercise, the fields adjacent to Highclere, Park Dingle are noted. These fields are deemed unsuitable by WFDC because of their visibility. This is interesting. The Highclere fields are far more visible and if WFDC reject the Park Dingle land then in all fairness they should reject Highclere.</li> <li>• WFDC appointed a firm Amion Consultancy to analyse housing needs over the period 2016-2034. They produced a report in February 2017. Their report includes input from Edge Analytics and makes reference to Cambridge Econometrics and Oxford Economics. To produce this analysis it looks at a range of factors such as projected employment needs, potential economic growth, likely migration figures, commuting trends etc. The report is full of assumptions and suggestions, it is no more than a best guess. Even so if we take this report at face value it produces a number of housing requirements for WFDC over the period 2016-2034. The highest figure is based on PG-Long-Term-X model and requires 291 dwellings/annum which is 5238 dwellings. The lowest figure based on the SNPP-14 model is 199 dwellings/annum which is 3582 dwellings. My question is where does the oft quoted figure of “6000” houses are needed by WFDC?</li> <li>• In the Kidderminster Shuttle of July 20th 2017 there is an article referring to the rejection of planning on the Snipes site, Areley Common. John Baggott is quoted: “The development would result in a substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to enhance this valuable landscape.” I could not agree more as it applies equally to the Highclere site.</li> <li>• In WFDC appeal against the Gladman development off Dry Mill Lane, it states on page 68 of Agenda Item 5 of WFDC Planning Committee dated 20/06/2017 that:</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>“Other Green Field sites (off Highclere and Snuff Mill Walk) appear to be more closely integrated with the town and are probably sequentially preferable.”</p> <p>What is the justification for stating that the Highclere site is more closely integrated with the town? Any one who lives in Bewdley will know this is nonsense. In fact Gladman could argue that the Dry Mill Lane site is more closely integrated since it is on bus route and road access is easier. Furthermore, why mention the Snuff Mill Lane site when the WFDC HELAA states that this site is not deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WFDC Local Plan states that development west of the River Severn is constrained by topography and the Air Quality Management Area at Welch Gate. However the Highclere site is still included. Furthermore the local plan says that all sites have easy access to services and facilities. This is clearly not correct with regard to the Highclere site. There is an alternative, namely the Catchem's End site. This is east of the River Severn and would provide an indicated number of 76 dwellings. The Bewdley Neighbourhood Plan consultation showed little or no objections to development in this area.</li> <li>• The WFDC Local Plan also states that the Highclere site is an area of “unimproved grassland.” Surely a more appropriate phrase would be “unspoilt grassland”. This is exactly why this site is an important wildlife habitat.</li> </ul> <p>I trust that the Planning Policy Team of WFDC will consider carefully the 3 site-specific issues I have mentioned and take on board what I feel are inconsistencies in the planning process.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2705</a>	Object	<p>The road access around Park Lane &amp; Wyre Hill is not suitable for additional traffic having restricted access and poor visibility.</p> <p>There are significant numbers of children using Wyre Hill and Park Lane. Increased traffic would increase the danger they experience due to narrow roads, no pavements and speeding traffic.</p> <p>The proposed site is unsuitable for retirement homes due to the steep sloping site and also the lack of facilities, services and bus routes that serves the immediate area.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			It has been home to colonies of locally kept bees which are of vital importance to the maintenance of the rural economy and ecological balance.
	<a href="#">LPPO2736</a>	Object	<p>Object to development at Highclere for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The access via Park Lane and Wyre Hill is totally inadequate, and there is no solution to the road problem in these areas.</li> <li>• Welch Gate is polluted.</li> <li>• Wyre Hill, to the bypass is also congested.</li> <li>• There is no road crossing patrol person putting school children at risk.</li> <li>• The site slopes steeply with several springs.</li> <li>• No bus route either, therefore increased use of cars</li> </ul> <p>Need to use brownfield sites. Small, infill housing is a much better idea, I am sure the roads would cope better with this plus the fact that it would be more in keeping with the town</p> <p>Any development on the west of the river is doomed because of the roads, to which there is no answer.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3339</a>	Object	<p>I believe proposals for Highclere is completely in the wrong place to build on and should be dropped. It is unstable for any development. There are many reasons for this:</p> <p>Wyre Hill and Park Lane used by student to walk to school. Both roads in parts have no pavements. Increasing traffic on these roads is not suitable for any pedestrians. The roads are narrow and give poor visibility for both driver and pedestrians. Highclere itself is bad in ice and snow for road and pavement users.</p> <p>There is no viable access to this site which is safe for everyone on the roads.</p> <p>There are many walks and public footpaths through the fields that are great for the community. The paths are well used and provide green open space for local people. Many groups use the public footpaths including dog walkers, the local walking group, tourists come to the area for walks here too. This land is valued and loved by the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>community for been what it is now.</p> <p>The FAQ handout says sites have to be suitable and sustainable for houses. Well Highclere fields can not come under this category. A housing estate there is not sustainable because it will just means that the estate will be expanded over time which will ruin the landscape of Bewdley. The site also is not suitable as it slopes down to Snuff Mill Brook/ the Golden Valley. There are no bus routs this side of Wyre Hill and no facilities for the residents making them use cars more causing more traffic. Retirement bungalows are unsuitable because of the big walk to any service in Bewdley. Not flat area for walking disability. And if retired people cannot drive there is no bus route for them so would be housebound. There are many other reason why this development should not happen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• air pollution</li> <li>• road access</li> <li>• green space</li> <li>• safeguarding of land</li> <li>• landscape pollution</li> <li>• local service e.g. the bus service – there not enough to support the population at the moment not alone more people.</li> <li>• pollution from any building traffic</li> <li>• land access</li> <li>• loss of places where young kids can come and walk to grow there imagination and enjoy them self.</li> <li>• trees been cut down</li> </ul> <p>I hope you consider all of these issues before carrying on with this development and decide to drop from the plan.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3396</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Access via Park Lane and/or Wyre Hill is dangerous as both roads are very narrow with poor visibility and without pavements in parts. The inevitable increase in traffic will make walking very hazardous for both the large number of school children and other pedestrians who use these roads daily.</p> <p>The proposed site has neither a bus route that serves the immediate area nor a local shop therefore increased car</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>usage will result.</p> <p>Will also increase traffic through the already congested town centre and will have a huge impact on the air quality.</p> <p>I believe it is essential that we keep our green fields and countryside for our future generations. Once developed it will be lost forever.</p> <p>The proposed site has well used public footpaths and is valued for its natural beauty.</p> <p>It also has high landscape value which is what makes Bewdley an attractive town for locals and visitors.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3401</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road access is very poor and the main ways in Park Lane and Wyre Hill are very narrow with poor visibility. This would add to the poor air quality in Welsh Gate.</li> <li>• Both the above roads mentioned above are main routes for the High School children going to and from school. They have limited pavements.</li> <li>• The whole site is currently used by many people from all over Bewdley as the town does not have a park as such and thus it is used by all for walking and getting fresh air.</li> <li>• The planner mentioned that they would like only 30 Bungalows, however once the land is sold the developer would quickly change this for many houses, well in excess of 100. The site is not commercially viable for bungalows as they use more land and do not command a high price.</li> <li>• The overall plan for the area is to keep country side where possible which is right. A development of this size in Bewdley will start to change the nature of this key tourist town for the area. The larger developments planned in Kidderminster on brown field sites would appear to be the better option.</li> </ul> <p>Please let's try to do use brown field sites first and very small infill developments.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3481</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The location of this site will create major issues in terms of access and road safety.</p> <p>Bewdley itself is gridlocked even now at certain times due to traffic congestion; this proposal would increase this</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>problem tenfold.</p> <p>I wish to object most strongly to these ill thought plans to develop what is a well used recreational area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03652</a>	Object	<p>These fields are used regularly by dog walkers. The views are very special and I feel that they should be maintained as a green area for everyone to enjoy.</p> <p><b>Pedestrian access:</b> Pedestrian access to this part of Bewdley is poor. I often walk through the fields and then into town. Park Lane does not have a foot path. The alternative is a gully that runs from Herne's Next to Snuff Mill Walk - this footpath is extremely steep, particularly at the bottom. It would not be accessible for anyone in a wheelchair or with a pushchair. Wyre Hill is also very steep and the more accessible alternative of Cleobury Road involves a long detour. There is no local shop on these estates and some residents might find it difficult to walk to any shops. This brings me to my next point, vehicle access.</p> <p><b>Vehicle access:</b> When comments are made about the narrow road at Welch Gate, and the congestion and pollution that arises, there is always the suggestion that all traffic uses the Bypass. I always use the Bypass if I am driving to Stourport or Kidderminster but it is a lot further if I want to go into Bewdley town centre so I do not use it when going to the town (as a member of Bewdley Rowing Club I regularly drive to this facility). The queuing traffic here at certain times indicates that others feel the same. When the Cleobury Road has been inaccessible there has also been congestion on the Bypass. For these reasons I feel that any developments should be to the East of the town, closer to the main roads to Kidderminster and Stourport.</p> <p>I hope that you will take note of the objections of local residents. These fields are a key reason for us living here, and for us enjoying living in this location.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03745</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. increased traffic to an already busy narrow road, often used as a 'cut threw' for commuters, adding to already poor traffic pollution and an increased risk to school children.</li> <li>2. reduction of the protection to watercourses and further reduction of landscape, contradicting local plans to protect land of recreational and amenity usage.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3996</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently the green fields are a buffer to heavy traffic on the bypass and consequent air pollution</li> <li>2. The fields provide a pleasing appearance to the entrance to Bewdley town as well as an important green space for wildlife</li> <li>3. The roads which approach the bypass allow no opportunity for overtaking which results in fast and dangerous traffic on the bypass itself. Introducing local slower traffic would be reckless</li> <li>4. The other access roads have stretches where there is no footpath as well as dangerous blind bends and stretches where there is only space for one vehicle at a time. It is likely that there would be more than one vehicle to each dwelling, a volume of traffic which is unsustainable for these roads</li> <li>5. The map which accompanied the proposal is inaccurate. It shows two means of direct access from Park Lane to the Highclere fields. In fact there is only one as there is no through route from Herne's Nest to the Highclere hammer head.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4003</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently the green fields are a buffer to heavy traffic on the bypass and consequent air pollution.</li> <li>2. The fields provide a pleasing appearance to the entrance to Bewdley town as well as an important green space for wildlife</li> <li>3. The roads which approach the bypass allow no opportunity for overtaking which results in fast and dangerous traffic on the bypass itself. Introducing local slower traffic would be reckless</li> <li>4. The other access roads have stretches where there is no footpath as well as dangerous blind bends and stretches where there is only space for one vehicle at a time. It is likely that there would be more than one vehicle to each dwelling, a volume of traffic which is unsustainable for these roads</li> <li>5. The map which accompanied the proposal is inaccurate. It shows two means of direct access from Park Lane to the Highclere fields. In fact there is only one as there is no through route from Herne's Nest to the Highclere hammer head.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3165</a>	Object	<p>Strongly object to the inclusion of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road access is very bad via Park Lane which would be the favoured access. Parts of Park Lane are very narrow, steep and with a blind bend in an area where there is no pavement. It is substantially used by</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>schoolchildren. Access via Wyre Hill is equally bad especially bearing in the mind the location of the Primary School.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There have been applications turned down in the past to build on this site the most recent in 1989 when the application went to appeal. The H M Government Inspector at the time had no hesitation in dismissing the appeal on the grounds that the land in question had high landscape value due to its natural beauty. In the intervening period the situation has not changed. The site is much valued by local residents for this reason and the well worn public footpaths over the land show that it is well used by many people. Given that WFDC fought off these proposals most strongly in 1989 I am unable to understand why WFDC has seen fit to include the same site in its Local Plan</li> <li>3. I understand from minutes made public that Bewdley Town Council is recommending to WFDC that the site is taken out of both its own Neighbourhood Plan and also the WFDC Local plan. I hope that WFDC will take note of what local people are saying.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP03190</a>	Object	<p>We enjoy the outdoors and often go walking around the local area, and would not like to see this beautiful natural area ruined by development.</p> <p>I find it very concerning. This proposed development could increase traffic around the school which is often already congested at peak times.</p> <p>There are also certain parts of the footpath around the area by the school are very narrow and the potential for increased traffic only increases the likelihood of accidents occurring.</p> <p>Does not obviously appear suitable for development as it slopes quite steeply.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04079</a>	Object	<p>Lack of safe traffic access, only means of access is via the Highclere/Park Lane junction, which leads traffic either down narrow steep Park Lane (no pedestrian footpath) or else, typically past St Anne's School on the way up to the bypass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04101</a>	Object	<p>I wish to express my concerns about the inclusion of the Highclere site in the WFDC Local Plan.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has poor access</li> <li>• Is highly visible for miles around</li> <li>• Rich in wildlife</li> <li>• Very wet in places with a small stream draining into the Golden Valley</li> <li>• It will put additional strain on Load Street and worsen the air pollution in Welch Gate.</li> <li>• It has rightly been removed from the Bewdley Town Neighbourhood Plan after the consultation, why is it still in the WFDC Local Plan?</li> <li>• Park Lane and Wyre Hill already have traffic problems.</li> <li>• Park Lane is narrow, steep, no pavements in places and blind bends.</li> <li>• The exit onto Load Street is awkward. Wyre Hill is no better.</li> </ul> <p>What exactly are the landowners intentions? A Government inspector turned down development on the site once before because of the nature of the site and its high visibility. Now it is proposed for thirty retirement bungalows plus some split level houses on the steeper parts of the field. As the whole field is included in the plan will that be just the start?</p> <p>In you appeal against the Gladman development you state that The Highclere site appears more closely integrated with the town and is probably sequentially preferable. The Gladman site has superior access to the by-pass, a bus route to the town centre and a local shop, in which way is the Highclere site preferable? I would like to know and I would think in their appeal Gladman would like to know as well, if you object to one you must object to them both.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4616</a>	Object	I object strongly to the proposed housing development at Highclere. Any housing development in the west of Bewdley could not be supported by the roads and infrastructure available or possible. The only possible exception to this would be if WFDC used the powers available to it to effect the development of dilapidated listed buildings in the centre of Bewdley, e.g. the old workhouse, into housing units. While this would add small pressures on services, the restoration of these buildings would bring considerable benefits to residents, visitors and businesses.
	<a href="#">LPPO4184</a>	Support	Any further development would be more appropriate on sites over the river, namely Highclere, if Bewdley has to be further developed.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3244</a>	Object	Objection to the redevelopment of Highclere fields for housing. Has lived at Hales Park for a long time, in that time I have used the fields almost every day to walk my dogs. It is a beautiful place in all seasons with easy access for all. I also believe that building on this site would be detrimental to the wellbeing of the residents in that there would be increased traffic on the narrow roads and more air and noise pollution.



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1567</a>	Comment	<p>Catchem's End is a deliverable housing site which would bring positive social and economic effects and providing housing towards to Wyre Forest's shortfall in housing. The site is considered wholly deliverable within the plan period of the Local Plan, subject to removing the site from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Shortfall in housing must be addressed in order that the plan is found sound. Catchem's End should be included as a housing allocation. The site will provide much needed housing, open space and link in to transport routes.</p> <p>The site is available for development, and is also suitable for development. There are no constraints to prevent the delivery of the site.</p> <p>The site is in close walking distance to a number of local facilities including three public bus routes which run regular services to High Town, Tenbury Wells, Kidderminster and Stourport allowing sustainable transport to local centres for commuting or other services. This site itself is just over 400m away from the local shop and is also within close walking distance to a number of public houses, places of worship and takeaways with a primary school also located within the village. The location is a sustainable one which would not require a high dependency on private transport and compares well to other sites which are not in such close proximity to services or public transport routes.</p> <p>Very few other sites within the area can provide as many benefits to the wider community on top of site residents without major negative effects. However, Catchem's End certainly has the ability to be able to do this even with scoring in the Sustainability being harsh in areas such as historic landscape and biodiversity. Catchem's End provides the ideal opportunity for an additional sustainable housing development in order address the current district housing shortfall and the local need within Bewdley.</p>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO811</a>	Object	<p>Bewdley allocations - 2 of the sites are within Green Belt (core sites). Thus the emerging plan is seeking to favour Green Belt land in lower order settlements over non-Green Belt sites in higher order settlements unless Option B is chosen.</p> <p>Site WA/Be/3 Catchems End is within Green Belt and makes significant contribution (see Green Belt review). Development would reduce openness and urbanise land. Western section of site adjoins Listed church and is</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			partly in flood zone 3. The allocation should therefore be removed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO980</a>	Support	Bewdley bypass is suitable as new Green Belt boundary - strong landscape barrier. Hill at Maypole Piece should be retained as undeveloped land. Any floodable land should only be used as open space.
	<a href="#">LPPO177</a>	Comment	Would like Catchems end to be included in option A.
	<a href="#">LPPO304</a>	Comment	It is accepted that further housing is required in Wyre forest area and that Bewdley is not exempt, however, there needs to be a structured argument for the inclusion of any land for development without the destruction of the Landscape and creation of substantial pollution concentration. It seems inconceivable that the Catchems End site [WA/BE/3] was not included as a core site and only included in option B. 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. _
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1562</a>	Comment	Proposed development at Catchem’s End is adjacent to a sustainable road system with is already being upgraded. The roundabout to the north east of the site is being upgraded to include an extra arm. This would enable the delivery of a sustainable transport system that would alleviate existing traffic problems on the road and be sufficient to deal with an increase in housing in the area.  The site at Catchem’s End would be able to provide appropriate contribution to support improvements to the local highways improvements, associated with the impacts of the development.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1564</a>	Comment	The site at Catchem’s End would provide significant green space in an area which is not allocated as such and would provide in an area where there is currently an under provision.  The open space that could be provided on the eastern and western areas of the site would provide green space to the residents of the new development and provide local green areas for residents of the wider Bewdley area. This is particularly important in a settlement which current has an under provision of this type of space.  The site can contribute 3.48 hectares of public open space to the community.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			There are no other sites within the area which could provide the equivalent in valuable open green space.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1600</a>	Comment	Propose Catchem's End for further housing growth to meet Bewdley's need. The site needs to be reconsidered as a future growth site in the Local Plan, which will assist in addressing shortfalls in the Council's delivery and also deliver wider benefits to the Wyre Forest area, including public open space to be used by the wider community.  Catchem's End is an appropriate location for future growth and is necessary to provide the Council with a greater cache of housing land, deliverable within the plan period of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
	<a href="#">LPPO2201</a>	Comment	Development at Catchems End will present a heavily built up area on the approach to Bewdley. Mature trees will be retained but a concentration of housing will create a wholly different street scene coming into the historic town and not reflect the character of existing dwellings. One must question how the traffic issues generated will be addressed with the existing congestion. In addition, it is questionable as to whether there sufficient local schools to accommodate additional family housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO4179</a>	Comment	Should be a core site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4089</a>	Comment	Whilst supporting option A, I would like to see the Land off Highclere BR/BE/6 removed from the core sites and replaced with part of the site in option B at Catchem's End. This would avoid the increase in traffic through Welch Gate that any development at Highclere would cause.
	<a href="#">LPPO176</a>	Comment	Catchem's end development would be more suitable than Highclere, as Catchems end gives direct access to the road network.
	<a href="#">LPPO686</a>	Comment	I suggest that Catchems End WA/BE/3 be changed to a core housing site.
	<a href="#">LPPO653</a>	Comment	I both support and object to this policy as I believe it is two distinct sites.  The land between the church and the track is a natural housing infill site, and should be released for that purpose to meet the heavy demand in this area.  However, the triangle between Kidderminster Road and the by-pass is integrally part of the agricultural open

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			space along with the surrounding Green Belt that should be preserved.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO838</a>	Object	Northern site adjoining the By-pass. Strongly object to the development of this part of the site for housing. It will seriously diminish the openness of this narrow and highly sensitive part of the Green Belt between Kidderminster and Bewdley, an area that is to be seriously compromised by the development of the WMSP's development of a water park and hotel and conference centre alongside the by-pass and will compromise the area's ability to maintain its identity. The two developments together would significantly affect the openness and the visual gap between the two towns and being so close to Wribbenhall/Bewdley it will read as an extension of the built-up area. 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.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1199</a>	Object	Concerned with proposed allocation of site WA/B/3 – Catchems End – Green Belt assessment identifies this as having a 'significant contribution' to the Green Belt. Important role in preventing encroachment and sprawl. Development would reduce openness in this area. The likely effects on openness are judged to be significant. Development would uncharacteristically urbanise the land. This allocation should be removed from the plan.
	<a href="#">LPPO1577</a>	Object	Objects on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More dwellings on Kidderminster Road will cause more traffic on an already busy road - especially with WMSP adding more facilities causing more vehicles to be on the road already.</li> <li>• Would like space adjacent to Wribbenhall Church to remain as open space. If this was developed with access onto Kidderminster Road, the road will not cope with the extra traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1578</a>	Object	More pollution 221 houses in a small area. And the Safari Park new link to water park.
	<a href="#">LPPO1787</a>	Object	Objects to proposed development at Catchems End due to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gridlocked roads between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>2. Entry and exit issues for new properties, cars and increased air pollution.</li> <li>3. 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.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Impact on local infrastructure - schools and local transport.</li> <li>5. Also concerned about rumours that predicted growth of population in the Wyre Forest are incorrect.</li> <li>6. States that the consultation period is in the summer holidays and consequently many people may be on holiday and not have the opportunity to respond.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2140</a>	Object	Opposes to the amount of affordable homes proposed in plans if this was to increase then he would have no objection as there is already a large amount of non affordable housing in the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2350</a>	Object	<p>Having inspected the proposed new Local Plan for Wyre Forest and in particular the proposals for the area between the by-pass island and All Saints Church in Wribbenhall, Bewdley, we would like to make the following observations:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area to the rear of Lodge Close historically floods, this problem has not been alleviated by the construction of the bund above Queensway, or the Environment Agency clearing out the silt in the stream running into the old Spring Grove pool. This has been cleared within the last few months. The area behind 16, 17, 18 and 19 Lodge Close floods for at least half of the year, and in wet years for a lot longer. The gardens of some properties in Lodge Close are consistently under a considerable amount of water for most of the winter.</li> <li>2. The farmer who ploughs this field has on more than one occasion had to get his tractor towed out of this area, where it has got bogged down.</li> <li>3. Kidderminster Road from the by-pass island is already a bottleneck. This would be exacerbated by additional traffic joining this road, especially as the new WMSP Hotel will potentially join the by-pass island. There are considerable traffic congestion problems caused by the Fish and Chip Shop and the Waggon and Horses Public House, this specifically causes huge issues in Lodge Close which is regularly blocked to such a degree that emergency vehicles would not gain access.</li> <li>4. The lane down the side of Lodge Close leading towards the SVR is very narrow and runs very close to properties abutting it, and if this was a potential access to and egress from any development, would cause considerable noise pollution and inconvenience to the properties abutting it.</li> <li>5. Loss of amenities, views etc from properties presently overlooking the woods and fields, with possible</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			additional flooding being caused to the properties mentioned in Lodge Close by the increased hard landscaping.
	<a href="#">LPPO2948</a>	Object	<p>Object to the proposed development sites in Bewdley. In particular the Kidderminster Road sites, Option B. We have lived in Bewdley for over fifty years. During this time we have experienced a considerable increase in traffic flow and noise particularly as vehicles approach the by-pass island.</p> <p>This increased traffic problem makes departure from New Road onto the Kidderminster Road, difficult. There are already certain times when traffic is bumper to bumper, morning and evening plus weekends.</p> <p>Increased housing on the proposed site would only exacerbate the current traffic situation, making waiting times longer and causing more congestion.</p> <p>If the West Midland Safari Park continue with their development of a water park and hotel, this would add enormous pressure onto the current by-pass roundabout on Kidderminster Road, and access roads.</p> <p>The local Bewdley schools already have pupil capacity, and parental parking along Stourport Road is already a difficult situation and sometimes dangerous. Additional housing would only add to the problems already faced by local residents and families.</p> <p>Wribbenhall has had its fair share of housing development over the last ten years. The Queensway Estate has had at least three housing developments and on Kidderminster Road there have been two significant building projects which have resulted in additional dwellings.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4852</a>	Object	We object to any development of this site, we would not wish to see erosion of the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO4705</a>	Object	<p>Policy 6B notes the need to safeguard and enhance open countryside, maintain openness to Green Belt and the provision of infrastructure and Policy 25C allows development on Green Belt only for small scale affordable housing in special circumstances.</p> <p>The developments on site reference WA/BE/1, WA/BE/5 AND WA/BE/3 are contrary to the policies noted above.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6B.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Site WA/BE/3 in option B currently incorporates the run off rain water from the Queensway estate and there are obvious environmental concerns of developing on this site</p> <p>Concerning infrastructure, all Wribbenhall sites will be affected by the bottleneck of the Bewdley bypass where it ends at the Kidderminster end and traffic connects with the Habberley Road. The addition of a potential Traveller site on the Habberley Road would further add to this congestion. Plus the development of the Safari Park and the increase in tourist traffic related to this. I cannot see where the plan addresses adequately the issues that the increased traffic would create.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4617</a>	Object	Object to the proposed developments south of the Habberley Road, the Stourport Road triangle and at Catchems End. Without extensive improvements to road, transport and other elements of infrastructure and services, none of these developments could be supported without damaging Bewdley and the amenities of its current residents. As these improvements are not proposed, the housing developments should not be allowed.
	<a href="#">LPPO4190</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The increase in parking and other highway issues this would bring.</li> <li>• How this will affect the schools, which are already over subscribed.</li> <li>• Waiting times and care at the dentist and doctors with an increase in the population.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4191</a>	Object	I feel the planned building of over 100 new houses in the area is far more than the area can stand. The extra strain on the roads in the area which are already at breaking point is unacceptable. The loss of Green Belt land should be avoided at all cost as once it has gone that is it.
	<a href="#">LPPO4177</a>	Object	<p>This relates to the overall plans for Bewdley as set out in the Wyre Forest Local Plan review: in particular section 33</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt land: I understand from the recent questionnaire completed by residents that one of the main concerns was the protection of Green Belt land. This proposal highlights a number of areas that are</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			protected as Green Belt.  The Green Belt is what makes Bewdley and the Severn Valley so desirable and a conservation area, any reduction at the main access points to the town will be out of character and a considerable visual impact
	<a href="#">LPPO4153</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affect on approach to town/sprawl effect of built up environments.</li> <li>• Whilst there is no “right to a view” in legal terms, is loss is not necessarily irrelevant when it comes to planning permission.</li> <li>• I am concerned about ongoing enforcement of use for the proposed sites.</li> <li>• There have been serious/near fatal road traffic incidents on the Habberley Road and an increase in traffic generated by large vehicles accessing the site would have an adverse affect on current highway safety</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4161</a>	Object	Wribbenhall - dangerous road that gets congested.
	<a href="#">LPPO3277</a>	Object	<p>Having read the proposals for the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, I am objecting to the proposal for the developments in Wribbenhall, Bewdley. (WA/BE/3 and WA/BE/5.</p> <p>Highways Problems - The A456 and B4129 in Wribbenhall are already very busy, and to build new homes in this area would cause even more congestion.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt - All this area is Green Belt land and previous planning inspectors have ruled there should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster. Planning history shows a site of historical interest on the Habberley Road.</p> <p>Services - 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.</p> <p>Environmental Issues - All of these plans raise many environmental issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4064</a>	Object	The gap between Bewdley and Kidderminster has already been jeopardised by the decision to allow hotel



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			expansion on the Safari Park with consequent traffic congestion which of course would be intensified if the additional development indicated in Option B along the road /by-pass at Catchems end were to materialise .
	<a href="#">LPPO3485</a>	Object	<p>Whenever there is heavy persistent rain, this can often be 6 months of the year and the water comes into the gardens and leaves the bottom half under a foot of water, any building work or even global warming could make this matter even worse.</p> <p>The section of Kidderminster Road from Catchems Chip Shop to the by-pass island is very congested most of the day.</p> <p>There will be noise pollution and inconvenience.</p> <p>The thought of losing some of the beautiful birds we get in our garden makes my heart sink.</p> <p>Would schools in our area be able to accommodate the new families new houses would bring?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3489</a>	Object	<p>The culvert in the field cannot cope with water coming through the Queensway estate from the hill to the rear.</p> <p>During really wet spells the wooded area in the lane marked red on the attached plan and adjacent to the cottage is like the everglades.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO411</a>	Object	<p>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. Traffic at peak times in this area is almost back to pre by-pass days.</p> <p>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.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO840</a>	Support	A) Southern End adjoining All Saints Church. This proposal qualified support. The BCS would support 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			openness and take account of drainage issues.
	<a href="#">LPPO1922</a>	Support	<p>Bewdley:                      OK to build on Catchem’s End site WA/BE3 and Habberley Road providing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drainage pipes are installed (preventing flooding from brook by Queensway).</li> <li>2. Parking space is allowed (for vehicle using Lodge Close from pub).</li> <li>3. Green park/play area is installed.</li> <li>4. Bus stop provided</li> <li>5. Local store/newsagents.</li> </ol> <p>No building on other sites in Bewdley.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3095</a>	Support	I would prefer site WA/BE/3 Catchems End to be designated as a Core Site instead of site BR/BE/6 Land off Highclere.
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO4097</a>	Support	<p>The Council supports the following sites which are included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and have the support of the local community:</p> <p>WA/BE/3 Catchems End (support removal from the Green Belt). Support for development only extends to the half of the site abutting the Safari Park roundabout. The half of the site adjacent to All Saint’s church should be made available as public open space and is not suitable for development.</p> <p>Early negotiations with potential developers have been and should be undertaken which would include negotiations over infrastructure, water management and community facilities such as school places/physical extensions and road improvements</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/UA/4 – ALLOTMENTS AT UPPER ARLEY**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of response
Upper Arley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01180</a>	Comment	<p>The allotments site in Upper Arley Village is listed as a site proposed for allocation, potentially 10 dwellings. The Parish Council has no issue at all with this proposal.</p> <p>However, the Parish Council would prefer that in the event of any development taking place, ALL the houses (not just some of them) should be affordable houses, of a smaller design, and for the people of the parish only and would request that this as a condition of any planning permission granted. Other than the site referred to the Parish Council would not wish to see any other development in the Parish.</p>
R & D Turner Charitable Trust	<a href="#">LPP01178</a>	Support	<p>The landowners are in full support of the proposal and would look to create a housing mix suitable for the village with particular thought to younger persons, young families and a retirement element. The site is currently unutilised and could be deliverable upon short notice. The site is well screened and adjoins some of the more modern houses that form part of Upper Arley. We believe that all mains services are readily available and the site is well placed for village facilities to include the school, sports ground, hall, shop and pub.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP01009</a>	Comment	<p>Upper Arley Allotments - acceptable if they are genuinely redundant. Site may be too large for such a small village. Relate numbers to local need.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2657</a>	Object	<p>I object to the land at Clows Top being used for housing or Travelling Showpeople. I wish to comment as follows, in particular for the Showpeople but has relevance in respect of the proposed housing site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Difficult vehicular access to and from the site from the A456. Access is on the brow of the hill. The site is not capable of safe, visible access from the A456 highway and will have an adverse impact on the safety of the highway network and its users.</li> <li>2. Turning into and out of the site will be difficult- A456 is not wide and there are houses opposite the access.</li> <li>3. Speed of vehicles and motor bikes through Clows Top. There is a disregard of the 30mph limit.</li> <li>4. The type of vehicles and trailers used can be large and extremely long. When they are entering or exiting the site, they will be slow therefore blocking the A456. This, coupled with 3 above, could be an accident waiting to happen.</li> <li>5. There could be numerous vehicles, trailers and caravans entering/exiting the site at all times of the year.</li> <li>6. There is no mains sewerage/drainage. How will the Showpeople's sewage be disposed of? This also applies to any housing development.</li> <li>7. The site is flat but is on the top of the hill. Therefore the sides along the perimeter form a bank. The land on the site is unstable and is falling away and is now close to a neighbour's field and also a public right of way. There is movement around the perimeter of the site, this before any heavy vehicles and trailers are using the area. Equally, this will be issue for house build.</li> <li>8. There is a lack of adequate access to services and utility infrastructure. Mains water supply and mains electricity services are currently working to capacity. There are Interruptions to these services during the</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>year.</p> <p>9. In respect of proposed houses, the number of houses proposed of 30 (I believe) could result in around 70 people (say 2 adults plus 1child per house) which will really stretch comment 8 above. It could also mean there would need to be parking for 70 motor vehicles on the site. Schooling could be an issue. Bus services are very limited.</p> <p>10. The cumulative impacts of the site would harm the character and appearance of the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4785</a>	Support	I would like to see houses built here for local families.
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPPO1248</a>	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO1829</a>	Comment	<p>I would like to object to the site use for Travelling Showpeople on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access to the site from a very busy main road (A456) at the top of a very steep hill for large vehicles with trailers.</li> <li>• Sewage problems - there are no mains in the village. The properties sit on clay and we suffer from poor drainage within the village.</li> <li>• We would prefer new housing on the land. There is a need for new houses in the area.</li> <li>• We do not want the site to become an eyesore (more so than it is at present).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3506</a>	Comment	I have to support the dual allocations for the land. Although it is of course preferred to become a small housing development and in-keeping.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>This housing development is indeed supported by the majority of all within the village parish.</p> <p>One individual from the company has made a personal representation against the site for Travelling Showpeople; and it can be understood; but commercial pressures lead us, as stated above.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3444</a>	Comment	I think it is affordable housing we need at Clows Top.
	<a href="#">LPPO3464</a>	Comment	<p>The yellow shading delineating the area in question at Clows Top is not entirely accurate.</p> <p>I think the housing option would be more beneficial to the local community.</p> <p>If travelling show people were to use the site their heavy vehicles would probably damage the road.</p> <p>There would be extra traffic, large vehicles turning in and out of the site onto as busy road/steep hill.</p> <p>Sewerage and water supply would be a problem.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5090</a>	Comment	<p>It is our impression that most people, like us, can under certain conditions get behind supporting housing development at the Clows Top site if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of housing development is beneficial to the village and will strengthen the fabric of the local community in terms of maintaining and supporting local facilities.</li> <li>• If the access from and to a new housing estate is not disruptive to the road infrastructure in and out of the village and it is safe for the local community.</li> <li>• The type of housing development is deemed to be attractive to and reflecting the demographic makeup of the local community and wider area.</li> <li>• If there are sufficient facilities such as parking to support the local community including the new housing estate?</li> <li>• The housing development is of high quality and aesthetically blends in with the local village and the</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			rural make up of the wider area.
	<a href="#">LPPO332</a>	Object	<p>Land at Clows Top</p> <p>I object to the proposals identified in the plan for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultation has been inadequate. The identified site is on the border of WFD. No effort has been made to consult with communities in the immediate area that do not fall within WFD but will be affected by the proposals.</li> <li>2. The identified site occupies an elevated position in a scenic rural setting that is visible from some distance. WFDC policies declare that sites for travelling show people should be 'very strictly limited in rural areas'. It is therefore unsuitable for this purpose. There are four other sites identified in the plan for Travelling Showpeople all of which are more suited to this purpose.</li> <li>3. The infrastructure serving the Clows Top settlement is inadequate for the purpose. WFDC policies declare that sites for Travelling Showpeople should be adequately served with power water and waste services. To make the site compliant with this policy would require significant investment. During these times of austerity, other sites identified in the plan offer a more cost effective solution.</li> <li>4. As identified in the WFDC plan there are already proposals within the SWDP for additional housing in the Clows Top settlement. Housing development in the settlement needs to be sensitively managed in conjunction with MHDC to ensure sustainability.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO413</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The village is totally unsuitable to be considered as a prospective site for travelling/showground on the land that has been identified.</li> <li>• Access is poor due to the volume and speed of the traffic that uses the road in both directions. Large goods vehicles frequently experience problems in getting up the steep hill. These vehicles often have to swing wide to enter the yard and in doing so, mount the pavement.</li> <li>• The increased traffic noise would also be an issue that I would object to.</li> <li>• No stipulation has been made as to the number of vehicles using this yard, or indeed if the users</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>would also be residing on the premises. There would be an issue with connecting to mains drainage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clows Top is a small village and the proposal of this kind would totally alter the appearance and safety of the village.</li> <li>• I agree that at present the land is an eyesore - it would be put to far better use if a small housing site was proposed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1506</a>	Object	<p>Objecting to travelling show people or houses being developed at Clows Top for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage - Clows Top houses not connecting to mains sewer and relies on septic tanks so an influx of residents would not be suitable.</li> <li>• Road Safety - access to the site is at a very narrow point in the road and on the brow of the hill so has poor visibility. Issues with the current entrance being suitable for access, particularly for slow, heavy vehicles, which have potential to cause damage to vehicles opposite as well as mounting the pavement which is a safety issue for pedestrians. Drivers already break the 30mph speed limit on the road.</li> <li>• Inadequate Utilities - due to being a remote location and the local topography electricity and water supply are often disrupted which will be affected further if additional requirements are added to the systems.</li> <li>• Stability of the Land - site is in a poor state of repair; worried without major work to stabilise the ground it could fall away if used by heavy vehicles.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1901</a>	Object	<p>Objects to further development and traffic at Clows Top. It has become increasingly busy and the crossroads at the top can be quite a challenge to negotiate, further traffic near the junction is sure to make the situation even worse.</p> <p>Suggests the land under discussion 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.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2126</a>	Object	Object to Clows Top Travelling Showpeople site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mains sewage Clows Top and septic tanks controversial due to drainage.</li> <li>• Lack of schools, doctors, street lights, public transport, poor electricity supply</li> <li>• Poor access for large vehicles</li> <li>• Land unstable and likely to be cut off in winter</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2129</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and roads</li> <li>• Lack of facilities and amenities</li> <li>• Electricity &amp; mains water supply is insufficient/ mains sewerage.</li> <li>• Little public transport</li> <li>• No Drs, school, college, or employment.</li> <li>• Possible impact on village community.</li> <li>• Noise increase</li> <li>• Instability of land/drainage issues</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2288</a>	Object	The proximity of the site the crossroads at Clows Top are quite dangerous and a lot of heavy vehicles using them.  There are no services such as schools, doctors, dentists in the immediate vicinity and the winters can be hard.
	<a href="#">LPPO2289</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the crossroad junction and the 456 is well used by heavy traffic</li> <li>• No local police or hospital so there could be a wait for rescue services</li> <li>• Lack of employment schools medical requirements</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2135</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed site has insufficient amenities i.e. water/sewage (low water pressure).</li> <li>2. Clows Top area/crossroads has traffic congestion/very poor visibility at junctions.</li> <li>3. The site is well known for poor and instability due to its previous use for mining /disposal waste metal.</li> <li>4. The infrastructure for this and nearby villages (schools, doctors etc.) is full to capacity.</li> <li>5. Thus I consider the site is only suitable for a small business venture i.e. garage or similar to support local needs.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4546</a>	Support	<p>I have reservations which have been echoed by local people at their meetings in Far Forest and In Clows Top.</p> <p>These meetings were well attended by around 100 residents in each case. There was considerable concern and misunderstanding about the proposals and it is a shame that one of the District Councillors could not have attended to clarify the situation to those who had not been able to attend the DC presentations.</p> <p>My concerns and reservations, largely echo those of local residents and are as follows;</p> <p>Clows Top.</p> <p>Should be kept as a core housing site and not used for Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>There is a need to bring new people into the village to revitalise it and failure of previous plans to build new houses on the land around the Victory Hall is much regretted. This development would also have gone a long way towards improving the appearance of the area which is, at present, an eyesore.</p> <p>The exit from the old garage site is onto a very busy stretch of the A456 with traffic which is often fast moving, despite the speed limit in place. Movements of large articulated vehicles onto and from the site is potentially dangerous. It is also felt that such activity, in such a prominent position in the village, would do nothing to improve the appearance of the area.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The absence of adequate infrastructure, unreliable water and electricity supplies and, in particular, the sewerage system, has been the main stumbling block to development and was at the heart of the rejection of the site as a potential one for travellers/show people when the subject was last considered in 2012. Nothing has changed, and, since the DC's criteria for a suitable site hasn't changed either, this site must still be considered unsuitable.</p> <p>Since Malvern Hills have also given consent to a housing development at a site at Clows Top, which is also stalled because of infrastructure shortcomings, have WFDC and MHDC liaised to try and find a shared solution to these problems?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1466</a>	Object	<p>Objecting due to worries about suitable drainage options.</p> <p>Would like to see something for the community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1467</a>	Object	<p>My objections and comments regarding the proposals of the land at Clows Top are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly regarding the travellers use, there are major concerns on the traffic climbing the hill, especially in winter.</li> <li>• I believe that there are also issues regarding main sewage.</li> <li>• The services at Clows Top are far from adequate – water pressure, power failing, also would the land be stable enough with all the heavy vehicles that would be using the land?</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the housing proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mains sewers are an issue</li> <li>• 3 proposed sites/plots with around to houses, the increase of vehicles will make things even more difficult to cross at the top.</li> <li>• Small corner shop/butchers would not be adequate for the extra increase in residents.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1559</a>	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns of traffic climbing the hill and turning into the yard.</li> <li>• Concerns about drainage.</li> <li>• Services such as water, electricity etc. are inadequate.</li> <li>• Concerns about the land stability.</li> <li>• Village facilities (shop, butchers etc,) not adequate for more people.</li> <li>• Same concerns if housing was to be put on site rather than travelling show people.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1560</a>	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about traffic climbing hill and turning into yard.</li> <li>• Concerns about drainage.</li> <li>• Services not adequate in the village i.e. water pressure, electricity.</li> <li>• Concerns about the stability of the ground.</li> <li>• More traffic on busy, dangerous crossroads.</li> <li>• Similar concerns with the housing proposal as well as the travelling show people.</li> <li>• Village hall will be surrounded/closed in - could cause conflicts with residents.</li> </ul> <p>Complaining about site plans as they are vague and not accurate.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2928</a>	Object	<p>The proposed development spoils a peaceful view.</p> <p>The damage to wildlife and natural habitats will be incalculable.</p> <p>The pressure on local road infrastructure will be intolerable and this in an area already very popular with walkers and dog walkers.</p> <p>The addition of this proposed development will again put an intolerable burden on local infrastructure and access for holiday makers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO255</a>	Comment	<p>In principle I have no objection to a development within the existing boundaries of Orchard House using the existing access to Orchard House. Houses would be on back land, in an existing residential location, the sewage would not impact the Sugars Lane pumping station, and the existing access could widened without impacting any other properties.</p> <p>I would object to the land on Plough Lane being used to access that land. however, I would not object to a single property, such as a bungalow on the land on Plough Lane sitting next to Tolland Bungalow, and that would be in keeping with the other properties in the lane, and would not require the lane to be upgraded, thus having a minimum impact on the locality.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2775</a>	Comment	<p>I would like to say that the plan for Far Forest has not been thought through in particular I would like to draw your attention to the following:</p> <p>1.) New Road is narrow and will not cope with the traffic. We have the School runs parking twice a day (I say parking but in some cases abandoned). We also have people from the Care Home on Cleobury Road now parking in New Road since their extension. People who live on the static caravans at the bottom of Sugar Lane also have to drive down New Road.</p> <p>2.) The School will not be able to cope especially if there is an influx of Children.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			3.) The sewerage system will certainly not be able to cope as it barely does now and we still have to have Tankers if we have adverse weather. I know that Severn Trent is doing more work in the near future but that is to solve the problem we have now.
	<a href="#">LPPO2195</a>	Comment	No objection, it would not be inappropriate to also develop land to the east of Plough Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO3611</a>	Object	<p><b>Proposed Housing Development in Far Forest at Plough Lane.</b></p> <p>We write to register our objections to the two proposed sites for house building in the village of Far Forest. Our concerns are wide ranging and relate to the whole infrastructure of the village.</p> <p><b>Objections to the housing development on Plough Lane, Far Forest:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the proposed site on Plough Lane is limited and predominantly single track. The current road, as it exists, is unfit for extra domestic traffic, being mostly used by farm and forestry vehicles and walkers. The potential junction onto the Cleobury Road, adjacent to the busy village shop, is poor and limited and further inhibited by the presence opposite of the very popular Plough pub and restaurant, which already brings extra traffic and congestion to this road. This potential junction onto the main road would have limited vision, is situated opposite the busy pub car park access point and on a section of road where drivers are accelerating out of the 30mph speed limit zone. It is also directly opposite the bus stop for Ludlow bound traffic, causing further limitations to vision and possible congestion. To create a busy junction here is potentially dangerous and a risk to the safety of both drivers and pedestrians.</li> </ol> <p><b>Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest. Transport/Roads Policy 13, Managing Travel</b></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Demand Ai, ii, iii and B, see pg 85.</b></p> <p>2. Plough Lane is currently, and historically, an access point to Wyre Forest and the bungalows and low level small holdings which exist on the edge of the forest. To build multiple houses of bricks and mortar on this site would dramatically alter the character and landscape of this area, creating an infill estate. This development would destroy and distract from many of the reasons residents move to this small rural settlement, creating a large suburban spread, destroying the quiet rural scattered nature of this settlement.</p> <p><b>Desirable Place to Live, point i/iii, Section 8 – Policy 8C and Infill Policy – 18B A Desirable Place to Live pg 55-56; Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness – 27 pg 154-164; A Unique Place To Live (sub)11.29 Protecting and Enhancing Policy 11D pg 80-85</b></p> <p>3. The predominant land uses off Plough Lane are agricultural, forestry and rural. To build 20 houses on this site with all the landscaping, building traffic, noise and upheaval that this would bring, would severely impact on the habitats for local wildlife. The proposed site for development is natural habitat, grassland, ancient hedgerows and trees and, as such, is home to a diverse range of insects, reptiles and mammals, including deer, who use this route to access feeding grounds across the far side of the Oakleaf Rise development and New Road.</p> <p><b>A Unique Place (sub) 11.9. Protect; Protecting and Enhancing Policy 11D pg 80 &amp; 85; 11a Unique Place, Historic Environment B II, IX; Habitats Regulations (HRA) Screening Requirement 1.4 pg 77; Desirable Place to Live Point ii/iii Section 8 – Policy 8C pg 55/56; Infill Policy – 18B a Desirable Place to Live; Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness – 27 pg 154-164.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3468</a>	Object	Redevelopment of Far Forest.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Word in the village is that it is planned to build 50 homes in the village.</p> <p>We wish to register our objection to any such plan. On the basis that 50 additional houses would simply overwhelm the village (not to mention the ecology). The outcome would be that the character of the village would be lost to the detriment of the current residents.</p> <p>Such a plan would jeopardise an established thriving community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3239</a>	Object	<p>This site has become overgrown and dormant for many years however it has a host of wildlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Egress from Plough Lane onto Cleobury Road (A4117) is dangerous and at a steep incline with limited views in either direction. Would WFDC ensure that new road layouts are installed to accommodate addition traffic to and from the site?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2806</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the housing proposals in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a quiet community with quiet village roads and pleasant surroundings.</li> <li>• There will be noise pollution and traffic congestion, turning Far Forest to a local urban area</li> <li>• The nearby roads are busy enough. The village hall is let nearly every night of the week causing congestion at New Road. There is also traffic congestion near the school at the start and the end of the school day. Additional traffic from an adjacent housing estate would be a nightmare.</li> <li>• Think about the wildlife, conservation and open space that will be destroyed; Far Forest is a nice rural area and we don't want to see this ruined by more houses.</li> </ul> <p>You will be spoiling our local community which is perfectly fine as it is without an influx of people/houses/cars to which the local infrastructure and surrounding area is simply not suited. Please take your housing proposals elsewhere away from our beautiful village.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2722</a>	Object	<p>The junction of New Road and Cleobury Road is already a danger, in part because there are no parking restrictions in New Road. There is congestion at the start of the school day and at its end since the school entrance is also located at the upper end. The increase in traffic from extra housing will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Some consideration to making New Road/Church Road a one way system might help but the junction of New Road with Cleobury Road is dangerously situated with traffic often moving very quickly along Cleobury Road.</p> <p>Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties.</p> <p>Sewage facilities are believed to be inadequate already.</p> <p>Loss of Dark skies.</p> <p>Proposed development will mean approximately 100 extra vehicles in and out of village therefore increased pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2669</a>	Object	<p>The bungalow named “Lawn View, Cleobury Road” is not on mains sewerage and has a septic tank which is located in the garden of “Orchard House”, with drainage discharging into the surrounding land; additionally storm water also soaks away in the grounds of Orchard House.</p> <p>My objections to the proposed building of 20 additional houses on the land are that the existing sewerage system currently serving the Far Forest community is totally inadequate and already causes flooding of the back fields running into properties across the road. Adding further house to the system would only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>It is clearly contrary to above policy in that it would be an over development of the site; causing overlooking of the existing surrounding properties with potential disturbance to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>those properties; and with the additional adverse affect on existing road safety.</p> <p>I fear there would be an increased risk to public safety. With little employment opportunities in the area mainly unskilled (minimum wages) and no doctor's surgery servicing the village - traffic on the local roads will increase as residents will need to travel out of the village for employment.</p> <p>With no late or Sunday service provided by the local bus company additional road traffic is inevitable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1789</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposed development at Far Forest due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased population impact on wildlife.</li> <li>2. School capacity</li> <li>3. Noise and pollution.</li> <li>4. No positive benefit to current residents.</li> <li>5. Local utilities-inadequate sewerage systems now</li> <li>6. Poor bus service, increases would uplift carbon footprint.</li> <li>7. Very little local employment. People to go further afield, again increase of carbon footprint.</li> <li>8. Loss of grazing for farmers, jeopardising livelihoods.</li> <li>9. Light pollution affecting nocturnal animals and insects.</li> <li>10. Land and Hedgerows ripped out affects many other wildlife species.</li> <li>11. Character of village would change to bricks and mortar development.</li> <li>12. Nearest medical cover is Bewdley or Cleobury we believe to be full.</li> <li>13. Storm water currently a problem and would be heightened due to any development.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO95</a>	Object	I object very strongly to the proposed building of "affordable housing" on the two sites

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>outlined in Far Forest.</p> <p>If you actually live in Far Forest you would know that this beautiful quiet village does not need any more houses built, as you propose 40+. There are plenty of houses for sale in and around the area.</p> <p>I only found out about these future proposals through a page on social media.</p> <p>The A4117 barely copes with local traffic and thru traffic from Cleobury Mortimer and the other way from areas such as Callow Hill and Kidderminster.</p> <p>Do you have any idea the impact on a 30mph road this extra traffic and people will have on this area? It's bad enough with caravan sites and their owners who have no respect for the area, littering, noise and cars. We have one shop and one pub and one school within walking distance, how can these cope with the extra people.</p> <p>Major problem is New Road and The Orchard, where these houses will be built. New Road can barely cope with the traffic first thing and at rush hour, are you just trying to destroy OUR village. The A4117 is a dangerous road as it is, many a driver overtakes if anyone slows them down, bare in mind the stretch through Far Forest is 30mph, so how will an extra 20-40+ houses help with that situation, more cars, more pollution, more rubbish. Can you reassure local residents that this very busy road is going to be safe with the extra pressure of more cars and more people?</p> <p>I also object to toy box houses being built in areas that have some beautiful individual homes. These housing developers build nothing but eye sores. Two up two down with little gardens, ugly homes. There are plenty of beautiful homes up for sale. We moved into this area to be away from major developments and noise, and traffic. It just seems to be getting worse. This beautiful green area with great walks and the forest on our doorstep will be destroyed. You may think "Not on my doorstep".....well yes that's exactly what I'm saying. Far Forest in my opinion does not need redeveloping. You will destroy it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1698</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current inadequate sewerage system needs frequent maintenance</li> <li>2. Dangerous junctions on narrow roads.</li> <li>3. No street lights as we are in the country</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>4. There are no jobs in Far Forest so people would have to commute and the state pay for people who are unable to find work.</p> <p>WE DO NOT WANT MORE HOUSES.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1699</a>	Object	<p>I object to housing development in New Road, Far Forest –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already high level of traffic congestions at peak times. Dangerous parking outside care home in New Road which is used by heavy machinery, caravans</li> <li>• Sewerage overflowing now</li> <li>• School full.</li> <li>• Poor bus service.</li> <li>• Natural habitats will be affected</li> <li>• We should protect countryside, there are plenty of brownfield sites available.</li> <li>• Please listen to the local people who cannot see any benefits to them</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1700</a>	Object	<p>Questions need for a further 60 houses</p> <p>Present inadequacies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage (P.97 Rural Dev 28, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Local flooding (P.100 Rural Dev, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Storm water drainage (P.97-100 Sewage systems, Policy 15 water quality)</li> <li>• Public transport (P.56, P.85 Policy 13)</li> <li>• Plough Lane/Cleobury Road junction (P.97, Policy 15, 150)</li> </ul> <p>Impact on wildlife in the area.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.80-81 – A Unique place</li> <li>• P.77 – 11A Unique place</li> <li>• P.79 – 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• P.5 – 8 Rural Exception sites</li> <li>• P.94 – Strategic green infrastructure</li> <li>• P.112 – Infill Policy 188</li> <li>• P.113 – Infill Policy 188</li> </ul> <p>Little employment – local residents have to commute to work – increase car usage and cost. – P.166 Health 9.1-9.10</p> <p>Plough House building is largely of bungalow design, the introduction of house building would damage the character. The ultimate decision making would not be in the hands of the local residents. – P.55/56 section 8 Policy 80, Infill Policy 188.</p> <p>The dark skies are very much part of our village, important to its character. Dark skies are also of great importance to wildlife. – P.80 Policy 110 protecting and enhancing, 81 Biodiversity and geological conservation, 103 con, 79 Section 16.2 Policy landscape character.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1701</a>	Object	<p>After going to a planning proposal meeting in Bewdley it became clear plots of land were being considered on New Road and Plough Lane. A planning attempt was tried in 2010 and turned down, the reasons are a matter of record about New Road, and however, nothing has changed in this regard. After consulting and reading through the Wyre Forest District Plan I can see many flaws and reasons why building here is detrimental to the area. The so called village is dominated by a road network, New Road which is very narrow in places because of car parking by residents, during school term hold ups occur frequently near the school, the whole area can become grid locked. Pg. 85, Pg. 89-89, Pg. 103.</p> <p>To get the proposed sites this has to be negotiated. Adding to the problem. Plough Lane site</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>has a similar problem with many accesses onto the main road from the Plough Inn nearly opposite a shop entrance and car park, bus when drivers slow down to turn down Plough Lane, drivers behind them think they are turning into the car park for the shop. This has some near misses.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the inadequate poor sewage and drainage taken 20 years after the problem occurred, tankers regularly having to pump excess storm water and sewage to be taken away, will this happen again with extra people putting strain on an overwhelmed system. Pg. 97, 98.</p> <p>The smell of sewage is terrible for cottage owners near the pumping station. This is also bad for tourism. The name of the cottage by the pump station is Coppice Gate and can be contacted. The proposed site in New Road has very valuable habitat. Hedgehogs in ancient meadows. Part of the area has old cherry orchards with national reptiles, adders, slow worms, grass bats hunt for insects. These need dark skies. Insects such as noble chaffer and many butterflies occur here. Pg. 79, 80, 81, 103. Cattle are also grazed. Pg. 79.</p> <p>The WFDP choice is based also on good bus service, but this service is poor sometimes 2 hours between buses. Pg 56 &amp; 85.</p> <p>People moving here will not find any local employment. I myself have to travel into Kidderminster, more car journeys and more congestion on New Road or Church Lane. Pg 66-68.</p> <p>Building so many houses near the church which does not have any parking except on Church Lane. New build houses will look awful near an old church, changing the character of our village. Pg 112/113 section 18.10.</p> <p>If the land is developed what plans are there making sure this is done properly to blend in</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>with existing properties? Pg. 154-164 section 27.</p> <p>Can you trust developers and builders? At Far Forest we have a very large undisclosed population living at caravan parks which is not monitored properly or taken into account. Building so many extra houses will destroy our community by turning our village into a housing estate. Pg. 55/56 Desirable place to live point.</p> <p>A brief summary, the road networking, the effect on ecology/ dark skies, the school is full, poor bus service, the sewage system, mobile phone signal poor. In conclusion I cannot see any benefit for Far Forest.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the future potential for Far Forest tourism, bad bricks and mortar developments ruin areas of outstanding beauty. I would not like this for our area, lots of campers and tourists use the campsite on Pound Bank next to the Plough Inn. This could affect the business. Pg. 81 – A Unique place 11B, Pg. 77 – 11C Landscape Character, Pg. 5 – 8 Rural Exception sites iii, Pg. 137 &amp; 144 – Sustainable Tourism 23.</p> <p>Brownfield sites provide less impact on Green Belt areas which WFDC seem to threaten constantly. 60 houses here is a massive impact which would be completely lost on properly developed Kidderminster town centric sites. I am completely at a loss over the WFD plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO392</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased flow of traffic</li> <li>• More congestion</li> <li>• No facility to widen road</li> <li>• More danger to pupils attending Far Forest school</li> <li>• Parking a big problem</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO666</a>	Object	Object to development in Far Forest - New Road very busy with school traffic, amenities cannot cope with existing housing, Plough Lane would need to be widened, increased

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			congestion and negative impact on countryside
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1008</a>	Support	Far Forest - 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO712</a>	Object	<p><b>Land at Orchard House and adjacent to Tolland Bungalow, Far Forest</b></p> <p>Policy 15B Sewerage Systems and Water Quality: -2 bungalows adjacent Orchard House have septic tanks located in the orchard with drainage discharging into ground. If land at Orchard House is developed, then these bungalows should be connected to mains sewerage paid for by developer.</p> <p>Policy 18B Residential Infill Development:- Development would over shadow the adjacent bungalow. Site is landlocked with narrow entrance between the adjacent bungalow and Orchard House unless accessed over neighbouring land.</p> <p>Policy 13 Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest - managing travel demand:- A4117 is very busy road. 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO373</a>	Object	<p>The 2 developments proposed for New Road and one for Plough Lane total approximately six acres which is huge compared with the rest of the village and contrary to Policy 6F page 36 where you say you will only allow "small scale" development and contrary to the policy where you say only infill (policy 18B page 112) while this proposal is extending the village.</p> <p>The village has no public "green space" despite being out in the country and Policy 29B and policy 20C say there should be "green space" for developments greater than 11 houses.</p> <p>Section 27 page 162 talks about protecting "local distinctiveness" and the loss of a small</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>orchard and the loss of a hay meadow changes the character of Far Forest where many properties, even in the village centre, retain their small holder origins.</p> <p>Policy 13 page 85 talks about promoting walking and cycling while to build out at Far Forest will create car commuter traffic to Kidderminster and the West Midlands, as there is no extra employment in Far Forest.</p> <p>Section 23.2 (The Wyre Forest) says policy is to support the work done by the £4M Grow with Wyre Project and yet part of the New Road site is old orchard that Grow With Wyre and Worcester County policy is to retain.</p> <p>Policy 23A Tourism depends on the Landscape Character of this area (page 79 11c) and this will be negatively impacted by such a development; the area has many public footpaths linking with the Wyre Forest and the Wyre Forest Centre is only 100 yards away.</p> <p>Policy 18E page 114 talks about limiting the expansion of mobile homes, especially near Far Forest, and this development will be off New Road which is heavily used to service 3 large caravan sites further down Sugars Lane - 160 vans on one of those sites.</p> <p>Policy 13, page 85 talks about traffic and highway safety and yet New Road is already overloaded by school traffic, plus the traffic to the 3 caravan sites, plus the large farm vehicles to the farm yard in Sugars lane, plus previous developments in New Forest Close, and other residences down New Road. Even if a developer was willing to fund improvements there is no space to open the junction at the top of New Road because the properties there do not have any back garden and to remove part of their frontage just adds to the parking problem with their cars now having to park on the road. Alternative land is available on the main road, on the Kidderminster side of the village, that would avoid any extra load on New Road. The pub, the shop, the bus stop, the village hall, the Methodist church, are all up on the main road therefore the council should consider redefining it's boundary of the village.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>6.57 Alternatives, page 45.</p> <p>Page 97, Utilities; the sewage system cannot cope with current capacity, and Severn Trent tankers are up and down New Road every hour when it rains. Severn Trent have had polices to upgrade the pumping station in new Road for the 20 years I have lived in the village and it has not happened yet. Some existing properties that are on septic tanks that drain into the development area will have to be put on the mains resulting in greater load beyond that created by the development. The mains power fails regularly, for short periods, and Severn Trent took a week to fully restore fresh water supplies to the Rock area only a couple of months ago. Far Forest does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this scale.</p> <p>Page 80/81 11.29 of a Unique Place talks about wildlife conservation, hedges, trees and the need to protect and enhance 11D yet the 3 sites in Far Forest are all hedged with old trees and orchard, and have populations of bats, adders, deer and many other diverse plant and animal life being on the edge of the forest. Worcestershire Wildlife has found Noble Chafer beetles in my orchard that is only 100 yards from the proposed site. On my land they found 20 species of lichens and the proposed site would have more.</p> <p>Page 112/113 talks about skyline changes and the 2 developments down New Road will be visible from most of the roads and public footpaths. The development will contribute to light pollution and Far Forest is one of the few areas of the county that still has dark skies. (A unique Place to live 11.29 and Protecting and enhancing policy 11D).</p> <p>The more I read the policies on a unique place to live and change of character, and the European habitat directory, effect on beauty, I am further reminded what a wonderful place Far Forest is, and therefore think it should be marked as an area for restrained development rather than including a general development plan that negatively impacts on all the good things about Far Forest, and also would create new problems as a result of any development.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO369</a>	Object	<p>We object to the sites proposed at Far Forest on the following grounds:</p> <p>Infrastructure – Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Rd Far Forest is a narrow road, difficult to pass residents’ parked cars and at school times it causes major problems.</li> <li>• Used by farm machinery all through the day.</li> <li>• Junction to main road has limited visibility with bus stop also on the junction.</li> <li>• Cars parked at village hall kerbside also cause problems.</li> <li>• Traffic on main road travels fast regardless of speed restrictions especially morning evening and late at night a race track.</li> <li>• Church Lane junction with main Cleobury Road is narrow and has very poor visibility with blind corners. 2 school buses use it morning and afternoon.</li> <li>• Church Lane used by many dog walkers. An increase in traffic is dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Church used regularly for weddings and funerals, this blocks the lane.</li> <li>• Plough Lane is currently used by only residents and farm vehicles and walkers. Its junction with the main Cleobury Road is unmade, narrow and conflicts with the entrance to The Plough Inn and the Village Stores, there have been a few bad accidents at this junction over the years.</li> <li>• There has been an increase in car and large lorry traffic travelling along the Cleobury Road through Far Forest, partly due to the expansion of Cleobury Mortimer.</li> </ul> <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses will impact existing views of the Wyre Forest surrounding the village. This is not acceptable.</li> <li>• New development would affect the character of Far Forest. New road is already an assortment of buildings and building on Plough Lane is outrageous it is a peaceful</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area with many types of wildlife living there</p> <p>Infrastructure - sewerage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing sewage system is inadequate although it has been worked on several times in recent years. It regularly smells very bad and leaks across Sugars Lane.</li> </ul> <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is an area with open fields, woodland hedges, trees and Wild flowers. It supports many species of wildlife which attract visitors to the area. This should be protected for the future. Noise pollution noise will destroy the quietness of Plough Lane and Church Lane.</li> </ul> <p>Agricultural Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of land to Farmers who are an integral part of Far Forest life, keeping the character and focus in country living.</li> </ul> <p>Employment and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little employment in Far Forest - many residents have to travel for work, bus service is poor.</li> </ul> <p>Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of dark sky at night is a very important concern. It is an important part of life in this area, for residents and wildlife. The neighbouring caravan park which was unused for 25 years now has 25 large caravan homes with street lights, no one</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			consulted the surrounding residents about this change.
	<a href="#">LPPO1748</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest is a village.</li> <li>• Other premises around to develop.</li> <li>• Far Forest residents already had enough impact from 'housing'.</li> <li>• Build houses somewhere else.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2239</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO: BR/RO/4 ADJ TOLLAND BUNGALOW, FAR FOREST BR/RO/6 LAND REAR OF ORCHARD HOUSE, FAR FOREST.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A4117 Far Forest. On road/pavement parking by cars/commercial vehicles notably outside Orchard House, Baptist Church and Londis Shop causes holdups and is dangerous to pedestrians. Speeding on this road is also a major and well-known problem. To have another vehicular access onto this road would only exacerbate an already serious situation. Do we have to wait for loss of life to stop this?</li> <li>2. Land rear of Orchard House and adj. Tolland Bungalow teems with wildlife including Muntjac and Fallow Deer. Several endangered species of moths, beetles and other insects would suffer greatly from development on these proposed sites. Please rethink allowing the introduction of housing and street lighting to destroy their natural habitat.</li> <li>3. There is a shop with a post office and a bus service. However, the post office has been threatened recently with closure and the Diamond bus service is intermittent.</li> <li>4. More traffic using New Road to access the school is highly dangerous to the children/parents and there is concern as to how the demand for additional school places will be met.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>5. 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.</p> <p>6. The 2013 Planning Review was against development in Far Forest because it would be detrimental to the countryside. What has changed?</p> <p>7. People living in the village need to be able to work as there are very few opportunities for employment in Far Forest. Let's not make Far Forest another commuter belt.</p> <p>8. The population of Far Forest can almost double during the holiday season with tourists coming to enjoy the village and adjoining countryside bringing in much needed revenue for local pubs and restaurants etc.</p> <p>In general concern about the impact on traffic, services and the countryside that these planning proposals will make.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2392</a>	Object	<p>We object to the proposals:</p> <p>We are concerned about the increase in traffic on what are already very small and highly used roads. The additional traffic is also a concern with respect to our children walking to school.</p> <p>There are huge problems in Sugars Lane with a sewerage lake to wade through whenever we have rain, this is only going to get worse.</p> <p>A major concern is the placement of the properties especially those on Plough Lane, with social housing properties overlooking and backing on directly to the school playing fields.</p> <p>We are concerned about many more of the issues with the placement and size of the developments but these we feel are the 3 main circumstances that make us want to object.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2441</a>	Object	<p>We wish to raise our concerns about this land being used for housing development in Far Forest on the following grounds:</p> <p>Traffic – the main road through Far Forest is already extremely busy and any development that results in another road junction or increased use of Plough Lane would be a public safety concern particularly where there is already a lot of movement of people and vehicles on and off the road accessing the shop, pub, bus stop and local houses.</p> <p>Effect on the landscape and natural beauty of the area – Plough Lane is currently a single track access point into the forest and surrounding tracks and lanes that is very popular with walkers, cyclists and horse riders because it is both safe, being relatively free from traffic and associated noise and pollution, and beautiful. There are plans to submit a DMMO application at some point to upgrade Plough Lane to a bridleway to confirm its multi user status so we would appreciate consideration being given to equestrian access within the planning process.</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation – the fields behind the shop and along Plough Lane are unspoilt natural habitats with mature trees, hedges and grasslands supporting reptiles, birds and insects. They are part of the locally important Wyre Forest habitat.</p> <p>A development in this area so close to the edge of the Forest will change the character of the area and bring a significant skyline change to those who live on the fringe of the forest in single storey lodges and bungalows. It is also questionable as to whether existing sewerage systems are adequate as some properties are still on septic tanks.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2467</a>	Object	<p>Object option B, Far Forest:</p> <p>Well-being/Concerns over loss of dark skies/Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology/Effect on the beauty/Change of character to the area/There is little employment/Higher human population/Traffic</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2840</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 &amp; BR/RO/7:</p> <p>Policy 13 Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest - Managing Travel Demand A i,ii,iii B Page 85:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already traffic congestion and Tolland bungalow site has access issues</li> <li>• There is no support for additional families which doesn't satisfy policy 13 section</li> <li>• loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2850</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to the A41 17 in Policy 13</li> <li>• Heavy traffic, some speeding, near houses, shop, pub/traffic congestion would increase</li> <li>• No local employment/limited public transport/no medical facilities.</li> <li>• Proposed sites are opposite school whose capacity could not be increased</li> <li>• Existing sewage provision inadequate</li> <li>• Loss of Grazing land/wildlife/loss of landscape</li> <li>• Earlier Planning applications refused due impact on landscape</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2856</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in New Road, Far Forest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic congestion</li> <li>2. Existing sewage system inadequate</li> <li>3. Effect on wildlife</li> <li>4. Loss of hay meadows/the area's natural beauty</li> </ol> <p>Regenerate Kidderminster instead</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2861</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Plough Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase on traffic volume/safety</li> <li>• Loss of natural habitat for wildlife</li> <li>• Existing properties will be overlooked</li> <li>• Sewage system is inadequate</li> <li>• No mainline gas</li> <li>• New build homes not in the character of the village</li> <li>• Increase in noise population.</li> <li>• Important route for visitors who enjoy the beauty of the area.</li> <li>• Far Forest is a rural community with no street lighting</li> <li>• Increase in population would not benefit existing villagers just increase current problems as above</li> <li>• Little employment in Far Forest, residents have to go outside area to find work</li> <li>• The village has nothing for young people to do.</li> <li>• No medical cover in the village; those close are full to capacity.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2864</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 and BR/RO/7 because of Impact on Biodiversity, policy 11C (policy 11D), on Landscape Character (policy 11C, policy 148) and amenity, and on traffic (policy 12/13).</p> <p>There is no indication of need for this level of housing locally, no prospect of new jobs and where protection of biodiversity, preservation of landscape character, importance of access to work and facilities, and reduction in car use, all factors specified in the District Plan, indicate its unsuitability. While the Plan hypothesises improved rural bus services and other mitigating factors, is this realistic within the next 15 years under foreseeable economic circumstances?</p> <p>Bungalows rather than houses could be built elsewhere in the village. A brown field site, part of the nursery further down A4117, has been put forward where it would not impact on the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			side roads.
	<a href="#">LPPO2901</a>	Object	<p>Plough Lane - Is a Public Footpath and has no legal right of use for motorized vehicles except for long term established use by its 13 properties. It is single track being 2.8 metres wide, has a (mostly) rough broken metalled surface and a dangerous exit onto A4117.</p> <p>Plough Lane Entrance/Exit (Junction with A41 17) -is directly opposite a busy public house car park. Is adjacent to a busy shop car park. Is directly opposite the bus stop. Is not wide enough to allow 2 vehicles to enter/leave at the same time. Has poor visibility to the right because of bollards and parked vehicles (including HGVs) outside Forest Stores. Has poor visibility to the left due to the rise in the A4117 from the junction with Pound Bank. Vehicles frequently exceed the 30 mph speed limit at this point.</p> <p>Character of Plough Lane -Serves 13 properties with vehicular access established over many years. 10 (77%) of these are single storey. All are in substantial plots of a minimum of 0.20 hectares each. The proposed development would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than double Plough Lane traffic with an additional 20 (conservative estimate) vehicles.</li> <li>• Have an urbanized density of property (0.04 hectare each).</li> <li>• Increase air pollution with 20+ additional vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase light pollution from cars and homes.</li> <li>• Increase noise pollution from cars and homes.</li> <li>• Overlook existing properties which are single storey bungalows.</li> <li>• Have a negative and de-ruralising effect on Plough Lane and its skyline.</li> <li>• Destroy wildlife and trees in an area of untouched orchard.</li> <li>• Deny deer a refuge from intensive harvesting operations in the forest and adjacent Christmas tree fields</li> <li>• Force deer onto Plough Lane to pass to and fro with the resulting risk to themselves</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and drivers using it. This risk being multiplied by the doubling of traffic.</p> <p>Distribution of Rural Development: Wyre Forest rural development is disproportionately centred on Far Forest with 60 of 105 (57%) of properties proposed here. This proportion increases to 71% if the Clows Top site is used as a Travellers site. In the last decade Far Forest saw a similar effect of new development with inadequate compensatory improvement in local services and facilities. This plan should target the development more equitably throughout the Rural West.</p> <p>Character/Nature: Far Forest is an open and widespread rural settlement. The proposed developments would urbanize the village. Density of housing proposed is more suitable to housing estates in urban areas. The urbanization could deter visitors to the village, its caravan site, Public House, shop and to the forest itself.</p> <p>Health/Environment: There would be significant increases in air, light and noise pollution in the settlement generally and specifically in the areas immediately surrounding the development sites, from both vehicles and homes. There is little employment in the village. There would be a consequent increase in vehicular traffic due to the inadequate and unreliable bus service.</p> <p>Sewage/Drainage: The village system is inadequate. There is frequent flooding of rainwater and sewerage in Sugars Lane due to run off from the sloping nature of the land across the village away from the A4117, including the proposed development sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2903</a>	Object	<p>These sites are completely unsuitable for development and our objections are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPRE highlights the need to reduce ‘Night Blight’ and protect Dark Skies. Far Forest comes alive at night with a multitude of species. The particular nature of small traditional meadows and orchards on the fringe of the forest needs to be preserved for these species. Development even without streetlights would lead to a scourge of</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>security lighting and a dramatic impact on wildlife.                      Currently the land adjacent to Tolland bungalow BR/RO/4/6 provides a safe haven to many different species of animal, insect, reptile and birds in the untouched old Orchard that sits undisturbed by human hand. Development of this area would have untold consequences on potentially rare and endangered species. This objection is not just to the loss of a few trees and hedges but to the loss of the habitat as a whole. Rather than desecrating this ground it should be protected to provide a rejuvenating habitat for decades to come. The old orchard serves as unique corridor to access neighbouring fields as is evident by the animal tracks to the school field, orchard and beyond. Plans to develop this area would destroy it.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if these sites should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land adjacent to Tolland Bungalow does not comprise of all built up frontages some properties are unseen behind old and newly re-established orchard. Consideration needs to be given to the neighbouring school playing fields ensuring protection and privacy for our children at play.</li> <li>• Development will not add to amenity value and will detract from existing character. Impact of overshadowing would be immense as the majority of dwellings are bungalows, daylight will be reduced.</li> <li>• Far Forest Primary school and The Bewdley School currently are oversubscribed and could not accommodate an increase in the proposed population.</li> <li>• No available NHS places at either dental practice of Cleobury or Bewdley.</li> <li>• The minimalistic Bus service is not fit for use and certainly not to be relied upon for dependable transport to work or appointments. This service is very intermittent even on the weekdays, on a Sunday it is non-existent.</li> <li>• No local Police, Fire or Ambulance service. Nearest Stations currently being - Kidderminster or Stourport.</li> </ul>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are insufficient work opportunities in Far forest for 40 plus households; so this will result in additional commuters.</li> <li>• Access to the A4117 for the twenty proposed houses adjacent to the Tolland Bungalow would have to be made via Plough Lane or via the entrance currently used to service Orchard House. This section of road already contains several busy junctions including: The Plough Pub that serves 1200 plus meals per week; The bus stop outside the Plough Pub; Far Forest Stores that has its own parking facility but HGV's and tractors have to park on the road / pavement; • Far Forest Methodist Chapel that has parking for 2 cars with other congregation members parking on the road.; New road.</li> <li>• New Road services Oak Leaf Rise estate, the houses along the road, Far Forest School, Hill Crest Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Wyre Forest Holiday Village sites down Sugars lane. The caravan sites contains permanent and 11 month lease caravans, most are fully occupied for the 11 month period resulting in significantly more commuter traffic on Sugars Lane and New Road. Caravan sites have been developed extensively in the area recently, The Willows has increased Far Forest population considerably all be it that the majority of these dwellings only have 11month residence permits the presence of this extra population, along with numerous others must be taken into account. Although New Road is designed for traffic to travel in both directions some of the houses neighbouring the road have no parking facilities. Thus resulting in approximately half the length of New Road effectively being reduced to a single lane for traffic and almost 100% of the road is reduced at term time.</li> <li>• Plough Lane is a footpath, an increase in traffic would put walkers at risk. Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are common</li> <li>• At peak times traffic on the A4117 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution to the area. I would urge a full independent highways review prior to any decision making.</li> <li>• Plough lane has no provision for storm water drainage. Run off from the purposed</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>quantity of properties has the potential to cause flooding further down the lane. Some of the properties in Plough Lane were built prior to modern building techniques and exist without foundations, changes to ground conditions has the potential to result in subsidence. Currently with every downpour Severn Trent battles with a convoy of tankers to prevent the pumping station in Far Forest flooding, we cannot cope with the existing waste from the properties that we have. More properties would lead to land being contaminated with raw sewerage.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal for future development in Far Forest is unacceptable, the stable village population does not warrant this proposal, and less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brownfield sites. Applications made previously for the Far Forest sites have been declined with very good reason, these concerns not only still stand but have been exacerbated. Equal distribution of development across Wyre Forest has been grossly neglected in this instance. Far Forest currently a village will soon become a town. Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for all.</p> <p>With so many fundamental issues weighing so heavily against the proposal, we would request that the District Council rejects the proposition without hesitation.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2723</a>	Object	<p>We wish to object to the proposed development in Far Forest. Page 85 Reference number - policy 13 and 16 and Page 114 reference number – policy 18E</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>The farm on Sugars Lane uses heavy plant and farm machinery on a day to day basis using New Road and Church Lane as access roads. The access at the end of Church Lane onto the A4117 is a terrible blind spot in which the traffic does not adhere to the speed limit. The farm uses heavy machinery which has to pull out onto the road with an excess of 30ft of equipment behind, which is dangerous so New Road is used. This can be chaotic as the road</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is already a busy area due to residents and school traffic, both of which park too far away from the curb meaning large vehicles can not pass easily with the machinery. New Road is frequently parked from top to bottom with cars and is even busier since the nearby residential home has expanded and their employees are using New Road to park too during the daytime. During school times i.e. drop off and collection, both New Road and Church Lane are both chaotic as drivers are coming from both ways. The traffic had increased even further with the added and expanding caravan site down Sugars Lane which people now live in rather than have as holiday homes.</p> <p>Both New Road and Church Lane can not manage any further traffic from the proposed development.</p> <p>Page 97 Reference number – Policy number 28B</p> <p>Our other objection to this proposal is the sewerage. I witness first hand what happens when we have a spell of bad weather and it rains. The sewerage station floods and raw sewerage runs all over the road and then the tankers turn up. I have witnessed two tankers removing water from the sewerage pit at the same time and once they have filled their tankers up and before they have removed their pipes the pit is full again and overflowing. Severn Trent has upgraded the system in recent years to no prevail.</p> <p>If you add more dwellings to the area you will add more sewerage and water which the pumping station will not handle therefore causing even more sewerage problems.</p> <p>Myself and my family have had to walk through raw sewerage on the road and endure the loud sound of the tankers reversing beepers and the tanker lorries working 24/7 for days on end when the weather is bad. By adding further dwellings to the area will only increase this problem</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3185</a>	Object	We would like to lodge our objections to this proposed development. As residents of Far

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Forest we are very concerned at the proposed plans to develop land in our village. We would like to draw your attention to the following issues.</p> <p>Transport &amp; Accessibility: The increase of traffic using both Plough Lane &amp; New Road will have a negative effect. Plough Lane will need to be made into a proper road junction as it is currently just a rough road. It is also nearby to a busy shop and public house and driveways to private houses therefore increasing the safety risk to pedestrians &amp; other road users. New Road is a narrow road and passing cars is already difficult, complicated by the school traffic which currently causes horrendous congestion during term time, the school bus already has problems trying to manoeuvre. Users of the church are increased for weddings &amp; funerals, especially as there are no areas to turn large vehicles so there is a need to drive all the way round New Road &amp; Church Lane. Sugars Lane is the main route down to a large caravan/ park home site, the narrow lane is in constant use by site users and also by lorries delivering &amp; collecting caravans, their only means of entrance/ exit being New Road. There are no footpaths along Church Lane, making walking along here more hazardous if the traffic increases any more. The Church Lane junction onto Lem Hill Bank is dangerous due to the blind spot and speed of traffic onto the A4117. These roads are also well used by a local farmer &amp; his tractor &amp; plant machinery trying to run his business. The A4117 is the main road in and out of the village and currently has a 30mph speed limit changing to 40mph part the way through. This limit is exceeded by many. The increase of traffic coming off side roads onto this busy road will see an increase in accidents. The increased traffic would have a negative effect on the health of local residents. The current bus service is totally unreliable due to continuous vehicle breakdowns and cannot be relied upon for journeys out of the area, especially to a workplace or school.</p> <p>A Unique Place: The land proposed is an untouched and natural habitat for many species of wildlife, there are very old damson and cherry trees in the fields on New Road. The ongoing forestry work in the Wyre Forest has displaced a number of wildlife out into the village especially many of the deer, these now reside in these fields. The fields have not been used for crops, only for grazing of local livestock and hay making for feed, this makes it a very rich</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>environment for wildlife including bats, moths, insects, reptiles &amp; birds as part of the outlying area of the Wyre Forest.</p> <p>We have concerns over the loss of dark skies. The number of houses proposed will have an impact on this. Dark skies are part of the village life and are important to the character of the village. People come to the area to visit and walk in the Wyre Forest as it is a place of beauty.</p> <p>The beautiful views of the Wyre Forest and fields in the area including across the Shropshire border which will be blanked out by a modern housing estate, this goes against the ethos of the village.</p> <p>More houses will increase noise pollution of both a human nature &amp; of vehicles.</p> <p>Water Management: The Severn Trent Water plant on Sugars Lane has regular tanker visits to empty them as they do not appear to be able to cope with the current demand. During heavy rainstorms, they have to run all night operations to keep the levels down. This creates more traffic and disturbance to the local residents and shows that the increase of housing will have a negative impact.</p> <p>Health: There is very little employment in the village, people would have to go further afield for work, increasing the travel costs, use of cars, traffic pollution and the carbon footprint, which surely, we should be trying to reduce.</p> <p>There are no Doctors in the village so people would have to use either Bewdley or Cleobury, both of which are full to capacity.</p> <p>Any changes to Far Forest will not have any positive benefit to those already residing here.</p> <p>The above reasons are why we are objecting to any development in Far Forest.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3590</a>	Object	<p>The Orchard House/Site next to Tolland (Plough Lane)</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation and ecology - Any development here will affect trees, ancient hedgerows and grassland which are known to support and sustain wildlife due to its location. With regards to the objections highlighted above for the New Road sites on Wildlife Conservation and ecology this remains the same for The Orchard House/Tolland site (Plough Lane).</p> <p>Change of character and landscape to the area - Any development to this site would mean a change in skyline, as all the buildings along this stretch are bungalows. Any new building would encroach on the current residents especially if houses are planned by any developer. As the developer will be unknown, then again the design and character of any buildings would be out of the control of the residents. The proposal from Wyre Forest District Councils Plan is not infill as the development is on the external area of the village and therefore not conducive with its own policy.</p> <p>Utilities - This site has exactly the same sewer system as New Road. It all flows to the same pumping station and I have already highlighted its inadequacy for the village.</p> <p>Traffic - Any exit from this area would mean coming out onto the A4117 (Cleobury Road) This is a busy and well used road. Any exit from either end of the site needs to negotiate The Plough which is across from the Plough lane exit. The current Bus Stop is at The Plough, the busy shop and its car park is between the 2 sites potential entrances and here cars regularly are exiting and turning into the car park. There is also a busy and well used Baptist church with only parking for 2 cars, plus numerous drives to residential buildings along that stretch of road. I anticipate that a junction would need to be undertaken here for safety reasons and on doing so this would greatly change the character of this part of the village.</p> <p>Other key points to make for both sites;</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Bus service - It is believed we have a good local bus service by Wyre Forest District. We have approximately 1 bus an hour. Other Villages such as Bliss gate and Rock Village have up to 3 buses an hour.</p> <p>Village School - The school has fairly recently had extensions to it to enable it to accommodate demand. An increase houses will mean an increase in children and it is not clear whether the school will be able to meet the demands of the children in the village.</p> <p>Employment - The village offers little in the terms of employment. People therefore have to go farther a field to find work. The ownership of a car is essential as the bus service is poor.</p> <p>Medical Cover - The village does not have its own practice and so we have to use either Bewdley Medical centre or Cleobury Mortimer. An increase in our village will have an impact on the respective medical practices and ensuring they have capacity to register individuals.</p> <p>Shropshire - With Shropshire just on the outskirts of the village it is not clear what impact this will have on their building plans and apparent needs. Over the years the increase in houses in Cleobury Mortimer has seen an increase in traffic along the A 4117.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty of our village - The Wyre Forest District Council advertise the district as a place of beauty and encourage tourism. How can building 60 houses in a small spears out village such as ours be sustaining the very heart of what the Wyre Forest stands for?</p> <p>The development will have substantial and devastating change to both the character and appearance of Far Forest and would certainly fail to enhance this valuable open space.</p> <p>Regenerating the town, to me, is the most obvious area to assign building too, not countryside or greenbelt. Much smaller plots around the rural district would be more palatable instead of large numbers of houses encroaching on a small community.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3591</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> <li>• Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</li> </ul> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3945</a>	Object	<p>Development of this area would have untold consequences on potentially rare and endangered species.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if these sites should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <p>There are insufficient work opportunities in Far forest for 40 plus households; so, this will result in additional commuters.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are frequent. An increase in traffic would put walkers at risk.</p> <p>At peak times traffic on the A41 17 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution.</p> <p>Less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brown field sites.</p> <p>Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for future generations.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4243</a>	Object	Plough Lane would not be suitable for more traffic and the access to Cleobury Road would be very close to the New Road junction
	<a href="#">LPPO4547</a>	Object	<p>Far Forest</p> <p>The recent work done by Severn Trent in the New Road, Sugars Lane area of the village has improved but not cured the problem with overflow and flooding of the sewerage system. The existing system could not cope with the addition of more houses on land above this facility. There is land to the south of the A4117 which may be suitable for housing and from which, it may be possible to connect into the existing sewage main pipes along that road.</p> <p>The school in New Road is at capacity and has no potential for growth. Any additional housing anywhere in the Rock Parish will add to the pupil numbers at Far Forest School. Has any thought been given to the possibility of building a new school on the land off New Road, possibly with an entrance in Station Road? The existing school site could then be used for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>housing, all with the proviso that the sewerage system is really sorted out.</p> <p>New Road is already a busy road being the main access road to the school and to properties and farm land beyond, and to the year-round residential caravan sites in Sugars Lane. At school drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic can be a major problem. A voluntary one way system, Station Road in and New Road out, has been suggested, tried before and abandoned because of non compliant drivers and the dangerous junction of Station Road with the A4117. ?Possible Peak time one way system and traffic lights</p> <p>New housing exiting onto New Road would exacerbate this problem. ?possible vehicle entrance/exit onto Station Road?</p> <p>There is little employment in Far Forest and, at present, little potential for its growth. A proportion of new residents would, inevitably, need to travel into surrounding townships for work, shopping, health care and for schooling. As mentioned at the outset, I feel new development should take into account the need to minimise travelling, for all the oft-voiced environmental reasons, and, with this in mind, I feel new rural housing should be kept to a minimum.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4601</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans to develop the sites in both Plough Lane and New Road, Far Forest for the following reasons:</p> <p>Transport and accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well known congestion hotspots, especially at start of, end of school.</li> <li>• Limited Parking.</li> <li>• Dangerous junction on to main road, with Bus Stop immediately at entrance to New Road, and popular Village Hall with own parking challenges.</li> <li>• No crossing and unenforced speed restrictions -Potential for accidents.</li> <li>• Inability or space to widen the road to accommodate increased traffic<sup>20</sup>.</li> </ul>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plough Lane junction would need significant improvement as blind exit due to shop car park to one side, Christmas tree plantation to the other, and Public House car park entrance immediately opposite.</li> </ul> <p>A Unique Place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation -This is untouched and natural habitat which will be affected, such as Hedgerows/Trees and grasslands which is known to support insects, reptiles and birds as part of the local important Wyre Forest area.</li> <li>• Sky line change -Overlooking existing properties.</li> <li>• Utilities -Sewage is already inadequate for the village with some properties having septic tanks, and the facility at the bottom of New Road is prone to flooding.</li> <li>• Change of Character -Modern buildings not in keeping with existing buildings.</li> <li>• Increase in noise -Due to increased population and increased vehicles.</li> <li>• Effect on Beauty -The current area is very popular with walkers, and promotes tourism to the local area.</li> </ul> <p>Biodiversity and Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Dark Skies, due to the number of proposed houses, and potential street lighting.</li> <li>• Impact of increased lighting on resident wildlife -Bats, Deer, Moths, Owls etc..)</li> </ul> <p>Community Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village school is at maximum capacity and would not be able to increase intake.</li> <li>• Poor and very limited Bus Service</li> </ul> <p>We purposely chose to move to Far Forest to ensure a better quality of life for our family. If the plans were to be agreed, I am sure that it would lead us to reconsider our residency, and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			force us to move away from the community we feel and enjoy being apart of.
	<a href="#">LPPO4521</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the site proposals in Far Forest, that of Plough Lane and New Road.</p> <p>I site the following points:</p> <p>Traffic: It is only the main road that is adequately wide for regular two way traffic: Plough Lane, Church Lane and New Road are all narrow and this poses a particular problem in the case of Church Lane and New Road during peak school traffic times. Also it should be noted that due to the recent expansion of Casa Mia their over flow traffic now park on New Road all days of the week at any time of day.</p> <p>Further more, problems often occur when static caravans are being transported to the caravan park located at the bottom of Sugars Lane due to them becoming stuck attempting to negotiate parked cars and traffic. This is also an issue for farm vehicles.</p> <p>The main road is a popular thoroughfare, one which even existing junctions are inadequate and unsafe for especially due to the 30mph speed limit not being adhered to. Using local amenities such as the village shop, village hall, pub and bus stop all require crossing and walking alongside this very busy and fast flowing road.</p> <p>Utilities: Sewage is still processed at the sewage pump work on Sugars Lane and some village properties still use septic tanks.</p> <p>There is existing poor drainage of surface water that causes issues, the drainage of storm water is poor on New road with existing drains being neglected and blocked.</p> <p>We regularly experience power and water disruption with the slightest high winds or water leak causing reduction or total loss.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Village school: Far Forest Primary School were not consulted or informed of the proposed developments. The school is already operating at full capacity. They have not been given the opportunity to voice their concerns or requirements to accommodate any additional pupil numbers.</p> <p>Poor bus service: The bus service is very limited and is located on the already busy main road where speed limits are not adhered to. School children who use the public bus as school transport are regularly in danger crossing the road. It is known to us that at least one child has been 'clipped by a vehicle' whilst attempting to cross the road. It is important to note there are no pedestrian crossings in place in the village.</p> <p>Our relatives who have attempted to use the local bus to travel from Bewdley to visit have very limited choice due to the poor provision of buses to Far Forest.</p> <p>Well-being: When attending the consultation at St George's Hall, Bewdley I spoke to a former local councillor. It was suggested that a certain option was favourable because 'it wouldn't be the big boy developers' so they would only build a small number of larger properties. A smaller number of houses on a plot would mean larger house sizes and higher house prices. This does not have benefit to the local residents and these houses would not be affordable as suggested by the proposed development plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, if these new houses are inhabited with families who cannot get places for their children at the Village primary school then they are unable to be involved in the local community.</p> <p>Wildlife conservation: Existing habitats in the village such as hedgerows, trees and grasslands have remained untouched or developed for a sustained period of time making them invaluable to the local wildlife. Redevelopment would jeopardise the established wildlife that rely on such habitats.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Skyline Change: Any developments undertaken on Plough Lane or New Road sites would make dramatic changes to the sky line and overlook existing properties. Many of the properties are bungalows and were designed as such to have low level impact on the sky line.</p> <p>Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology: Far Forest is described as 'a small village' and has historically been of a rural community. The character of the village includes not having street lighting, it's abundance of old orchards and woodlands, fields for deer to graze in and fields used not only as farm land but also as habitat to support the Wyre Forest wildlife. All of these features will be threatened, compromised and almost certainly destroyed by the proposed developments. Past generations have sought to protect, and develop afore mentioned landscapes in and around Far Forest to enable wildlife to thrive and prosper, some of which will have been displaced by other developments in the near locality.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty: Far Forest is a village that is part of the Wyre Forest area and is actively advertised as a place of natural beauty. Tourists visit and explore the woodlands, footpaths and bridleways to observe the abundance of trees, insects, wildlife and undeveloped areas of natural beauty. Local residents have grown up enjoying and preserving the environment and those that have moved to the village have done so with the knowledge that they have the existing environment to enjoy and nurture for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>Medical cover: Within the village there is no provision for a doctors surgery or medical centre. As a family of 5 we are patients of Bewdley medical centre which by all accounts is stretched to capacity already. When attempting to make medical appointments for ourselves as adults or indeed our young children we find that an appointment is not easy to get due to the already high existing demand.</p> <p>I trust that our comments will be considered when assessing the proposed developments in Far Forest.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO364</a>	Object	<p>Far Forest is the 'best served village' - by what? Not the bus service for sure, or broadband, nor water supply, nor continuity of electricity supply. General comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus service is sporadic and has been downgraded by the current provider to the point where it is practically useless and therefore, passenger numbers are in freefall.</li> <li>2. Broadband - most people (different providers) get around 2-3 MBps at best.</li> <li>3. Low water pressure is a constant problem.</li> <li>4. Power outages are frequent - many people, self-included, have generators.</li> <li>5. Sewerage - an ongoing issue which will be made much, much worse by new housing. The sewer pipe in Plough Lane I believe to be 150mm, after discussion with Severn Trent workers - as it is presently, it should be 300mm in my opinion (as a former water board employee). There are frequent overflows of sewage in Sugars Lane, presenting a health hazard - this is a matter of fact, not just my public health opinion. After heavy rain, there is a significant occurrence of 'storm sewage run-off' - I am informed that the houses in the New Forest Close area have a combined connection of surface run-off and sewerage: this should not be the case.</li> <li>6. Traffic: the A4117 is a busy road, as many goods vehicles choose to ignore the recommended route via the A456. The poor public transport will have the effect of forcing people to use cars - and additional 40 houses could be up to 80 cars, perhaps twice a day or more.</li> <li>7. Far Forest is integrated into the forest. As noted in this document, there are several SSSIs and reserves, many of which would be impacted by even a few extra dwellings (and, by extension, people). I don't see any 'local need' for dwellings at all, with the village population showing no net growth. There are several species found in the Wyre Forest which are either rare, or not found anywhere else (see: 'The Natural History of an English Forest' by Norman Hickin for details). Bats, moths and other wildlife are adversely affected by extraneous light in particular.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land behind Tolland bungalow/school fields:</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>1. The issues here are several:</p> <p>2. Firstly, Plough Lane (unadopted) is highly unsuitable for additional traffic, being single track. Furthermore, the egress onto Cleobury Road is quite dangerous, with very restricted visual splays.</p> <p>3. Secondly - note my comments above on the sewerage system.</p> <p>4. Thirdly, from a biological angle, I understand there may be adders on the site adjoining Plough Lane, plus a badger sett and the presence of deer (the latter I see myself regularly and have photographs) and slow-worms - slow worms are a protected species under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orchard House 'infill':</li> </ul> <p>1. Please note my prior comments on the sewerage/water system in Far Forest as applying here.</p> <p>2. Egress onto Cleobury Road: I think Highways would be alarmed by this. Not only is the proposed roadway very close to 2 existing junctions (Plough Lane, New Road), but very close to the Forest Stores car park - from my home office, which overlooks the shop, there is not a day goes by without more than one 'near miss': sometimes this is due to parked vehicles and sometimes due to the speed of traffic through the village.</p> <p>3. Overlighting/street lighting - there are no street lights in Far Forest apart from in the New Forest Close area and the absence of street lights is preferred by residents. The 'dark skies' view should be respected and fears about crime are largely unfounded, studies have shown where street lights have been switched off or do not exist in the first place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed New Road development:</li> </ul> <p>1. Traffic - although not single-track, there are roads connected (which may be used as</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a through route) such as Church Lane and Sugars Lane which are effectively single-track in parts. The school, I understand, is full to capacity and there is a lot of traffic and parked cars at certain times of the day. Factor in rural traffic (tractors) and occasional static caravan movements and it's a potential problem. The egress from New Road onto Cleobury Road has poor visibility and that from Church Lane (the other end to the proposed development) has dangerously poor visibility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Please note my prior comments about the poor capacity of the sewerage system and low water pressure in Far Forest.</li> <li>3. Please note my comments on street lighting for the Orchard House proposal as also applying here.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3266</a>	Comment	<p>Adjacent Tolland Bungalow BR/RO/4/6</p> <p>My Objections to the proposal of house's at the sites quoted are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage Page 97 Policy 15 Sewage systems and water quality.</li> <li>• Page 98 Policy 15C Flood Risk Management</li> <li>• Page 100 Policy 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems</li> </ul> <p>It is well known that when Oak Leaf Rise and New Forest Close were built, the storm water and sewage waste share the same pipe work. The result is flooding on a grand scale in Sugars Lane. This has been on going for the last 20 years. The discharge from another 20 houses would be joined to this system should this go ahead. The attached picture is after about 20 minute's rain. That is not only dirty water, but sewage too. Tankers are dispatched by Severn Trent Water on a regular basis to pump out the overflow. A totally unacceptable situation from a health and environmental point of view. In Plough Lane we have an inadequate waste system, also we have residents on septic tanks, it is imperative they are looked after.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 85 Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Policy 13 Managing Travel Demands Ai,ii,iii and B</li> <li>• Page 88-89 Highway Network - 13.12</li> </ul> <p>Increasing any traffic into Plough Lane, the entrance/exit out is opposite to one of the busiest restaurants in the county. The entrance/exit is obscured by the shop car park. Near misses are a daily occurrence. HGV'S, large lorries park on road (A4117) to use the shop. The Baptist church only has two parking spaces, they too park on the road. Between New Road and Plough Lane there are 16 driveways, both side's of the road all on to a very busy A4117.</p> <p>Bus Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 56 Section 8</li> <li>• Page 85 Section13</li> </ul> <p>A two hourly service is all that passes through Far Forest. The last bus from Kidderminster is 6.15 pm so is of no use for a social life or ways to work.</p> <p>Other local villages have a much better service up to three services pass through.</p> <p>Village School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 116 Community Facilities Section 20</li> </ul> <p>Our village school is full, September 17 intake is already up to capacity. This primary school covers places wider than the village and it has been known that very local children were</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>unable to attend the school. Other local villages have a choice of more than one school.</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80/81 and 85 A Unique Place to Live sub. 11.29 11B 11.3 section 3</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing policy 11D</li> <li>• Page 79 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• Page 94 Strategic Green Infrastructure B</li> <li>• Page 112 Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i,ii</li> <li>• Page 113 18.8, 18.9, 18.10</li> <li>• Page 137-144 Sustainable Tourism 23</li> <li>• Page 79 Section 11.c Landscape Charter</li> </ul> <p>We sit on the very edge of The Wyre Forest and provide a corridor for wildlife. Habitat will be affected, if hedges, trees, grassland are taken away. They support insects, birds reptiles local to this area. Grazing land would be lost for the local farmer along with a hay meadow. Our bats, deer, owls, moths would be displaced from an area where they are renowned. Any development would have a detrimental affect on all forms of wildlife at both sites.</p> <p>Loss of Dark Skies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80 Protecting and enhancing</li> <li>• Page 81 Biodiversity and geological</li> <li>• Page 103 Conservation Policy 11D</li> </ul> <p>Dark skies are part of the village life and important to its character. I believe any new development would have to include street lighting something in Far Forest that was always fought against.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Skyline Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 112 Section 18.10</li> <li>• Page 113</li> </ul> <p>Residents around the Plough Lane plan mostly consist of bungalows so they will be overlooked should houses make their way there. An invasion of their privacy. Extra houses means extra noise, more people. This would impact on people's well-being and have no positive benefit to them.</p> <p>We have no medical cover in the village, nearest, we believe Bewdley Medical Centre is full. Cleobury Mortimer has had very large housing developments, to which impacts on their new medical centre. Worcestershire hospital is full to breaking before all the projected housing. There is very little employment in the village so people have to travel, so more cars, more emissions, more pollution to the woodland.</p> <p>I don't believe that this proposed plan is good for this village for the reasons I have tried to explain. Traffic, sewage, school, medical, public transport, are all an issue in this village. Therefore I object to both option A and B proposed developments on both sites.</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4263</a>	Comment	<p>The 2 developments proposed for New Road and one for Plough Lane total approximately six acres which is huge compared with the rest of the village and contrary to Policy 6F page 36 where you say you will only allow "small scale" development and contrary to the policy where you say only infill (policy 18B page 112) while this proposal is extending the village.</p> <p>The village has no public "green space" despite being out in the country and Policy 29B and policy 20C say there should be "green space" for developments greater than 11 houses.</p> <p>Section 27 page 162 talks about protecting "local distinctiveness" and the loss of a small orchard and the loss of a hay meadow changes the character of Far Forest where many properties, even in the village centre, retain their small holder origins.</p> <p>Policy 13 page 85 talks about promoting walking and cycling while to build out at Far Forest will create car commuter traffic to Kidderminster and the West Midlands, as there is no extra employment in Far Forest.</p> <p>Section 23.2 (The Wyre Forest) says policy is to support the work done by the £4M Grow with Wyre Project and yet part of the New Road site is old orchard that Grow With Wyre and Worcester County policy is to retain.</p> <p>Policy 23A Tourism depends on the Landscape Character of this area (page 79 11c) and this will be negatively impacted by such a development; the area has many public footpaths linking with the Wyre Forest and the Wyre Forest Centre is only 100 yards away.</p> <p>Policy 18E page 114 talks about limiting the expansion of mobile homes, especially near Far Forest, and this development will be off New Road which is heavily used to service 3 large caravan sites further down Sugars Lane - 160 vans on one of those sites.</p> <p>Policy 13, page 85 talks about traffic and highway safety and yet New Road is already overloaded by school traffic, plus the traffic to the 3 caravan sites, plus the large farm vehicles to the farm yard in Sugars lane, plus previous developments in New Forest Close, and other residences down New Road. Even if a developer was willing to fund improvements there is no space to open the junction at the top of New Road because the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>properties there do not have any back garden and to remove part of their frontage just adds to the parking problem with their cars now having to park on the road. Alternative land is available on the main road, on the Kidderminster side of the village, that would avoid any extra load on New Road. The pub, shop, bus stop, village hall, and Methodist church, are all up on the main road therefore the council should consider redefining it's boundary of the village. 6.57 Alternatives, page 45.</p> <p>Page 97, Utilities; the sewage system cannot cope with current capacity, and Severn Trent tankers are up and down New Road every hour when it rains. Severn Trent have had polices to upgrade the pumping station in new Road for the 20 years I have lived in the village, and it has not happened yet. Some existing properties that are on septic tanks that drain into the development area will have to be put on the mains resulting in greater load beyond that created by the development. The mains power fails regularly, for short periods, and Severn Trent took a week to fully restore fresh water supplies to the Rock area only a couple of months ago. Far Forest does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this scale.</p> <p>Page 80/81 11.29 of a Unique Place talks about wildlife conservation, hedges, trees and the need to protect and enhance 11D yet the 3 sites in Far Forest are all hedged with old trees and orchard, and have populations of bats, adders, deer and many other diverse plant and animal life being on the edge of the forest. Worcestershire Wildlife has found Noble Chafer beetles in my orchard that is only 100 yards from the proposed site. On my land they found 20 species of lichens and the proposed site would have more.</p> <p>Page 112/113 talks about skyline changes and the 2 developments down New Road will be visible from most of the roads and public footpaths. The development will contribute to light pollution and Far Forest is one of the few areas of the county that still has dark skies. (A unique Place to live 11.29 and Protecting and enhancing policy 11D).</p> <p>The more I read the policies on a unique place to live and change of character, and the European habitat directory, effect on beauty, I am further reminded what a wonderful place Far Forest is, and therefore think it should be marked as an area for restrained development rather than including a general development plan that negatively impacts on all the good things about Far Forest, and also would create new problems as a result of any development.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4264</a>	Comment	<p>I would like to say that the plan for Far Forest has not been thought through in Particular I would like to draw your attention to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) New Road is narrow and will not cope with the traffic. We have the School runs parking twice a day (I say parking but in some cases abandoned). We also have people from the Care Home on Cleobury Road now parking in New Road since their extension. People who live on the static caravans at the bottom of Sugar Lane also have to drive down New Road.</li> <li>2.) The School will not be able to cope especially if there is an influx of Children.</li> <li>3.) The sewerage system will certainly not be able to cope as it barely does now and we still have to have Tankers if we have adverse weather. I know that Severn Trent is doing more work in the near future but that is to solve the problem we have now.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4277</a>	Object	<p>I object very strongly to the proposed building of "affordable housing" on the two sites outlined in Far Forest.</p> <p>If you actually live in Far Forest you would know that this beautiful quiet village does not need any more houses built, as you propose 40+. There are plenty of houses for sale in and around the area.</p> <p>I only found out about these future proposals through a page on social media.</p> <p>The A4117 barely copes with local traffic and thru traffic from Cleobury Mortimer and the other way from areas such as Callow Hill and Kidderminster.</p> <p>Do you have any idea the impact on a 30mph road this extra traffic and people will have on this area. It's bad enough with caravan sites and their owners who have no respect for the area, littering, noise and cars. We have one shop and one pub and one school within walking distance, how can these cope with the extra people.</p> <p>Major problem is New Road and The Orchard, where these houses will be built. New Road can barely cope with the traffic first thing and at rush hour, are you just trying to destroy OUR village. The A4117 is a dangerous road as it is, many a driver overtakes if anyone slows them down, bare in mind the stretch through Far Forest is 30mph, so how will an extra 20-40+ houses help with that situation, more cars, more pollution, more rubbish.</p> <p>My son was knocked over on his way to school 2 years ago, yet nothing was done, no pedestrian crossing, no traffic lights. Can you reassure local residents that this very busy road is going to be safe with the extra pressure of more cars and more people.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I also object to toy box houses being built in areas that have some beautiful individual homes. These housing developers build nothing but eye sores. Two up two down with little gardens, ugly homes. There are plenty of beautiful homes up for sale. We moved into this area to be away from major developments and noise our, and traffic. It just seems to be getting worse. This beautiful green area with great walks and the forest on doorstep will be destroyed. You may think "Not on my doorstep".....well yes that's exactly what I'm saying. Far Forest in my opinion does not need redeveloping. You will destroy it.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4278</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We write to register our objections to the two proposed sites for house building in the village of Far Forest. Our concerns are wide ranging and relate to the whole infrastructure of the village.</p> <p><b>Objections to the housing development on New Road, Far Forest:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As it currently exists, New Road struggles to deal with the volume and size of traffic using it regularly. It is the only access route to the properties down New Road, New Forest Close and Oakleaf Rise and the properties in Wyre Forest and the mobile home development at the bottom of Sugars Lane. This caravan park necessitates "Oversized" vehicles regularly carrying mobile homes along New Road. It is narrow and congested and compounded by the cars down New Road parking in the lane, causing cars to stop and wait to allow traffic to pass. This situation is exacerbated by the large agricultural vehicles, which need to access the farms and fields, traffic to and from the church in Church Lane, specifically weddings, funerals and church services and, most significantly, the traffic that appears twice daily transporting children to Far Forest Lea Primary School. The congestion caused through parents parking in New Road, directly opposite the proposed new building site, is significant and impossible to pass. The current voluntary one way system around Church Lane is unenforceable and problematic, involving turning off Cleobury Road into Church Lane on a blind bend, with vehicles from two other lanes entering the main road at the same point. The proposed development in New Road would significantly impact on an already difficult situation, causing further congestion and risk to life for the parents and children walking to school along New Road. Children already have to navigate around cars parked on the footpath and the school and Police frequently contact parents about this situation. We personally worry for the safety of our children who walk to and from this school.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest. Transport/Roads Policy 13 Managing Travel Demand A i, ii, iii and B pg 85; Highway Network -13.12 pg 88-89; Policy 16- pollution and land instability pg103; Policy 13 pg 13; Rural Development 28 – Policy 28B pg 169; Policy 18E pg 114 &amp; 169</b></p> <p>2. The proposed housing development of 40 houses on New Road would have a significant impact on other elements of social infrastructure. The local village school is already supporting pupils from out of area, some with Specific Educational Needs. To increase the numbers in this small village school would impact on the nature and class sizes, affecting the ethos of the school and the quality of education. This would also impact the local Secondary Schools in Bewdley and Cleobury, again with implications for class size, buildings and, significantly, transport to and from these schools.</p> <p><b>Community Facilities – 20 pg 116</b></p> <p>3. To build 40 houses on New Road would further impact on the village atmosphere and affect the aesthetics of an area where visitors and tourists come to experience a place of beauty and village environment. The construction of these properties would involve the destruction of ancient hedgerows, which host a variety of plants and slow growing trees and an abundance of wildlife. This field too is also one where deer regularly graze at night and during the winter months. To build here would cause destruction of a valuable and significant natural habitat, home to numerous species including badgers, which are regularly seen in the vicinity of this meadow. The additional house and street lighting would also impact the local bat population, attracting the bats prey items and disorienting the bats and affecting their natural flight paths and commuting routes.</p> <p><b>A Unique Place 11B 11.3 Section 3 i, ii, iii, iv, v pg 80/81; Historic Environment B ii, ix pg 77; 11C Landscape Character pg 79; 8 Rural Exception Sites iii pg 5; Strategic Green Infrastructure B iii pg 94.</b></p> <p>We hope you take our concerns seriously and choose not to destroy this rural piece of Worcestershire. We would also suggest that the Council examine existing Brown Field sites that exist in and around Kidderminster and Stourport, which are numerous and significantly better positioned in terms of local amenities and transport</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			links, before destroying the countryside for which Wyre Forest is famous for and synonymous with.
	<a href="#">LPPO4279</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the housing proposals in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a quiet community with quiet village roads and pleasant surroundings.</li> <li>• There will be noise pollution and traffic congestion, turning Far Forest to a local urban area</li> <li>• The nearby roads are busy enough. The village hall is let nearly every night of the week causing congestion at New Road. There is also traffic congestion near the school at the start and the end of the school day. Additional traffic from an adjacent housing estate would be a nightmare.</li> <li>• Think about the wildlife, conservation and open space that will be destroyed; Far Forest is a nice rural area and we don't want to see this ruined by more houses.</li> </ul> <p>You will be spoiling our local community which is perfectly fine as it is without an influx of people/houses/cars to which the local infrastructure and surrounding area is simply not suited. Please take your housing proposals elsewhere away from our beautiful village.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4280</a>	Object	<p>Far Forest is the 'best served village' - by what? Not the bus service for sure, or broadband, nor water supply, nor continuity of electricity supply.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus service is sporadic and has been downgraded by the current provider to the point where it is practically useless and therefore, passenger numbers are in freefall.</li> <li>2. Broadband - most people (different providers) get around 2-3 MBps at best.</li> <li>3. Low water pressure is a constant problem.</li> <li>4. Power outages are frequent - many people, self-included, have generators.</li> <li>5. Sewerage - an ongoing issue which will be made much, much worse by new housing. The sewer pipe in Plough Lane I believe to be 150mm, after discussion with Severn Trent workers - as it is presently, it should be 300mm in my opinion (as a former water board employee). There are frequent overflows of sewage in Sugars Lane, presenting a health hazard - this is a matter of fact, not just my public health opinion. After heavy rain, there is a significant occurrence of 'storm sewage run-off' - I am informed that the houses in the New Forest Close area have a combined connection of surface run-off and sewerage:</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this should not be the case.</p> <p>6. Traffic: the A4117 is a busy road, as many goods vehicles choose to ignore the recommended route via the A456. The poor public transport will have the effect of forcing people to use cars - and additional 40 houses could be up to 80 cars, perhaps twice a day or more.</p> <p>7. Far Forest is integrated into the forest. As noted in this document, there are several SSSIs and reserves, many of which would be impacted by even a few extra dwellings (and, by extension, people). I don't see any 'local need' for dwellings at all, with the village population showing no net growth. There are several species found in the Wyre Forest which are either rare or not found anywhere else (see: 'The Natural History of an English Forest' by Norman Hickin for details). Bats, moths and other wildlife are adversely affected by extraneous light in particular.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Land behind Tolland bungalow/school fields:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issues here are several:</li> <li>2. Firstly, Plough Lane (unadopted) is highly unsuitable for additional traffic, being single track. Furthermore, the egress onto Cleobury Road is quite dangerous, with very restricted visual splays.</li> <li>3. Secondly - note my comments above on the sewerage system.</li> <li>4. Thirdly, from a biological angle, I understand there may be adders on the site adjoining Plough Lane, plus a badger sett and the presence of deer (the latter I see myself regularly and have photographs) and slow-worms - slow worms are a protected species under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• <u>Orchard House 'infill':</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please note my prior comments on the sewerage/water system in Far Forest as applying here.</li> <li>2. Egress onto Cleobury Road: I think Highways would be alarmed by this. Not only is the proposed roadway very close to 2 existing junctions (Plough Lane, New Road), but very close to the Forest Stores car park - from my home office, which overlooks the shop, there is not a day goes by without more than one 'near miss': sometimes this is due to parked vehicles and sometimes due to the speed of traffic through the village.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. Over lighting/street lighting - there are no street lights in Far Forest apart from in the New Forest Close area and the absence of street lights is preferred by residents. The 'dark skies' view should be respected and fears about crime are largely unfounded, studies have shown where street lights have been switched off or do not exist in the first place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Proposed New Road development:</u></li> </ul> <p>1. Traffic - although not single-track, there are roads connected (which may be used as a through route) such as Church Lane and Sugars Lane which are effectively single-track in parts. The school, I understand, is full to capacity and there is a lot of traffic and parked cars at certain times of the day. Factor in rural traffic (tractors) and occasional static caravan movements and it's a potential problem. The egress from New Road onto Cleobury Road has poor visibility and that from Church Lane (the other end to the proposed development) has dangerously poor visibility.</p> <p>2. Please note my prior comments about the poor capacity of the sewerage system and low water pressure in Far Forest.</p> <p>3. Please note my comments on street lighting for the Orchard House proposal as also applying here.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4281</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased flow of traffic</li> <li>• More congestion</li> <li>• No facility to widen road</li> <li>• More danger to pupils attending Far Forest school</li> <li>• Parking a big problem</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4282</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposed development at Far Forest due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased population impact on wildlife.</li> <li>2. School capacity</li> <li>3. Noise and pollution.</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. No positive benefit to current residents.</li> <li>5. Local utilities-inadequate sewerage systems now</li> <li>6. Poor bus service, increases would uplift carbon footprint.</li> <li>7. Very little local employment. People to go further afield, again increase of carbon footprint.</li> <li>8. Loss of grazing for farmers, jeopardising livelihoods.</li> <li>9. Light pollution affecting nocturnal animals and insects.</li> <li>10. Land and Hedgerows ripped out affects many other wildlife species.</li> <li>11. Character of village would change to bricks and mortar development.</li> <li>12. Nearest medical cover is Bewdley or Cleobury we believe to be full.</li> <li>13. Storm water currently a problem and would be heightened due to any development.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4283</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My main concern is the sewerage. It is now vey inadequate not being dealt with for 7 years. When it rains it floods over the road and land, lorries have to come and pump it out at a high cost that W.F.D.C cannot afford (people in the W.F.D.C area)</li> <li>2. Would be very bad entries and exits on narrow roads.</li> <li>3. Should be no street lights because we are in the country NOT town.</li> <li>4. There are no jobs in Far Forest so people would have to commute so money would come from people who work in town with the state paying for people who do NOT want to live without opportunity of working.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4274</a>	Object	Object to development in Far Forest - New Road very busy with school traffic, amenities cannot cope with existing housing, Plough Lane would need to be widened, increased congestion and negative impact on countryside
	<a href="#">LPPO3040</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road- Congestion along road at school times and parked cars. Road used by heavy machinery, main way in and out of the village.</li> <li>• Plough Lane- Increase of traffic on lane where local amenities are.</li> <li>• Sewerage system is inadequate at the moment.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus service limited</li> <li>• Loss of farm land</li> <li>• Little employment in the village and services are currently stretched.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3064</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased noise pollution</li> <li>• Damage and effect on the environment</li> <li>• Change in perception of area</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on narrow and already congested roads</li> <li>• Stress on utilities, localised flooding and poor sewerage system, no mains gas currently in village and drs already over subscribed.</li> <li>• Negative impact on the village, currently a small rural village, will become a housing estate.</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and wildlife.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3083</a>	Object	This site has extremely dangerous traffic passing. There are no schools, doctors, dentists or facilities of any kind at Clows Top. The cross roads are treacherous in bad weather and the main road is very busy.
	<a href="#">LPPO3084</a>	Object	Small community that has no services or facilities. The cross roads are dangerous currently A456 is a very busy road.
	<a href="#">LPPO2194</a>	Object	<p>Inappropriate to have additional development in New Road. The road is already dangerously congested. It serves properties on New Road itself, New Forest Close, Church Lane, Rectory Lane, Sugars Lane and Lynells Lane. These include a school, three farms and three extensive residential caravan parks and numerous private residences. It is too narrow in places for two lorries to pass and there are always numerous cars and vans parked on the highway. Some parked vehicles relate to people working at and visiting premises on the main A4117 Tenbury Road, and also to people catching busses to Bewdley and Kidderminster.</p> <p>The main problem is, however, the actual junction where New Road joins the A4117. This is an acute turn and has no sight lines at all, making it difficult to see approaching traffic. This situation is made worse by the location</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			of a bus stop immediately adjacent to it. Additionally, ever since the development of New Forest Close, surface water has been getting into the foul sewer and causing flooding in Sugars Lane. A solution to this problem has been suggested, but to date there is no action and it is folly to propose any additional burden on this overloaded sewer pumping station.
	<a href="#">LPPO2133</a>	Object	Object to proposed development at Far Forest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic/Sewage/Light pollution/land availability</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1605</a>	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic is already horrendous will be made worse with more dwellings.</li> <li>• Lack of services locally (doctors etc.) - leading to pollution as people would have to travel to appointments by car.</li> <li>• Bus service is unreliable and route is awful; takes over an hour to get to Kidderminster.</li> <li>• No place for commuting i.e. train station.</li> <li>• No jobs locally - again causing more pollution as they will have to travel.</li> <li>• If fire station moves from Bewdley, people's lives will be at risk.</li> <li>• Countryside and natural habitats will be lost.</li> <li>• Habitat of rare species.</li> <li>• Beautiful ancient orchards will be replaced by houses.</li> <li>• Village too small - not enough facilities.</li> <li>• Children at risk due to traffic increase.</li> <li>• Views will be spoilt.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites in Kidderminster could be used.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1606</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion at peak times already - constant flow of traffic for caravan sites/development on New Forest Close.</li> <li>• Tractors and caravans some of the regular users of the narrow road.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parked vehicles cause traffic to a halt due to the road being narrow - no area for this to be widened.</li> <li>• Concerns for wildlife, especially rare species.</li> <li>• Drainage issues.</li> <li>• Landscape will be affected - don't want to look at houses.</li> <li>• Land not suitable for development (see SHLAA report).</li> <li>• Other site better suited.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1607</a>	Object	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already struggle with volume of traffic.</li> <li>• Drainage issues.</li> <li>• School will struggle to cope with influx of new pupils.</li> <li>• Few local employment opportunities - therefore people will have to travel to work by car which isn't good for the environment.</li> <li>• Bus service is poor.</li> <li>• Lack of doctors - nearest ones near capacity.</li> <li>• Wildlife.</li> <li>• People enjoy the current countryside - local people would not have any benefit from the proposals.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1608</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic already bad.</li> <li>• Additional traffic will make accident inevitable.</li> <li>• Lack of jobs locally.</li> <li>• Lack of local services.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites with services already in place.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1670</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion is already bad on New Road - especially at peak times - this makes it difficult for larger vehicles to pass which frequently use the road. More development will make this worse.</li> <li>• Bus service is poor for people who do not drive.</li> <li>• Facilities in Far Forest are not suitable for an increase in population as it will cause more traffic and pollution.</li> <li>• More development could deter residents and tourists to the rural village as it will lose its natural aesthetic.</li> <li>• No positive affects for the residents in the area - will just cause problems for them.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1688</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic increase/highway safety. The road is used by large vehicles.</li> <li>• Wildlife conservation - natural habitat will be greatly affected.</li> <li>• Change in skyline - will overlook existing properties.</li> <li>• Utilities - sewerage is inadequate - some properties still have septic tank. Has flooded in the past; should be sorted for the current situation but not taking into account new housing.</li> <li>• Change of character to the area.</li> <li>• Public services are inadequate.</li> <li>• No employment opportunities locally.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4288</a>	Object	<p>Redevelopment of Far Forest. Word in the village is that it is planned to build 50 homes in the village.</p> <p>We wish to register our objection to any such plan. On the basis that 50 additional houses would simply overwhelm the village (not to mention the ecology). The outcome would be that the character of the village would be lost to the detriment of the current residents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Such a plan would jeopardise an established thriving community.
	<a href="#">LPPO4289</a>	Object	<p>Objections and major considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic ref p.85 and p.88-89 of plan; the junction of New Road and Cleobury Road is already a danger, in part because there are no parking restrictions in New Road. There is congestion at the start of the school day and at its end since the school entrance is also located at the upper end of New Road. The increase in traffic from extra housing will make the situation worse especially taking into account traffic associated with caravan parks for which New Road is the only access.</li> <li>• Some consideration to making New Road/Church Road a one way system might help but the junction of New Road with Cleobury Road is dangerously situated with traffic often moving very quickly along Cleobury Road.</li> <li>• Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties because of high water table and increased run off due to development (p98). Flood risk management.</li> <li>• Sewage facilities are believed to be inadequate already, more houses will mean sewage system may need to be upgraded considerably.pg97 rural development policy 28.</li> <li>• Loss of Dark skies. pg80-81, 103. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation policy 11D If street lighting is introduced this will have a marked effect on the nature of the locality with loss of dark skies and detrimental impact on flora and fauna.</li> <li>• Proposed development will mean approximately 100 extra vehicles in and out of village therefore increased pollution. pg103. Pollution and land instability Policy 16.</li> </ul> <p>I hope serious consideration will be given to these points and further consultation with local residents before any firm decisions are made.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4284</a>	Object	<p>I object to housing development in New Road, Far Forest –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already high level of traffic congestions at peak times. Dangerous parking outside care home in New Road which is used by heavy machinery, caravans</li> <li>• Sewerage overflowing now</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School full.</li> <li>• Poor bus service.</li> <li>• Natural habitats will be affected</li> <li>• We should protect countryside, there are plenty of brownfield sites available.</li> <li>• Please listen to the local people who cannot see any benefits to them</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4285</a>	Object	<p>Questions need for a further 60 houses</p> <p>Present inadequacies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage (P.97 Rural Dev 28, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Local flooding (P.100 Rural Dev, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Storm water drainage (P.97-100 Sewage systems, Policy 15 water quality)</li> <li>• Public transport (P.56, P.85 Policy 13)</li> <li>• Plough Lane/Cleobury Road junction (P.97, Policy 15, 150)</li> </ul> <p>Impact on wildlife in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.80-81 – A Unique place</li> <li>• P.77 – 11A Unique place</li> <li>• P.79 – 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• P.5 – 8 Rural Exception sites</li> <li>• P.94 – Strategic green infrastructure</li> <li>• P.112 – Infill Policy 188</li> <li>• P.113 – Infill Policy 188</li> </ul> <p>Little employment – local residents have to commute to work – increase car usage and cost. – P.166 Health 9.1-</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>9.10</p> <p>Plough House building is largely of bungalow design, the introduction of house building would damage the character. The ultimate decision making would not be in the hands of the local residents. – P.55/56 section 8 Policy 80, Infill Policy 188.</p> <p>The dark skies are very much part of our village, important to its character. Dark skies are also of great importance to wildlife. – P.80 Policy 110 protecting and enhancing, 81 Biodiversity and geological conservation, 103 con, 79 Section 16.2 Policy landscape character.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4286</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>After going to a planning proposal meeting in Bewdley it became clear plots of land were being considered on New Road and Plough Lane. A planning attempt was tried in 2010 and turned down, the reasons are a matter of record about New Road, however, nothing has changed in this regard. After consulting and reading through the Wyre Forest District Plan I can see many flaws and reason’s why building here is detrimental to the area. The so called village is dominated by a road network, New Road which is very narrow in places because of car parking by residents, during school term hold ups occur frequently near the school, the whole area can become grid locked. Pg. 85, Pg. 89-89, Pg. 103.</p> <p>To get the proposed sites this has to be negotiated. Adding to the problem. Plough Lane site has a similar problem with many accesses onto the main road from the Plough Inn nearly opposite a shop entrance and car park, bus when drivers slow down to turn down Plough Lane, drivers behind them think they are turning into the car park for the shop. This has some near misses.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the inadequate poor sewage and drainage taken 20 years after the problem occurred, tankers regularly having to pump excess storm water and sewage to be taken away, will this happen again with extra people putting strain on an overwhelmed system. Pg. 97, 98.</p> <p>The smell of sewage is terrible for cottage owners near the pumping station. This is also bad for tourism. The name of the cottage by the pump station is Coppice Gate and can be contacted. The proposed site in New Road has very valuable habitat. Hedgehogs in ancient meadows. Part of the area has old cherry orchards with national</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>reptiles, adders, slow worms, grass bats hunt for insects. These need dark skies. Insects such as noble chaffer and many butterflies occur here. Pg. 79, 80, 81, 103. Cattle are also grazed. Pg. 79.</p> <p>The WFDP choice is based also on good bus service, but this service is poor sometimes 2 hours between buses. Pg 56 &amp; 85.</p> <p>People moving here will not find any local employment. I myself have to travel into Kidderminster, more car journeys and more congestion on New Road or Church Lane. Pg 66-68.</p> <p>Building so many houses near the church which does not have any parking except on Church Lane. New build houses will look awful near an old church, changing the character of our village. Pg 112/113 section 18.10.</p> <p>If the land is developed what plans are there making sure this is done properly to blend in with existing properties? Pg. 154-164 section 27.</p> <p>Can you trust developers and builders? At Far Forest we have a very large undisclosed population living at caravan parks which is not monitored properly or taken into account. Building so many extra houses will destroy our community by turning our village into a housing estate. Pg. 55/56 Desirable place to live point.</p> <p>A brief summary, the road networking, the effect on ecology/ dark skies, the school is full, poor bus service, the sewage system, mobile phone signal poor. In conclusion I cannot see any benefit for Far Forest.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the future potential for Far Forest tourism, bad bricks and mortar developments ruin areas of outstanding beauty. I would not like this for our area, lots of campers and tourists use the campsite on Pound Bank next to the Plough Inn. This could affect the business. Pg. 81 – A Unique place 11B, Pg. 77 – 11C Landscape Character, Pg. 5 – 8 Rural Exception sites iii, Pg. 137 &amp; 144 – Sustainable Tourism 23.</p> <p>Brownfield sites provide less impact on greenbelt areas which WFDC seem to threaten constantly. 60 houses</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response																		
			here is a massive impact which would be completely lost on properly developed Kidderminster town centric sites. I am completely at a loss over the WFD plan.																		
	<a href="#">LPPO2223</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed developments in the Far Forest area. Namely Plough Lane/The Orchard House - 20 houses in total and New Road Development proposal - 40 houses in total. My reasons are as follows:-</p> <p><u>Page No. On Ref. No.</u> <u>WFDP</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 614 840 646">97</td> <td data-bbox="840 614 952 646">28</td> <td data-bbox="952 614 2056 758">Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 758 840 790">98</td> <td data-bbox="840 758 952 790">15</td> <td data-bbox="952 758 2056 869">Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 869 840 901">85</td> <td data-bbox="840 869 952 901">13</td> <td data-bbox="952 869 2056 1013">Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 1013 840 1045">88-89</td> <td data-bbox="840 1013 952 1045">13</td> <td data-bbox="952 1013 2056 1045">New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 1045 840 1077">103</td> <td data-bbox="840 1045 952 1077">16</td> <td data-bbox="952 1045 2056 1300">Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="696 1300 840 1332">80, 85</td> <td data-bbox="840 1300 952 1332">11</td> <td data-bbox="952 1300 2056 1372">Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old</td> </tr> </table>	97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.	98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.	85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.	88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.	103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.	80, 85	11	Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old
97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.																			
98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.																			
85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.																			
88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.																			
103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.																			
80, 85	11	Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old																			

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>trees support wildlife such as reptiles, (adders, newts etc.)Insects (moths, butterflies, beetles etc) and birds, some of these are protected, and will be endangered by these developments.</p> <p>94 18 Deer graze in the fields and seek refuge there from the very busy Wyre Forest, they are already under pressure as they have already lost some of their natural woodland habitat. Local farmers use the fields for grazing.</p> <p>5 8 The Plough Lane site includes an ancient orchard of damson and cherry trees, which supports much wildlife.</p> <p>80, 81, 77 11D Far Forest is a village and as such has very little street lighting. This is how we like our village. More housing would mean the loss of our dark skies, we like to see the stars at night, its part of the character of the village.</p> <p>79 16 Street lighting will also affect wildlife mentioned above.</p> <p>66-68 9 The village offers very few job prospects, therefore occupants of the proposed housing would have to commute by car as public transport is poor, causing more car usage and more pollution.</p> <p>55-56 8 1 Far Forest is a unique village, the proposed developments will significantly change its character. As I understand the proposal the developer will be responsible for the design, and will therefore consider cost to be the most important factor, not preserving the character of the village.</p> <p>80/81 77, 79, 5, 94, 112/113 8 137-144 Effect on the Natural Beauty of the area. This area is a place of tourism where people come to enjoy the woodland the surrounding areas and the wildlife. Who will want to visit a housing estate?</p> <p>Finally I would like to ask why choose an area so rich in wildlife, supporting tourism and a unique, historic village much loved by its inhabitants, when there are brown field sites within the Wyre Forest that could be developed</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			instead?
	<a href="#">LPPO3592</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> <li>• Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</li> </ul> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO254</a>	Object	<p>Objections - I object to the development on New Road due to lack of infrastructure, a good proportion of the housing allocation is already filled by those living permanently on caravan sites, where the caravan is their sole residency.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure:</p> <p>New Road itself. Development of the site on New Road will have a negative effect on the village because of parking for the residents, parking for the staff at the extended Casa Mia care home, and parking for parents dropping off and picking up from the school or village hall, means that for the majority of the time the road is reduced to a single lane with passing places, at peak hours the road frequently comes to a halt, as cars are trying to enter and leave New Road at the same time, and if the one side is taken up with parked cars, no-one can pass</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>each other, resulting in reversing, or having to turn around. The proposed houses are likely to each have two cars, leaving for work at peak times some potentially adding up to an additional 40 cars trying to get out of New Road in the morning.</p> <p>The site line and splay where New Road meets the main road opposite the village hall is insufficient, difficulty in seeing other traffic and no room to safely move out of and into New Road, especially when negotiating other vehicles trying to do the same. I have often hit the curb pulling out to avoid swinging too far into the middle of the main road and traffic on the far side. Cars coming into New Road from the main road often cut the corner, as the road at that point does not get them a great area to turn into. Plus residents park very close to the junction. Any new development on New Road would require an update of the splay, but there is nowhere for it to go as buildings lie either side.</p> <p>Sewage</p> <p>The Sugars Lane pumping station is currently inadequate to handle any additional sewage, and there are proposals for an extension which may or may not be sufficient. The housing development around Forest Close discharges both foul and storm water to the pumping station, when they were supposed to have soakaways, which puts a huge strain on the station, resulting in flooding outside our gate at times of heavy rainfall. You should also be aware that the caravan site referred to above is also connected to this pumping station, with increasing residents over the last couple of years, is also putting a strain on the station.</p> <p>Shouldn't the allocation be reduced to reflect the homes provided by caravan sites?</p> <p>Wyre Forest Caravan Site at the end of Sugars Lane has expanded exponentially since a change of ownership a couple of years ago. New caravans for the site pass our house on a regular basis. Although a "holiday" park, the site has an 11 months license, and it well known that a large proportion of these caravans are the main residence of the occupants and are consequently banded for Council Tax. These "households", which they effectively are, should be considered in the allocation for Far Forest as they are already providing homes that the District is lacking, and we the residents are already affected from the additional traffic their occupancy brings, in particular their impact on the traffic to New Road. Similarly, The Willows on the Cleobury Road, Far Forest has</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			permanent occupants.
	<a href="#">LPPO1775</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objecting to New Road/Plough Lane development at Far Forest (BR/RO/7)</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2042</a>	Object	<p>I object to housing development in New Road, Far Forest as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The traffic in New Road is already a daily problem and Plough Lane would not cope with more traffic.</li> <li>2. SLILLAA committee report of July 2010 states this land is not suitable for housing development due to adverse impact on landscape.</li> <li>3. Sugars Lane sewage treatment works does not cope with current demand.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2213</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the proposed development on Plough Lane/Orchard House and New Road, Far Forest, Worcestershire due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disturbance to the natural beauty and conservation of the area (Far Forest is an area with extensive wildlife and natural habitats - building works themselves would damage hedgerows and green fields).</li> <li>• Insufficient infrastructure to accommodate the developments. On New Road there is very limited and poor access. There is regular vehicle access to the caravan sites along Sugars Lane at the bottom of New Road which already causes extensive disruption and traffic, particularly during peak holiday times and weekends (pg114 &amp; 169 WFDP). The added pollution and noise that this brings is unpleasant and has a significant detrimental impact on the local environment</li> <li>• The junction of New Road onto the Cleobury Road is dangerous with a limited view at the best of times. An increased amount of traffic, and large construction vehicles during the development, would cause an increased danger to the residents and children attending Far Forest Primary School.</li> <li>• An added complexity to the difficult traffic conditions is the lack of a sufficient bus service to Far Forest. An infrequent service of one per hour, with poorly maintained buses which are often seen broken down (or on fire), is not sustainable for a village such as Far Forest.</li> <li>• The sewage system already in place is hardly fit for the current properties which it serves, let alone with</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the extra 40 houses that are proposed on New Road and the 20 houses that are proposed on Plough Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a known issue with phone signal and internet accessibility for a while in Far Forest. There is not sufficient infrastructure in the village to support another 60 properties without further, invasive works taking place.</li> </ul> <p>Suggest that alternative sites are considered for development such as Bliss Gate or Cleobury Mortimer.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2301</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to them for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic Congestion: Road Safety. These sites are on narrow, already heavily used lanes. In New Road with the school in use, it is virtually no-go at times and totally not suitable to even more traffic. The recent heavily expanded "caravan site" in Sugars Lane, now open all year round, with even more static homes arriving weekly, is bringing more service vehicles/delivery vans as well as the people living on the sit, so that it is impossible to walk the lane and New Road/ Church Lane without running a risk of vehicle danger bearing in mind no footpaths for most of the way. The thought of even more traffic anywhere in and around the village is unacceptable. Ref: WFDP Pages Nos. 85, 114,169,88-89,103.</li> <li>2. Local Wildlife: The small patches of land under consideration are oasis for local wildlife, which includes many protected species the hedgerows trees and grassland, support insects, reptiles and birds-simply paying lip service to the wildlife and conservation acts is not good enough. Once these areas are gone-they are gone forever.</li> <li>3. The necessity: Why choose to build in villages such a Far Forest? There is little employment around the village, meaning people have to travel further to find work, increases costs and adding to pollution and carbon footprint. Many areas in and around Kidderminster have been identified as "brown-field" sites, surely these must be considered before small rural villages. We suspect it is easier and more profitable to simply use greenfield sites, not actual Government policy by the way. It seems yet again profit before people, if this goes ahead.</li> </ol> <p>Ref: WFPD Page Nos. 154-164, 56,85,66-68,185</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Utilities: The sewerage system in the village area is marginal or best, with water run-off constantly a problem in the New Road, Sugars Lane area whenever heavy rain occurs.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2362</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans to develop the sites in both Plough Lane and New Road, Far Forest for the following reasons:</p> <p>Transport and accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well known congestion hotspots, especially at start of, end of school.</li> <li>• Limited Parking.</li> <li>• Dangerous junction on to main road, with Bus Stop immediately at entrance to New Road, and popular Village Hall with own parking challenges.</li> <li>• No crossing and unenforced speed restrictions -Potential for accidents.</li> <li>• Inability or space to widen the road to accommodate increased traffic20.</li> <li>• Plough Lane junction would need significant improvement as blind exit due to shop car park to one side, Christmas Tree Plantation to the other, and Public House car park entrance immediately opposite.</li> </ul> <p>A Unique Place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation -This is untouched and natural habitat which will be affected, such as Hedgerows/Trees and grasslands which is known to support insects, reptiles and birds as part of the local important Wyre Forest area.</li> <li>• Sky line change -Overlooking existing properties.</li> <li>• Utilities -Sewage is already inadequate for the village with some properties having septic tanks, and the facility at the bottom of New Road is prone to flooding.</li> <li>• Change of Character -Modern buildings not in keeping with existing buildings.</li> <li>• Increase in noise -Due to increased population and increased vehicles.</li> <li>• Effect on Beauty -The current area is very popular with walkers, and promotes tourism to the local area.</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Biodiversity and Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Dark Skies, due to the number of proposed houses, and potential street lighting.</li> <li>• Impact of increased lighting on resident wildlife -Bats, Deer, Moths, Owls etc..)</li> </ul> <p>Community Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village School is at maximum capacity and would not be able to increase intake.</li> <li>• Poor and very limited Bus Service</li> </ul> <p>We purposely chose to move to Far Forest to ensure a better quality of life for our family. If the plans were to be agreed, I am sure that it would lead us to reconsider our residency, and force us to move away from the community we feel and enjoy being apart of.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2391</a>	Object	<p>We object to the proposals:</p> <p>We are concerned about the increase in traffic on what are already very small and highly used roads. The additional traffic is also a concern with respect to our children walking to school.</p> <p>There are huge problems in Sugars Lane with a sewerage lake to wade through whenever we have rain, this is only going to get worse.</p> <p>A major concern is the placement of the properties especially those on Plough Lane, with social housing properties overlooking and backing on directly to the school playing fields.</p> <p>We are concerned about many more of the issues with the placement and size of the developments but these we feel are the 3 main circumstances that make us want to object.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2476</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the site proposals in Far Forest, that of Plough Lane and New Road.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I site the following points:</p> <p>Traffic: It is only the main road that is adequately wide for regular two way traffic: Plough Lane, Church Lane and New Road are all narrow and this poses a particular problem in the case of Church Lane and New Road during peak school traffic times. Also it should be noted that due to the recent expansion of Casa Mia their over flow traffic now park on New Road all days of the week at any time of day.</p> <p>Further more, problems often occur when static caravans are being transported to the caravan park located at the bottom of Sugars Lane due to them becoming stuck attempting to negotiate parked cars and traffic. This is also an issue for farm vehicles.</p> <p>The main road is a popular thoroughfare, one which even existing junctions are inadequate and unsafe for especially due to the 30mph speed limit not being adhered to. Using local amenities such as the village shop, village hall, pub and bus stop all require crossing and walking alongside this very busy and fast flowing road.</p> <p>Utilities: Sewage is still processed at the sewage pump work on Sugars Lane and some village properties still use septic tanks.</p> <p>There is existing poor drainage of surface water that causes issues, the drainage of storm water is poor on New road with existing drains being neglected and blocked.</p> <p>We regularly experience power and water disruption with the slightest high winds or water leak causing reduction or total loss.</p> <p>Village school: Far Forest Primary School were not consulted or informed of the proposed developments. The school is already operating at full capacity. They have not been given the opportunity to voice their concerns or requirements to accommodate any additional pupil numbers.</p> <p>Poor bus service: The bus service is very limited and is located on the already busy main road where speed limits</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>are not adhered to. School children who use the public bus as school transport are regularly in danger crossing the road. It is known to us that at least one child has been 'clipped by a vehicle' whilst attempting to cross the road. It is important to note there are no pedestrian crossing in place in the village.</p> <p>Our relatives who have attempted to use the local bus to travel from Bewdley to visit have very limited choice due to the poor provision of buses to Far Forest.</p> <p>Well-being: When attending the consultation at St George's Hall, Bewdley I spoke to a former local councillor. It was suggested that a certain option was favourable because 'it wouldn't be the big boy developers' so they would only build a small number of larger properties. A smaller number of houses on a plot would mean larger house sizes and higher house prices. This does not have benefit to the local residents and these houses would not be affordable as suggested by the proposed development plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, if these new houses are inhabited with families who cannot get places for their children at the Village primary school then they are unable to be involved in the local community.</p> <p>Wildlife conservation: Existing habitats in the village such as hedgerows, trees and grasslands have remained untouched or developed for a sustained period of time making them invaluable to the local wildlife. Redevelopment would jeopardise the established wildlife that rely on such habitats.</p> <p>Skyline Change: Any developments undertaken on Plough Lane or New Road sites would make dramatic changes to the sky line and overlook existing properties. Many of the properties are bungalows and were designed as such to have low level impact on the sky line.</p> <p>Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology: Far Forest is described as 'a small village' and has historically been of a rural community. The character of the village includes not having street lighting, it's abundance of old orchards and woodlands, fields for deer to graze in and fields used not only as farm land but also as habitat to support the Wyre Forest wildlife. All of these features will be threatened, compromised and almost certainly destroyed by the proposed developments. Past generations have sought to protect, and develop afore mentioned landscapes in and around Far Forest to enable wildlife to thrive and prosper, some of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>which will have been displaced by other developments in the near locality.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty: Far Forest is a village that is part of the Wyre Forest area and is actively advertised as a place of natural beauty. Tourists visit and explore the woodlands, footpaths and bridleways to observe the abundance of trees, insects, wildlife and undeveloped areas of natural beauty. Local residents have grown up enjoying and preserving the environment and those that have moved to the village have done so with the knowledge that they have the existing environment to enjoy and nurture for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>Medical cover: Within the village there is no provision for a doctors surgery or medical centre. As a family of 5 we are patients of Bewdley medical centre which by all accounts is stretched to capacity already. When attempting to make medical appointments for ourselves as adults or indeed our young children we find that an appointment is not easy to get due to the already high existing demand.</p> <p>I trust that our comments will be considered when assessing the proposed developments in Far Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2539</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed building site on New Road Far Forest. My reasons are :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The effect on the beauty of the village. Lots of people come to Far Forest to walk down into the forest &amp; surrounding area.</li> <li>2. Change the character of the area. It is a village, not a housing estate.</li> <li>3. New Road is a nightmare, traffic can barely move at school hours, it is grid locked. I've witnessed the school bus getting stuck, trying to reverse to manoeuvre around parked cars (parents dropping off children &amp; residents' cars). New static caravans are taken down this road, to a very busy caravan park (signs are left out so people don't park their cars outside their homes) because Church Lane is too narrow to be used. There are several farms down the lane so lots of farm vehicles are a regular thing, again having problems passing residents parked cars. Delivery lorries have such a problem, often causing damage because the lane is so narrow. It would be impossible to widen the road, other than removing the only pavement. New Road does loop around to Church Lane but it is far narrower, 2 cars cannot pass in areas, also the junction onto Cleobury Road is extremely dangerous, an accident waiting to happen. Moreover Sunday service or a wedding at the church on Church Lane can cause vehicles to have</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to reverse back up the road and turn because getting through is impossible. The narrowness of this country road / lane and children being dropped off at school, the fact that it is already congested, it is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The village school is already full to capacity, fairly recent extensions were made to accommodate demand and there are local children who still cannot secure a place.</li> <li>5. There is a problem with the sewage, we have continued issues with it even though it has been addressed many times over the years, it causes localized flooding at the end of the road which will only worsen if there are more houses built.</li> <li>6. The European Habitats Directory requires an assessment to be made of possible effects of certain plans on the integrity of European sites before a plan is adopted.</li> </ol> <p>Far Forest is a village, a beautiful one, with lots of wildlife in the proposed sites. There is not the infrastructure, places in the already over subscribed village school and regular buses to accommodate the amount of people that would come to live here.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2721</a></p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>We wish to object to the proposed development in Far Forest. Page 85 Reference number - policy 13 and 16 and Page 114 reference number – policy 18E</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>The farm on Sugars Lane uses heavy plant and farm machinery on a day to day basis using New Road and Church Lane as access roads. The access at the end of Church Lane onto the A4117 is a terrible blind spot in which the traffic does not adhere to the speed limit. The farm uses heavy machinery which has to pull out onto the road with an excess of 30ft of equipment behind, which is dangerous so New Road is used. This can be chaotic as the road is already a busy area due to residents and school traffic, both of which park too far away from the curb meaning large vehicles can not pass easily with the machinery. New Road is frequently parked from top to bottom with cars and is even busier since the nearby residential home has expanded and their employees are using New Road to park too during the daytime. During school times i.e. drop off and collection, both New Road and Church Lane are both chaotic as drivers are coming from both ways. The traffic had increased even further with the added and expanding caravan site down Sugars Lane which people now live in rather than have as</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>holiday homes.</p> <p>Both New Road and Church Lane can not manage any further traffic from the proposed development.</p> <p>Page 97 Reference number – Policy number 28B</p> <p>Our other objection to this proposal is the sewerage. I witness first hand what happens when we have a spell of bad weather and it rains. The sewerage station floods and raw sewerage runs all over the road and then the tankers turn up. I have witnessed two tankers removing water from the sewerage pit at the same time and once they have filled their tankers up and before they have removed their pipes the pit is full again and overflowing. Severn Trent has upgraded the system in recent years to no prevail.</p> <p>If you add more dwellings to the area you will add more sewerage and water which the pumping station will not handle therefore causing even more sewerage problems.</p> <p>Myself and my family have had to walk through raw sewerage on the road and endure the loud sound of the tankers reversing beepers and the tanker lorries working 24/7 for days on end when the weather is bad. By adding further dwellings to the area will only increase this problem</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2994</a>	Object	<p>The recent work done by Severn Trent in the New Road, Sugars Lane area of the village has improved but not cured the problem with overflow and flooding of the sewerage system. The existing system could not cope with the addition of more houses on land above this facility. There is land to the south of the A4117 which may be suitable for housing and from which, it may be possible to connect into the existing sewage main pipes along that road.</p> <p>The school in New Road is at capacity and has no potential for growth. Any additional housing anywhere in the Rock Parish will add to the pupil numbers at Far Forest School. Has any thought been given to the possibility of building a new school on the land off New Road, possibly with an entrance in Station Road. The existing school site could then be used for housing, all with the proviso that the sewerage system is really sorted out.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>New Road is already a busy road being the main access road to the school and to properties and farm land beyond, and to the year-round residential caravan sites in Sugars Lane. At school drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic can be a major problem. A voluntary one way system, Station Road in and New Road out, has been suggested, tried before and abandoned because of non compliant drivers and the dangerous junction of Station Road with the A4117. ?Possible Peak time one way system and traffic lights</p> <p>New housing exiting onto New Road would exacerbate this problem? Possible vehicle entrance/exit onto Station Road?</p> <p>There is little employment in Far Forest and, at present, little potential for its growth. A proportion of new residents would, inevitably, need to travel into surrounding townships for work, shopping, health care and for schooling. As mentioned at the outset, I feel new development should take into account the need to minimise travelling, for all the oft-voiced environmental reasons, and, with this in mind, I feel new rural housing should be kept to a minimum.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3480</a>	Object	<p>Land adjacent to New Road, Far Forest</p> <p>This road access is very restricted especially at school times. The road is too narrow for the traffic using it now. If twenty more houses are built they will bring forty more cars or more.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3492</a>	Object	<p>We have noticed a marked increase in traffic along and around New Road/Church Road whilst I understand the Primary School will generate some traffic at certain times its the constant use of lorry's large mobile homes up and down to Sugars Lane caravan/mobile home site that really does concern me.</p> <p>The view from our house across the surrounding orchard and land is a real bonus to us, in fact we feel it enhances our well being and brings us lots of happiness.</p> <p>We have noticed more traffic, more problems with the sewerage plant (pump station) and speeding vehicles.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3303</a>	Object	<p>The proposed Far Forest development concerns me for the following reasons:</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>1. Plough Lane Development: This is an un-adopted dirt lane. Should the development take place, it would need to be adopted, widened and tarmacked into a proper road. The A4117 is a busy road and access to the lane is directly opposite The Plough Inn, an extremely busy pub. Also the local shop and car park are directly by access into the A4117. A touring caravan site is also nearby and is fully occupied most weekends. All this would mean that access onto the A4117 would have to be extremely altered.</p> <p>2. New Road Development: Access to this site would have to be directly opposite Far Forest Lea Memorial School. Chaos already exists morning and afternoon when the school is in session. With the parking problem already in existence, the extra population would only make the problem worse. New Road would need to be widened or made one way. Speed limits would need to be vigorously enforced.</p> <p>Can the local school accommodate the extra children? There is a main sewerage but is it capable of taking the extra population? The same argument goes with other facilities.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3250</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road cannot take the traffic it now has, let alone that following another twenty houses.</li> <li>• The present school cannot take more children.</li> <li>• Have you seen the standard of Plough Lane and its access from Cleobury Road?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4265</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO: BR/RO/4 ADJ TOLLAND BUNGALOW, FAR FOREST BR/RO/6 LAND REAR OF ORCHARD HOUSE, FAR FOREST.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A4117 Far Forest. On road/pavement parking by cars/commercial vehicles notably outside Orchard House, Baptist Church and Londis Shop causes holdups and is dangerous to pedestrians. Speeding on this road is also a major and well-known problem. To have another vehicular access onto this road would only exacerbate an already serious situation. Do we have to wait for loss of life to stop this?</li> <li>2. Land rear of Orchard House and adj. Tolland Bungalow teems with wildlife including Muntjac and Fallow</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Deer. Several endangered species of moths, beetles and other insects would suffer greatly from development on these proposed sites. Please rethink allowing the introduction of housing and street lighting to destroy their natural habitat.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. There is a shop with a post office and a bus service. However, the post office has been threatened recently with closure and the Diamond bus service is intermittent.</li> <li>4. More traffic using New Road to access the school is highly dangerous to the children/parents and there is concern as to how the demand for additional school places will be met.</li> <li>5. 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.</li> <li>6. The 2013 Planning Review was against development in Far Forest because it would be detrimental to the countryside. What has changed?</li> <li>7. People living in the village need to be able to work as there are very few opportunities for employment in Far Forest. Let's not make Far Forest another commuter belt.</li> <li>8. The population of Far Forest can almost double during the holiday season with tourists coming to enjoy the village and adjoining countryside bringing in much needed revenue for local pubs and restaurants etc.</li> </ol> <p>In general concern about the impact on traffic, services and the countryside that these planning proposals will make.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4266</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> <li>• Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</p> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4267</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in New Road Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road is narrow and already congested with added traffic from local caravan sites</li> <li>• More places in the local school increases traffic. Inadequate sewerage/flooding an ongoing problem</li> <li>• Poor bus service</li> <li>• Loss of dark skies/wildlife</li> <li>• Loss of grazing land</li> <li>• Far Forest is a rural community with no street lighting</li> <li>• Increase in population would not benefit existing villagers just increase current problems as above</li> <li>• Little employment in Far Forest, residents have to work outside area</li> <li>• Nothing for young people to do.</li> <li>• No medical cover in the village; those close are full to capacity</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4268</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 &amp; BR/RO/7:</p> <p>Policy 13 Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest - Managing Travel Demand A i,ii,iii B Page 85:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already traffic congestion and Tolland bungalow site has access issues</li> <li>• There is no support for additional families which doesn't satisfy policy 13 section</li> <li>• loss of wildlife</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4269</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to the A4117 in Policy 13</li> <li>• Heavy traffic, some speeding, near houses, shop, pub/traffic congestion would increase</li> <li>• No local employment/limited public transport/no medical facilities.</li> <li>• Proposed sites are opposite school whose capacity could not be increased</li> <li>• Existing sewage provision inadequate</li> <li>• Loss of Grazing land/wildlife/loss of landscape</li> <li>• Earlier Planning applications refused due impact on landscape</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4270</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in New Road, Far Forest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic congestion</li> <li>2. Existing sewage system inadequate</li> <li>3. Effect on wildlife</li> <li>4. Loss of hay meadows/the area's natural beauty</li> </ol> <p>Regenerate Kidderminster instead</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4271</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 and BR/RO/7 because of Impact on Biodiversity Biodiversity, policy 11C (policy 11D), on Landscape Character (policy 11C, policy 148) and amenity, and on traffic (policy 12/13).</p> <p>There is no indication of need for this level of housing locally, no prospect of new jobs and where protection of biodiversity, preservation of landscape character, importance of access to work and facilities, and reduction in car use, all factors specified in the District Plan, indicate its unsuitability. While the Plan hypothesises improved rural bus services and other mitigating factors, is this realistic within the next 15 years under foreseeable economic circumstances?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Bungalows rather than houses could be built elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>A brown field site, part of the nursery further down A4117, has been put forward where it would not impact on the side roads.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4272</a>	Object	<p>Distribution of Rural Development: Wyre Forest rural development is disproportionately centred on Far Forest with 60 of 105 (57%) of properties proposed here. This proportion increases to 71% if the Clows Top site is used as a Travellers site. In the last decade Far Forest saw a similar effect of new development with inadequate compensatory improvement in local services and facilities. This plan should target the development more equitably throughout the Rural West.</p> <p>Character/Nature: Far Forest is an open and widespread rural settlement. The proposed developments would urbanize the village. Density of housing proposed is more suitable to housing estates in urban areas. The urbanization could deter visitors to the village, its caravan site, Public House, shop and to the forest itself.</p> <p>Health/Environment: There would be significant increases in air, light and noise pollution in the settlement generally and specifically in the areas immediately surrounding the development sites, from both vehicles and homes. There is little employment in the village. There would be a consequent increase in vehicular traffic due to the inadequate and unreliable bus service.</p> <p>Sewage/Drainage: The village system is inadequate. There is frequent flooding of rainwater and sewerage in Sugars Lane due to run off from the sloping nature of the land across the village away from the A4117, including the proposed development sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4273</a>	Object	<p>This site is completely unsuitable for development and our objections are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPRE highlights the need to reduce 'Night Blight' and protect Dark Skies. Far Forest comes alive at night with a multitude of species. The particular nature of small traditional meadows and orchards on the fringe of the forest needs to be preserved for these species. Development even without streetlights would lead to a scourge of security lighting and a dramatic impact on wildlife.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>This land is also of particular interest as it has been farmed in a traditional manor and not suffered from intensive farming methods, its native hedgerows are species rich, meadows being cut for hay with a wealth of flora and fauna.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if this site should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest Primary school and The Bewdley School currently are oversubscribed and could not accommodate an increase in the proposed population.</li> <li>• No available NHS places at either dental practice of Cleobury or Bewdley.</li> <li>• The minimalistic Bus service is not fit for use and certainly not to be relied upon for dependable transport to work or appointments. This service is very intermittent even on the weekdays, on a Sunday it is non-existent.</li> <li>• No local Police, Fire or Ambulance service. Nearest Stations currently being - Kidderminster or Stourport.</li> <li>• There are insufficient work opportunities in Far Forest for 40 plus households; so this will result in additional commuters.</li> <li>• Access to the A4117 for the twenty proposed houses adjacent to the Tolland Bungalow would have to be made via Plough Lane or via the entrance currently used to service Orchard House. This section of road already contains several busy junctions including: The Plough Pub that serves 1200 plus meals per week; The bus stop outside the Plough Pub; Far Forest Stores that has its own parking facility but HGV's and tractors have to park on the road / pavement; • Far Forest Methodist Chapel that has parking for 2 cars with other congregation members parking on the road.; New road.</li> <li>• New Road services Oak Leaf Rise estate, the houses along the road, Far Forest School, Hill Crest Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Wyre Forest Holiday Village sites down Sugars lane. The caravan sites contains permanent and 11 month lease caravans, most are fully occupied for the 11 month period resulting in significantly more commuter traffic on Sugars Lane and New Road. Caravan sites have been developed extensively in the area recently, The Willows has increased Far Forest population considerably all be it that the majority of these dwellings only have 11month residence permits the presence of this extra population, along with numerous others must be taken into account. Although New Road is designed for traffic to travel in both directions some of the houses neighbouring the road have no parking facilities.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Thus resulting in approximately half the length of New Road effectively being reduced to a single lane for traffic and almost 100% of the road is reduced at term time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plough Lane is a footpath, an increase in traffic would put walkers at risk. Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are common</li> <li>• At peak times traffic on the A4117 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution to the area. I would urge a full independent highways review prior to any decision making.</li> <li>• Plough Lane has no provision for storm water drainage. Run off from the purposed quantity of properties has the potential to cause flooding further down the lane. Some of the properties in Plough Lane were built prior to modern building techniques and exist without foundations, changes to ground conditions has the potential to result in subsidence. Currently with every downpour Severn Trent battles with a convoy of tankers to prevent the pumping station in Far Forest flooding, we cannot cope with the existing waste from the properties that we have. More properties would lead to land being contaminated with raw sewerage.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, the proposal for future development in Far Forest is unacceptable, the stable village population does not warrant this proposal, and less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brownfield sites. Applications made previously for the Far Forest sites have been declined with very good reason, these concerns not only still stand but have been exacerbated. Equal distribution of development across Wyre Forest has been grossly neglected in this instance. Far Forest currently a village will soon become a town. Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for all.</p> <p>With so many fundamental issues weighing so heavily against the proposal, we would request that the District Council rejects the proposition without hesitation.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04275</a>	Object	<p>We would like to lodge our objections to this proposed development. As residents of Far Forest we are very concerned at the proposed plans to develop land in our village. We would like to draw your attention to the following issues.</p> <p>Transport &amp; Accessibility: The increase of traffic using both Plough Lane &amp; New Road will have a negative effect.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Plough Lane will need to be made into a proper road junction as it is currently just a rough road. It is also nearby to a busy shop and public house and driveways to private houses therefore increasing the safety risk to pedestrians &amp; other road users. New Road is a narrow road and passing cars is already difficult, complicated by the school traffic which currently causes horrendous congestion during term time, the school bus already has problems trying to manoeuvre. Users of the church are increased for weddings &amp; funerals, especially as there are no areas to turn large vehicles so there is a need to drive all the way round New Road &amp; Church Lane. Sugars Lane is the main route down to a large caravan/ park home site, the narrow lane is in constant use by site users and also by lorries delivering &amp; collecting caravans, their only means of entrance/ exit being New Road. There are no footpaths along Church Lane, making walking along here more hazardous if the traffic increases any more. The Church Lane junction onto Lem Hill Bank is dangerous due to the blind spot and speed of traffic onto the A4117. These roads are also well used by a local farmer &amp; his tractor &amp; plant machinery trying to run his business. The A4117 is the main road in and out of the village and currently has a 30mph speed limit changing to 40mph part the way through. This limit is exceeded by many. The increase of traffic coming off side roads onto this busy road will see an increase in accidents. The increased traffic would have a negative effect on the health of local residents. The current bus service is totally unreliable due to continuous vehicle breakdowns and cannot be relied upon for journeys out of the area, especially to a workplace or school.</p> <p>A Unique Place: The land proposed is an untouched and natural habitat for many species of wildlife, there are very old damson and cherry trees in the fields on New Road. The ongoing forestry work in the Wyre Forest has displaced a number of wildlife out into the village especially many of the deer, these now reside in these fields. The fields have not been used for crops, only for grazing of local livestock and hay making for feed, this makes it a very rich environment for wildlife including bats, moths, insects, reptiles &amp; birds as part of the outlying area of the Wyre Forest.</p> <p>We have concerns over the loss of dark skies. The number of houses proposed will have an impact on this. Dark skies are part of the village life and are important to the character of the village. People come to the area to visit and walk in the Wyre Forest as it is a place of beauty.</p> <p>The beautiful views of the Wyre Forest and fields in the area including across the Shropshire border which will</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>be blanked out by a modern housing estate, this goes against the ethos of the village.</p> <p>More houses will increase noise pollution of both a human nature &amp; of vehicles.</p> <p>Water Management: The Severn Trent Water plant on Sugars Lane has regular tanker visits to empty them as they do not appear to be able to cope with the current demand. During heavy rainstorms, they have to run all night operations to keep the levels down. This creates more traffic and disturbance to the local residents and shows that the increase of housing will have a negative impact.</p> <p>Health: There is very little employment in the village, people would have to go further afield for work, increasing the travel costs, use of cars, traffic pollution and the carbon footprint, which surely, we should be trying to reduce.</p> <p>There are no Doctors in the village so people would have to use either Bewdley or Cleobury, both of which are full to capacity.</p> <p>Any changes to Far Forest will not have any positive benefit to those already residing here.</p> <p>The above reasons are why we are objecting to any development in Far Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4276</a>	Object	<p>I write this letter as evidence for my objection of building on the following 2 sites in Far Forest.</p> <p>New Road - Objection reasons;</p> <p>This land was rejected for building in 2010. The reasons for rejection have not changed in anyway and in fact some elements of the village have negatively increased as I trust my rationales for rejecting the proposal state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation and Ecology - pg. 80/81 A Unique place to live</li> <li>• 11.29/Protecting and enhancing 11D pg. 85, Biodiversity and Geological</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation i,ii. Landscape Character - a Unique place pg. 79.</li> <li>• 11A Unique place - Historic Environment B 11,1x pg. 77</li> <li>• Habitats regulations(HRA) Screening Environment 1.4</li> <li>• 8 Rural Exception Sites iii pg.5</li> <li>• Strategic Green Infrastructure B ii pg.94</li> <li>• Infill Policy 18B i,ii 18.8 18.9 18.10 pg.112, pg. 113.</li> </ul> <p>The 2 meadows that have been identified on the Wyre Forest District Plan indicated as option A and B are currently used by a local farmer. These have never been used for arable farming and have only been used for grazing and haymaking which is traditional to the area. The one Meadow has an old orchard within it.</p> <p>These lands are valuable to the richness of the Wyre Forest and the support they provide to its wildlife and natural flora and fauna. They also provide employment to the farmer.</p> <p>It is important to note that there have been adders spotted in this vicinity which is a protected species.</p> <p>There is also a strong possibility that a rare beetle called the ‘Noble Chaffer’ resides in the old orchard in the option B site. As a resident adjacent to this Meadow has had it confirmed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust that this beetle can be found in his orchard and therefore it is reasonable to believe they will be found there too.</p> <p>The European Habitats Directory requires an assessment to be made of the possible effects of certain plans on the integrity of the site before a plan can be adopted. This is taken to mean, that it would be expected that any plan to develop this land would not progress at all and be seen as unfounded/not possible if protected and important species were found and /or the ecology of the land would be damaged.</p> <p>The area has a wide range of animals and birds regularly seen in the village which includes these 2 meadow sites. Examples are Owls, Bats, Buzzard, Goshawk, numerous butterflies and moths, native deer, Field voles and field mice, bees and insect life The food chain being important for these animals and birds etc in turn to thrive and survive. Any loss to these 2 areas would have a negative impact on the conservation and supportive role to the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Forest itself which is well known for its rich wildlife.</p> <p>The 2 meadow sites it is important to point out have ancient hedgerows and is something the Wyre Forest District council has supported the protection of along with old orchards and dead wood. So effecting these in anyway would I believe go against the councils own policies.</p> <p>The hedgerows themselves support an abundance of insect, reptiles and birdlife which is an important element to the ecology and conservation of the Wyre Forest Area.</p> <p>Dark skies - Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geological Conservation policy 11D pg.80/81 pg. 103, Policy C - Landscape Character pg. 79</p> <p>We are very lucky in this village to be able to stand in our gardens and see the stars. Light pollution in this village is very low. This is important to the area due to its significant moth and bat populations for which the area is renowned. It also assists other night time animals/birds. The dark skies have always been part of our village life and important to its character. The development of 20 or 40 houses on the New Road site would threaten this significantly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities - Sewage Systems and water Quality Policy 15B - section iii and section 15 pg. 97</li> <li>• 15C - Flood Risk Management pg. 98</li> <li>• 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems pg.100.</li> <li>• A desirable place to live - section 8 policy 8C point ii-iii pg. 55-56</li> <li>• Rural Development 28 Policy 28B pg.97 and pg. 100.</li> </ul> <p>The sewage on New Road is well known by its residents as not being adequate for the number of houses in situ to date. The pumping station is not able to cope with demand, especially in conjunction with storm water. When it has rained it is known that in the dip on Sugars lane outside Coppice Gate Cottage, a ford of storm water and sewage can be seen like a river across the road. Following heavy rain it is not unusual to have tankers coming to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>take the excess water away as the pumping station is not able to cope at these times. Additional houses would only exacerbate this known issue and increase the pressure on an weak system impacting on health including he seeping of foul water into the small brook that runs accent across the road from the ‘sewage ford’ and into an SSSI site.</p> <p>I also have concerns regarding land drainage down New Road if houses are built on both or either of the sites, as there is a natural runoff down the backs of the fields and gardens, down the meadows to the bottom of New Road and Church Lane. This is a long standing and natural occurrence. If houses are built this will potentially increase the surface water and volume, which will not able to be absorbed and dissipated as it travels down the fields to the road and onto the orchards and fields below the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest pg. 85</li> <li>• Transport/Roads policy 13 managing travel demand Ai,ii,ii and B, Highways Network 13.12 pg. 88-89,</li> <li>• Policy 16 - pollution and land instability 16.2 Policy 18 E pg.114, Rural Development 28- policy 28B pg. 169</li> </ul> <p>Any increase in housing will naturally increase the vehicle use of the road.</p> <p>New Road in particular is a well used and busy road. It is the safest route for many, as the alternative road out of the village along Church Lane is much narrower and the junction onto the Cleobury road (A4117) is fast This includes a junction and blind spot as cars come up Lem Hill from the Cleobury direction. It is only natural to enter and exit the village from New Road.</p> <p>During school term the road is well known for its congestion and gridlock as people try to enter and exit New Road. This includes school bus, council vehicles and other road users.</p> <p>New Road is not particularly wide and parked cars on the road side can make passing difficult. There are Agricultural vehicles regularly using New Road as well as Plant machinery as there is a family business from</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Lynalls Lane.</p> <p>We have a number of caravan/chalet sites in the locality where individuals may reside for up to 11 months of the year. The Willows on Cleobury Road and Acre Farm Caravan site at the bottom of Ranters Bank. Down Sugars Lane we have 2 sites - Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Goodmore Farm. These alone house a high population of residents to the area and who are often unseen residents.</p> <p>The 2 caravan parks on Sugars lane heighten the use of cars impacting on New Road. This includes the removal and deliveries of new caravans. Church lane is not suitable for as previously stated due to its narrow nature and with regards to caravan movement way too narrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wellbeing - Health 9.1 - 9.10 pg.68-88</li> </ul> <p>Any change to Far Forest in respect of these proposals will have no positive benefit to those individuals like myself living there. Any development will only increase the issues already highlighted i.e. traffic/sewage/light pollution</p> <p>Change of Character and landscape to the area -</p> <p>Desirable place to live ii,iii Section 8- policy 8C pg. 55-56. Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live, Quality Design and Local distinctiveness 27 pg. 154-164.</p> <p>Any new development in the area will be at the hands of the developer, these may not be at a design in keeping with the local area. Additional houses will create the feel of a housing estate which is not in keeping with the village character or ethos.</p> <p>It is my belief that the proposal from Wyre Forest District Councils Plan is not infill as the development is on the external area of the village and therefore not conductive with its own policy.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The village is open and well scattered in parts, which is important to the village character and to the wildlife that shares this space with its inhabitants.</p> <p>I feel strongly that this remains the case for the future of the Wyre Forest itself and the village for the next generations to come. By developing the land here this will be lost and not regained to the detriment of the landscape and its wonderful character.</p> <p>Other key points to make for both sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus service - Section 8 pg.56, Policy 3 pg. 85</li> </ul> <p>It is believed we have a good local bus service by Wyre Forest District. We have approximately 1 bus an hour. Other Villages such as Bliss gate and Rock Village have up to 3 buses an hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village School - Community Facilities 20 pg.116</li> </ul> <p>The school serves not just the village, but Rock, Heightington, Bliss Gate, Bewdley and children as far as Kidderminster. The school has fairly recently had extensions to it to enable it to accommodate demand. An increase houses will mean an increase in children and it is not clear whether the school will be able to meet the demands of the children in the village as this has not always been the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment - Health 9.1- 9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul> <p>The village offers little in the terms of employment. Those who work mainly travel towards Kidderminster, Stourport, Worcester or Birmingham. People therefore have to go farther a field to find work. The ownership of a car is essential as the bus service is poor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical Cover - Health 9.1-9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The village does not have its own practice and so we have to use either Bewdley Medical centre or Cleobury Mortimer. An increase in our village will have an impact on the respective medical practices and ensuring they have capacity to register individuals.</p> <p>Shropshire -</p> <p>With Shropshire just on the outskirts of the village it is not clear what impact this will have on their building plans and apparent needs. Over the years the increase in houses in Cleobury Mortimer has seen an increase in traffic along the A 4117.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty of our village - A unique place to live 11B pg.80/81, 11.3 Section 3 i,ii,iii,iv,v., Historic Environment B ii, ix pg.77, 11C Landscape and character pg.79, 8 Rural Exception sites iii pg.5, Strategic Green Infrastructure B iii pg.94, Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i ii pg.112, 18.8, 18.9.18.10 pg.113, Sustainable Tourism 23 pg.137-144</p> <p>This is currently an area for which people come to enjoy and come to visit, walk and experience the rural areas of the Wyre Forest. Far Forest is popular due to its access to the forest itself and surrounding countywide, its public house and the touring caravan site on Pound Bank for example. The Wyre Forest District Council advertises the district as a place of beauty and encourages tourism. How can building 60 houses in a small spears out village such as ours be sustaining the very heart of what the Wyre Forest stands for?</p> <p>The development will have substantial and devastating change to both the character and appearance of Far Forest and would certainly fail to enhance this valuable open space. This is valuable landscape not only for the village but for the future of the area and its wildlife and for which both the inhabitants of the district and visitors enjoy at their leisure.</p> <p>So I implore the Wyre Forest District Council to reconsider the all sites identified at Far Forest. The inhabitants at Clows Top for example are wanting houses on their brownfield site identified on the Wyre Forest Districts Plan. Kidderminster has many brownfield sites and to regenerate the town this to me is the most obvious area to assign building too, not countryside or greenbelt which are the easiest/cheapest to build new properties on.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Much smaller plots around the rural district would be more palatable instead of large numbers of houses encroaching on a small community as in the case of New Road and The Orchard House.</p> <p>I also feel that the proposed number of houses in our district is over estimated with the models used to do so, this has been published in the Local papers as the case.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3961</a>	Object	<p>Development of this area would have untold consequences on potentially rare and endangered species.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if these sites should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <p>There are insufficient work opportunities in Far Forest for 40 plus households; so, this will result in additional commuters.</p> <p>Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are frequent. An increase in traffic would put walkers at risk.</p> <p>At peak times traffic on the A41 17 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution.</p> <p>Less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brown field sites.</p> <p>Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for future generations.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4287</a>	Object	<p>We object to the sites proposed at Far Forest on the following grounds:</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Infrastructure – Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Rd Far Forest is a narrow road, difficult to pass residents’ parked cars and at school times it causes major problems.</li> <li>• Used by farm machinery all through the day.</li> <li>• Junction to main road has limited visibility with bus stop also on the junction.</li> <li>• Cars parked at village hall kerbside also causes problems.</li> <li>• Traffic on main road travels fast regardless of speed restrictions especially morning evening and late at night a race track.</li> <li>• Church Lane junction with main Cleobury Road is narrow and has very poor visibility with blind corners. 2 school buses use it morning and afternoon.</li> <li>• Church Lane used by many dog walkers. An increase in traffic is dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Church used regularly for weddings and funerals, this blocks the lane.</li> <li>• Plough Lane is currently used by only residents and farm vehicles and walkers. Its junction with the main Cleobury Road is unmade, narrow and conflicts with the entrance to The Plough Inn and The Village Stores, there have been a few bad accidents at this junction over the years.</li> <li>• There has been an increase in car and large lorry traffic travelling along the Cleobury Road through Far Forest, partly due to the expansion of Cleobury Mortimer.</li> </ul> <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses will impact existing views of the Wyre Forest surrounding the village. This is not acceptable.</li> <li>• New development would affect the character of Far Forest. New road is already an assortment of buildings and building on Plough Lane is outrageous it is a peaceful area with many types of wildlife living there</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure - sewerage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing sewage system is inadequate although it has been worked on several times in recent years.</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>It regularly smells very bad and leaks across Sugars Lane.</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is an area with open fields, woodland hedges, trees and Wild flowers. It supports many species of wildlife which attract visitors to the area. This should be protected for the future. Noise pollution noise will destroy the quietness of Plough Lane and Church Lane.</li> </ul> <p>Agricultural Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of land to Farmers who are an integral part of Far Forest life, keeping the character and focus in country living.</li> </ul> <p>Employment and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little employment in Far Forest - many residents have to travel for work, bus service is poor.</li> </ul> <p>Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of dark sky at night is a very important concern. It is an important part of life in this area, for residents and wildlife. The neighbouring caravan park which was unused for 25 years now has 25 large caravan homes with street lights, no one consulted the surrounding residents about this change.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3594</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response															
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</li> </ul> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>															
	<a href="#">LPPO2224</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed developments in the Far Forest area. Namely Plough Lane/The Orchard House - 20 houses in total and New Road Development proposal - 40 houses in total. My reasons are as follows:-</p> <p><u>Page No. On Ref. No.</u> <u>WFDP</u></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">97</td> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">28</td> <td>Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>98</td> <td>15</td> <td>Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>85</td> <td>13</td> <td>Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>88-89</td> <td>13</td> <td>New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>103</td> <td>16</td> <td>Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and</td> </tr> </table>	97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.	98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.	85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.	88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.	103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and
97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.																
98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.																
85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.																
88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.																
103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and																

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.</p>
	80, 85	11	Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old trees support wildlife such as reptiles, (adders, newts etc.)Insects (moths, butterflies, beetles etc) and birds, some of these are protected, and will be endangered by these developments.
	94	18	Deer graze in the fields and seek refuge there from the very busy Wyre Forest, they are already under pressure as they have already lost some of their natural woodland habitat. Local farmers use the fields for grazing.
	5	8	The Plough Lane site includes an ancient orchard of damson and cherry trees, which supports much wildlife.
	80, 81, 77	11D	Far Forest is a village and as such has very little street lighting. This is how we like our village. More housing would mean the loss of our dark skies, we like to see the stars at night, its part of the character of the village.
	79	16	Street lighting will also affect wildlife mentioned above.
	66-68	9	The village offers very few job prospects, therefore occupants of the proposed housing would have to commute by car as public transport is poor, causing more car usage and more pollution.
	55-56	8 1	Far Forest is a unique village, the proposed developments will significantly change its character. As I understand the proposal the developer will be responsible for the design, and will therefore consider cost to be the most important factor, not preserving the character of the village.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>80/81 77, 11 Effect on the Natural Beauty of the area. This area is a place of tourism                      79, 5, 94, where people come to enjoy the woodland the surrounding areas and the                      112/113 8 wildlife. Who will want to visit a housing estate?                      137-144</p> <p>Finally I would like to ask why choose an area so rich in wildlife, supporting tourism and a unique, historic village much loved by its inhabitants, when there are brown field sites within the Wyre Forest that could be developed instead?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2602</a>	Object	<p>Traffic Congestion, road safety, roads are narrow already heavily used lanes.</p> <p>Local Wildlife, land under consideration is an oasis for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Necessity, Why chose to build in villages where there are little employment opportunities. There are many brownfield sites in Kidderminster.</p> <p>Utilities, Sewerage system is marginal, many properties have septic tanks which are susceptible to flooding.</p> <p>Change of character to the area, currently a beauty spot for visitors, the effect on the area will all contribute to Far Forest becoming just another housing estate.</p> <p>Other considerations, the road network.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2469</a>	Object	<p>Object option B, Far Forest:</p> <p>Well-being/Concerns over loss of dark skies/Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology/Effect on the beauty/Change of character to the area/There is little employment/Higher human population/Traffic</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1728</a>	Object	Objects for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the school cope with more pupils.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3252</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road cannot take the traffic it now has, let alone that following another twenty houses.</li> <li>• The present school cannot take more children.</li> <li>• Have you seen the standard of Plough Lane and its access from Cleobury Road?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5146</a>	Object	<p>New Road -Objection reasons;</p> <p>New Road; This land was rejected for building in 2010. The reasons for rejection have not changed in anyway and in fact some elements of the village have negatively increased as I trust my rationales for rejecting the proposal state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation and Ecology - pg.80/81 A Unique place to live</li> <li>• 11.29/Protecting and enhancing 11D pg.85, Biodiversity and Geological</li> <li>• Conservation i,ii. Landscape Character - a Unique place pg.79.</li> <li>• 11A Unique place - Historic Environment B 11,1x pg.77</li> <li>• Habitats regulations(HRA) Screening Environment 1.4</li> <li>• 8 Rural Exception Sites iii pg.5</li> <li>• Strategic Green Infrastructure B ii pg.94</li> <li>• Infill Policy 18B i,ii 18.8 18.9 18.10 pg.112, pg.113.</li> </ul> <p>The 2 meadows that have been identified on the Wyre Forest District Plan indicated as option A and B are currently used by a local farmer. These have never been used for arable farming and have only been used for grazing and haymaking which is traditional to the area. The one Meadow has an old orchard within in it.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>These lands are valuable to the richness of the Wyre Forest and the support they provide to its wildlife and natural flora and fauna. They also provide employment to the farmer.</p> <p>It is important to note that there have been adders spotted in this vicinity which is a protected species.</p> <p>There is also a strong possibility that a rare beetle called the ‘Noble Chaffer’ resides in the old orchard in the option B site. As a resident adjacent to this Meadow has had it confirmed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust that this beetle can be found in his orchard and therefore it is reasonable to believe they will be found there too.</p> <p>The European Habitats Directory requires an assessment to be made of the possible effects of certain plans on the integrity of the site before a plan can be adopted. This is taken to mean, that it would be expected that any plan to develop this land would not progress at all and be seen as unfounded/not possible if protected and important species were found and /or the ecology of the land would be damaged.</p> <p>The area has a wide range of animals and birds regularly seen in the village which includes these 2 meadow sites. Examples are Owls, Bats, Buzzard, Goshawk, numerous butterflies and moths, native deer, Field voles and field mice, bees and insect life The food chain being important for these animals and birds etc in turn to thrive and survive. Any loss to these 2 areas would have a negative impact on the conservation and supportive role to the Forest itself which is well known for its rich wildlife.</p> <p>The 2 meadow sites it is important to point out have ancient hedgerows and is something the Wyre Forest District council has supported the protection of along with old orchards and dead wood. So effecting these in anyway would I believe go against the councils own policies.</p> <p>The hedgerows themselves support an abundance of insect, reptiles and birdlife which is an important element to the ecology and conservation of the Wyre Forest Area.</p> <p>Dark skies - Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geological Conservation policy 11D pg.80/81 pg.103,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Policy C - Landscape Character pg.79</p> <p>We are very lucky in this village to be able to stand in our gardens and see the stars. Light pollution in this village is very low. This is important to the area due to its significant moth and bat populations for which the area is renowned. It also assists other night time animals/birds. The dark skies have always been part of our village life and important to its character. The development of 20 or 40 houses on the New Road site would threaten this significantly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities - Sewage Systems and water Quality Policy 15B - section iii and section 15 pg.97</li> <li>• 15C - Flood Risk Management pg.98</li> <li>• 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems pg.100.</li> <li>• A desirable place to live - section 8 policy 8C point ii-iii pg.55-56</li> <li>• Rural Development 28 Policy 28B pg.97 and pg.100.</li> </ul> <p>The sewage on New Road is well known by its residents as not being adequate for the number of houses in situ to date. The pumping station is not able to cope with demand, especially in conjunction with storm water. When it has rained it is known that in the dip on Sugars lane outside Coppice Gate Cottage, a ford of storm water and sewage can be seen like a river across the road. Following heavy rain it is not unusual to have tankers coming to take the excess water away as the pumping station is not able to cope at these times. Additional houses would only exacerbate this known issue and increase the pressure on an weak system impacting on health including he seeping of foul water into the small brook that runs accent across the road from the 'sewage ford' and into an SSSI site.</p> <p>I also have concerns regarding land drainage down New Road if houses are built on both or either of the sites, as there is a natural runoff down the backs of the fields and gardens, down the meadows to the bottom of New Road and Church Lane. This is a long standing and natural occurrence. If houses are built this will potentially increase the surface water and volume, which will not able to be absorbed and dissipated as it travels down the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>fields to the road and onto the orchards and fields below the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest pg.85</li> <li>• Transport/Roads policy 13 managing travel demand Ai,ii,ii and B, Highways Network 13.12 pg.88-89,</li> <li>• Policy 16 - pollution and land instability 16.2 Policy 18 E pg.114, Rural Development 28- policy 28B pg.169</li> </ul> <p>Any increase in housing will naturally increase the vehicle use of the road.</p> <p>New Road in particular is a well used and busy road. It is the safest route for many, as the alternative road out of the village along Church Lane is much narrower and the junction onto the Cleobury road (A4117) is fast This includes a junction and blind spot as cars come up Lem Hill from the Cleobury direction. It is only natural to enter and exit the village from New Road.</p> <p>During school term the road is well known for its congestion and gridlock as people try to enter and exit New Road. This includes school bus, council vehicles and other road users.</p> <p>New Road is not particularly wide and parked cars on the road side can make passing difficult. There are Agricultural vehicles regularly using New Road as well as Plant machinery as there is a family business from Lynalls Lane.</p> <p>We have a number of caravan/chalet sites in the locality where individuals may reside for up to 11 months of the year. The Willows on Cleobury Road and Acre Farm Caravan site at the bottom of Ranters Bank. Down Sugars Lane we have 2 sites - Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Goodmore Farm. These alone house a high population of residents to the area and who are often unseen residents.</p> <p>The 2 caravan parks on Sugars lane heighten the use of cars impacting on New Road. This includes the removal and deliveries of new caravans. Church lane is not suitable for as previously stated due to its narrow nature and</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>with regards to caravan movement way too narrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wellbeing - Health 9.1 - 9.10 pg.68-88</li> </ul> <p>Any change to Far Forest in respect of these proposals will have no positive benefit to those individuals like myself living there. Any development will only increase the issues already highlighted i.e. traffic/sewage/light pollution</p> <p>Change of Character and landscape to the area -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desirable place to live ii,iii Section 8- policy 8C pg.55-56. Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live, Quality Design and Local distinctiveness 27 pg.154-164.</li> </ul> <p>Any new development in the area will be at the hands of the developer, these may not be at a design in keeping with the local area. Additional houses will create the feel of a housing estate which is not in keeping with the village character or ethos.</p> <p>It is my belief that the proposal from Wyre Forest District Councils Plan is not infill as the development is on the external area of the village and therefore not conducive with its own policy.</p> <p>The village is open and well scattered in parts, which is important to the village character and to the wildlife that shares this space with its inhabitants.</p> <p>I feel strongly that this remains the case for the future of the Wyre Forest itself and the village for the next generations to come. By developing the land here this will be lost and not regained to the detriment of the landscape and its wonderful character.</p> <p>Other key points to make for both sites;</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus service - Section 8 pg.56, Policy 3 pg.85</li> </ul> <p>It is believed we have a good local bus service by Wyre Forest District. We have approximately 1 bus an hour. Other Villages such as Bliss gate and Rock Village have up to 3 buses an hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village School - Community Facilities 20 pg.116</li> </ul> <p>The school serves not just the village, but Rock, Heightington, Bliss Gate, Bewdley and children as far as Kidderminster. The school has fairly recently had extensions to it to enable it to accommodate demand. An increase houses will mean an increase in children and it is not clear whether the school will be able to meet the demands of the children in the village as this has not always been the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment - Health 9.1- 9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul> <p>The village offers little in the terms of employment. Those who work mainly travel towards Kidderminster, Stourport, Worcester or Birmingham. People therefore have to go farther a field to find work. The ownership of a car is essential as the bus service is poor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical Cover - Health 9.1-9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul> <p>The village does not have its own practice and so we have to use either Bewdley Medical centre or Cleobury Mortimer. An increase in our village will have an impact on the respective medical practices and ensuring they have capacity to register individuals.</p> <p>Shropshire -</p> <p>With Shropshire just on the outskirts of the village it is not clear what impact this will have on their building plans and apparent needs. Over the years the increase in houses in Cleobury Mortimer has seen an increase in</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic along the A 4117.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty of our village - A unique place to live 11B pg.80/81, 11.3 Section 3 i,ii,iii,iv,v., Historic Environment B ii, ix pg.77, 11C Landscape and character pg.79, 8 Rural Exception sites iii pg.5, Strategic Green Infrastructure B iii pg.94, Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i ii pg.112, 18.8, 18.9.18.10 pg.113, Sustainable Tourism 23 pg.137-144</p> <p>This is currently an area for which people come to enjoy and come to visit, walk and experience the rural areas of the Wyre Forest. Far Forest is popular due to its access to the forest itself and surrounding countywide, its public house and the touring caravan site on Pound Bank for example. The Wyre Forest District Council advertises the district as a place of beauty and encourages tourism. How can building 60 houses in a small spears out village such as ours be sustaining the very heart of what the Wyre Forest stands for?</p> <p>The development will have substantial and devastating change to both the character and appearance of Far Forest and would certainly fail to enhance this valuable open space. This is valuable landscape not only for the village but for the future of the area and its wildlife and for which both the inhabitants of the district and visitors enjoy at their leisure.</p> <p>So I implore the Wyre Forest District Council to reconsider the all sites identified at Far Forest. The inhabitants at Clows Top for example are wanting houses on their brownfield site identified on the Wyre Forest Districts Plan. Kidderminster has many brownfield sites and to regenerate the town this to me is the most obvious area to assign building too, not countryside or greenbelt which are the easiest/cheapest to build new properties on. Much smaller plots around the rural district would be more palatable instead of large numbers of houses encroaching on a small community as in the case of New Road and The Orchard House.</p> <p>I also feel that the proposed number of houses in our district is over estimated with the models used to do so, this has been published in the Local papers as the case.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5147</a>	Object	Far Forest - New Road and Plough Lane proposals

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Objections and major considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic ref p85 and pp88-89 of plan; the junction of New Road and Cleobury Road is already a danger, in part because there are no parking restrictions in New Road. There is congestion at the start of the school day and at its end since the school entrance is also located at the upper end of New Road. The increase in traffic from extra housing will make the situation worse especially taking into account traffic associated with caravan parks for which New Road is the only access.</li> <li>• Some consideration to making New Road/Church Road a one way system might help but the junction of New Road with Cleobury Road is dangerously situated with traffic often moving very quickly along Cleobury Road.</li> <li>• Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties because of high water table and increased run off due to development (p98). Flood risk management.</li> <li>• Sewage facilities are believed to be inadequate already, more houses will mean sewage system may need to be upgraded considerably.pg.97 rural development policy 28.</li> <li>• Loss of Dark skies. pg.80-81, 103. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation policy 11D If street lighting is introduced this will have a marked effect on the nature of the locality with loss of dark skies and detrimental impact on flora and fauna.</li> <li>• Proposed development will mean approximately 100 extra vehicles in and out of village therefore increased pollution. pg103. Pollution and land instability Policy 16.</li> </ul> <p>I hope serious consideration will be given to these points and further consultation with local residents before any firm decisions are made.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4254</a></p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Map Reference New Road Far Forest (South) BR/RO/7</p> <p>My Objections to the proposal of house's at the sites quoted are as follows:-</p> <p>Sewage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 97 Policy 15 Sewage systems and water quality.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 98 Policy 15C Flood Risk Management</li> <li>• Page 100 Policy 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems</li> </ul> <p>It is well known that when Oak Leaf Rise and New Forest Close were built, the storm water and sewage waste share the same pipe work. The result is flooding on a grand scale in Sugars Lane. This has been on going for the last 20 years. The discharge from another 20 houses would be joined to this system should this go ahead. The attached picture is after about 20 minutes rain. That is not only dirty water, but sewage too. Tankers are dispatched by Severn Trent Water on a regular basis to pump out the overflow. A totally unacceptable situation from a health and environmental point of view.</p> <p>Traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 85 Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Policy 13 Managing Travel Demands Ai,ii,iii and B</li> <li>• Page 88-89 Highway Network - 13.12</li> </ul> <p>Between New Road and Plough Lane there are 16 driveways, both side's of the road all on to a very busy A4117.</p> <p>New Road is already far too congested. Many houses do not have off road parking leaving them on the road. It is a road of choice for the movement of caravans and motor homes to the three caravan parks we have in Sugars Lane. There are two farming families in Sugars lane and Church Lane, regular tractor and trailer journeys are made on New Road. Brays Plant yard is on Sugars Lane, again heavy plant is on this very narrow road on a daily basis. During term time (appreciate at every school) the village primary school causes chaos on New Road.</p> <p>Bus Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 56 Section 8</li> <li>• Page 85 Section13</li> </ul> <p>A two hourly service is all that passes through Far Forest. The last bus from Kidderminster is 6.15 pm so is of no</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>use for a social life or ways to work.</p> <p>Other local villages have a much better service up to three services pass through.</p> <p>Village School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 116 Community Facilities Section 20</li> </ul> <p>Our village school is full. September 17 intake is already up to capacity. This primary school covers places wider than the village and it has been known that very local children were unable to attend the school. Other local villages have a choice of more than one school.</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80/81 and 85 a unique place to live sub. 11.29 11B 11.3 section 3</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing policy 11D</li> <li>• Page 79 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• Page 94 Strategic Green Infrastructure B</li> <li>• Page 112 Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i,ii</li> <li>• Page 113 18.8, 18.9, 18.10</li> <li>• Page 137-144 Sustainable Tourism 23</li> <li>• Page 79 Section 11.c Landscape Charter</li> </ul> <p>We sit on the very edge of The Wyre Forest and provide a corridor for wildlife. Habitat will be affected, if hedges, trees, grassland are taken away. They support insects, birds reptiles local to this area. Grazing land would be lost for the local farmer along with a hay meadow. Our bats, deer, owls, moths would be displaced from an area where they are renowned. Any development would have a detrimental affect on all forms of wildlife at both sites.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST**

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Loss of Dark Skies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80 Protecting and enhancing</li> <li>• Page 81 Biodiversity and geological</li> <li>• Page 103 Conservation Policy 11D</li> </ul> <p>Dark skies are part of the village life and important to its character. I believe any new development would have to include street lighting something in Far Forest that was always fought against.</p> <p>Skyline Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 112 Section 18.10</li> <li>• Page 113</li> </ul> <p>Residents around the Plough Lane plan mostly consist of bungalows so they will be overlooked should houses make there way there. An invasion of their privacy. New Road would be devastated for ever an outlook to the Clee Hills would be lost. Extra houses means extra noise, more people. This would impact on peoples well being and have no positive benefit to them.</p> <p>We have no medical cover in the village, nearest, we believe Bewdley Medical Centre is full. Cleobury Mortimer has had very large housing developments, to which impacts on their new medical centre. Worcestershire hospital are full to breaking before all the projected housing.</p> <p>There is very little employment in the village so people have to travel, so more cars, more emissions, more pollution to the woodland.</p> <p>I don't believe that this proposed plan is good for this village for the reasons I have tried to explain. Traffic, sewage, school, medical, public transport are all an issue in this village. Therefore I object to both option A and B proposed developments on both sites.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/26 – WALNUT COTTAGE, BLISS GATE**

Company / Organisation	Response No		Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2214</a>	BR/RO/26	Object	<p>Objects to BR/RO/26 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The village has no amenities (the pub is closed, the site in a neglected condition).</li> <li>2. The telephone box is disconnected and in private ownership.</li> <li>3. Lack of defibrillator. There isn't an appropriate community space to locate it.</li> <li>4. There is no school, church, shop, village hall or community centre, unlike each other part of the district.</li> <li>5. There is a poor rural bus service and no bus stop. Residents wishing to catch the intermittent service are obliged to stand in the open on the corner of two roads at a crossroads, with not even a footpath for their safety. The bus company uses buses which have on two recent occasions caught fire and burnt out.</li> <li>6. Utilities are inadequate for modern families. There is no gas, except by cylinder. There is no mains drainage in this road. Sewerage is managed by septic tanks. Electricity is delivered by overhead power lines. Strong winds, rain and trees cause frequent power cuts, a risk for vulnerable members of the community.</li> <li>7. The road is narrow, less than 12 feet wide. Any proposed access would be near a small blind summit, dangerous in either direction. Residential traffic is slight but with two farms in the road and many in the district, heavy agricultural traffic is significant during all seasons.</li> <li>8. The site is rural. It is a field with fruit trees bordered by a mature thick hedge. Converting this to a housing development destroys the rural nature of the site, reduces habitat and opens the way for further damaging development in a road where almost every house is separated from its neighbour by open land. There is a risk that, given the planning department's overload of work, a potential developer would not respect the rural nature of the area, resulting in the removal of trees and hedges, the erection of fences and great red brick walls.</li> </ol> <p>Alternative suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Glass Houses site on the A456, near Long Bank.</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/26 – WALNUT COTTAGE, BLISS GATE**

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Churchfields, Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Park Street, Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Green Street, Kidderminster, formerly Victoria Carpets.</li> </ul> <p>These brownfield sites could provide housing closer to all amenities in potentially exciting developments, more suitable as apartments for young people or the old who become stranded in the countryside.</p> <p>I am grateful to the staff of the planning department who did so much to explain the planning options at the series of open meetings. I am aware of the Council’s wish to respect rural environments and I hope that the points I have raised will receive a fair reading. Unfortunately the consultation process is taking place in the summer holidays which is likely to reduce the public’s awareness of the process.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Victoria Carpets	<a href="#">LPPO1503</a>	Policy 30	Comment	The emerging policy notes that Kidderminster is the strategic centre when the majority of development should be located to ensure sustainable development, easy access to services and greatest ability to promote infrastructure.
King Charles I School, Kidderminster	<a href="#">LPPO2286</a>	Policy 30	Comment	<p>The Governing Body has considered the Wyre Forest Local Plan proposals and the two options contained therein in the context of their possible impact on the educational needs of the community for the future.</p> <p>We are satisfied that our School has sufficient capacity to deal with the effects of both options which are under consideration should either ultimately be adopted.</p> <p>We intend to follow closely the progress of the Review process and to assess its potential impact on the provision of secondary education locally so we will be in a position to accommodate the children of families who in due course come to reside in any new residential developments in Kidderminster.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1073</a>	Policy 30	Object	For the most part our concerns in relation to the sites proposed for development in Kidderminster are limited but nonetheless they arise as a result of the background evidence on which the allocations have been based. Of particular note is the need to determine any ecological constraints using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been considered in the evidence base or SA for the plan. This may have the effect of rendering the plan unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for sites listed in Table 30.0.1 is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.
	<a href="#">LPPO1874</a>	Policy 30	Object	<p>Objects to new development because the roads are already busy and not made for extra traffic. The area also lacks proper crossings and it is difficult to cross the roads. Concerned that the schools and doctors will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Suggests trying to drive down Sion Hill.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2336</a>	Policy 30	Object	<p>Object to Option A: traffic is already congested, public transport is poor and there is no budget for a relief road.</p> <p>Wilden Lane is ill considered due to the flood risk/loss of wildlife link/buffer for adjacent SSSI. Without its support systems, Wilden Marsh, one of Worcestershire Wildlife Trust's Flagship Reserves, will die.</p> <p>How will water/sewage disposal for 5400 households be provided?</p> <p>Bring empty houses back into use?</p> <p>The hospital is already inadequate and new schools places would be needed</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4330</a>	Policy 30	Comment	<p>Kidderminster has 'zoned' parts of the town centre for commercial development which is just not happening.</p> <p>Office occupancy rates on Green Street for example are low.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2986</a>	Policy 30	Support	<p>*Policy 30 relates to homes in the town centres. I fully support the idea that people should live in town centres. It makes sense to use the unused space over shops and business premises for housing. Worcester Street and Oxford Street should be redeveloped for housing as the retail units in these streets are either empty or under-used.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4363</a>	30.2	Comment	<p>On the redevelopment of the Horsefair area and the proposed one way system.</p> <p>Surely it is undeniable that the Horsefair Shopping street is a disgrace to look at especially as an entry/exit portal to and from Kidderminster. It certainly does not give a good reflection of what to expect when visiting the town.</p> <p>This area needed refurbishment 40-50 years ago and again when the ring road was developed it should have been redeveloped. The Horsefair has been totally ignored for most of this time,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>resulting in the first of possibly more buildings collapsing like the original Post Office earlier this Summer 2017, the collapse presumably occurring in part due to lack of good maintenance, which applies to most of the buildings on both sides of this short street area.</p> <p>On visual inspection alone most exposed brickwork is in desperate need of drastic repair work.</p> <p>If the Council are considering the purchase of CMS Car Sales/workshop/display ground to ensure access to new homes being built and to install a one way system at what one can only assume is a considerable purchase price plus install a new access road from the roundabout through this area at another high cost.</p> <p><b>Why not</b> actually improve the area correctly by demolishing the two rows of shops/accommodation buildings that line the road, then rebuild a new row of shops and accommodation this could be multi storey to offer a large selection of apartment sizes. This allows sufficient room for a much needed wider road approach to the ring road roundabout and access to a road network which heads towards the new housing planned area.</p> <p>This would give a dramatically improved entrance view to the town for any visitors using this arterial road from Wolverhampton and Stourbridge areas. The cost surely would be very similar to proposed alterations costs and the extra costs along with the benefits for the Town, Horsefair appeal, Horsefair small shops and residents would be immense.</p> <p>It would give excellent accommodation above the shops which could be offered to the existing tenants first, Plus excellent shops built to a suitable size for small business' and again offered to existing Horsefair business' they could have a loading/unloading rear access in Silver Street access from Radford, for vehicles and parking for residents of the flats.</p>
Historic England	<a href="#">LPPO1292</a>	30.4	Comment	There is mention in paragraph 30.4 about historic buildings being retained on site - are these heritage assets?

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO917</a>	30.5	Comment	'Spennells Brook' should read 'Hoo Brook'
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1074</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>We have significant reservations about some allocations proposed under this policy. Overarching issues are set out in comments we make under Policy 6D and elsewhere. We urge you to take these comments into account but we also wish to provide further information here.</p> <p><u>Sites in Table 31.0.1</u></p> <p>Allocations BW4 and OC 4 may have adverse impacts on the adjacent Hurcott and Podmore Pool SSSI and the NERC listed Hornet Robberfly. These and other biodiversity implications need further consideration prior to finalising the allocations though we note the commentary in paragraph 31.3 of the consultation document. OC12 and 13 North are likely to affect designated sites including, Spennells Valley and Hoo Brook Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). So far as we can ascertain the allocations are not underpinned by up to date ecological information and so the assumptions in the SA (suggesting positive biodiversity outcomes) seem extremely optimistic. Whilst mitigation for some of the biodiversity issues may well be possible it will require land take that is likely to have implications for the net developable area (and accordingly the number of dwellings allocated) set out in the plan.</p> <p>WFR/ST1 appears to directly overlap Captains Pool LWS and so we object to the allocation as it stands. Further work to determine the net developable area and any indirect biodiversity implications will be needed prior to finalising the allocation or it is likely to be found unsound.</p> <p><u>Sites in Table 31.0.2</u></p> <p>OC13 South, WFR/ST/2. We object to these allocations because of their likely impact on</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Captains and Stanklyn Pools and Spennells Valley LWS and species of principle importance listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, including Corn Bunting and Tower Mustard. Notwithstanding the fact that large parts of the sites would be left undeveloped we do 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. Further comments on these Option A allocations can be found elsewhere in our response.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2917</a></p>	<p>Policy 31</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>I live along Hurcott Lane, by the Pool and have some safety concerns that I think should be considered.</p> <p>Daily, I observe local people of all ages, in groups and alone, with dogs and children, dice with death as they experience 'near misses' from speeding cars, lorries and vans that hurtle through the village between the two main roads. It is only a matter of time before there is a fatal accident.</p> <p>If more houses are to be built, and more people enabled to access this wonderful haven of nature, it is imperative that some safety measures be put in place. A suggestion would be to separate the two access routes from the main roads. i.e. maintain access from the A456 up to the woodland entrance but no further and maintain access from the A451 up to the woodland entrance but no further. Drivers would then drive back up the way they came down, on both sides. The car park could be split in two and fenced off, to accommodate both entrances and ensure that it couldn't be used as a 'cut through'. This would reduce vehicles speeding through and causing a danger to pedestrians, children, dogs and residents.</p> <p>I am also aware of the proposal to build the housing in areas where facilities are limited and road access is poor, i.e. Offmore, at the back of Baldwin Road and at the back of Hurcott on the Stourbridge Road. This would increase traffic in the dangerous zones, as people will have to drive more to shops and schools. 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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3508</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The web pages are not user friendly, neither is this form. It is difficult to choose a particular section from the document. I have however been to a consultation meeting, talked with officers and perused the documentation.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The statement that there is not enough brownfield land in the area to cope with the amount of housing required raises the question of whether the land within Kidderminster is zoned appropriately. There are an awful lot of empty offices which could be converted into living accommodation and reinvigorate the town centre.</p> <p>Land banking needs to be stopped.</p> <p>The plan seems to pursue urban sprawl and needs to be more imaginative, without building on farmland.</p>
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO219</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>As with our comments on the planning application relating to Lea Castle Hospital there is a need to ensure onsite playing field is protected AND improved as well as other provision made in the light of the PPS recommendations to ensure there is no loss of playing field and that new provision is made to meet the additional needs generated by the proposal.</p> <p>New provision will also 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 which they all contribute to rather than having several single pitch sites across individual extension plots as this is not sustainable.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO959</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Allocation of sites east of Kidderminster will encourage commuting to Birmingham. Wyre Forest is not part of the Birmingham/Black Country Housing Market Area and this will worsen traffic in Blakedown / Hagley. Bypass around Hagley would be required which would probably</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				make sites unviable.
	<a href="#">LPPO344</a>	Lea Castle - All Options	Object	<p>I am totally 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, all should be encased in woodlands for wildlife. Development would put extra pressure on an already busy A449 and Stourbridge Road.</p> <p>I agree for dwellings to sit on the blue print of Lea Castle only. These should be used to cater for the housing needs of Cookley residents already on the waiting list. I therefore reject and object to option A and B.</p> <p>I also reject it on the grounds of local plan vision for the area in 2034 we want Cookley to continue to maintain its distinctive and separate identity and to grow organically to meet our own community needs... It also says section 3.2 of vision for the area to protect and support the role of the Green Belt, if these visions go ahead you will be contradicted 3.2 point 6 this plan goes beyond a limited incursion of Green Belt land.</p> <p>We are a village and wish to remain that.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO740</a>	Policy 31	Object	Surrounding Green Belt fields used for walking and new development will erode this. Noise will destroy peaceful countryside
	<a href="#">LPPO2015</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How are people supposed to make informed choices/engage in consultation without adequate information indicating scale/what is to be built where?</li> <li>2. What infrastructure is planned to support extra housing- new school places, roads/parking, more GP surgeries will be needed. Access to/from of Comberton Park Road at school times is already very hard.</li> <li>3. What are green spaces in plans?</li> <li>4. I 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</li> </ol>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				environment. The financial aspect also sounds prohibitive.
	<a href="#">LPPO2066</a>	Lea Castle General	Object	<p>I agree with building more affordable housing- a small proportion of the planned 6,000 houses and location uncertain.</p> <p>Villages like Cookley cannot be made.</p> <p>Would need more schools/doctors capacity and entertainment Build in Kidderminster town centre first to reduce traffic/pollution and save Green Belt.</p>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1423</a>	Policy 31	Support	<p>Gladman supports need to plan for growth in Kidderminster. Agree that this is likely to require carefully considered GB release. Support proposed intention to review Green Belt.</p> <p>GBBR Part I - note conclusions on parcel NE1 - contributes to purpose of GB to prevent encroachment of urban edge into open countryside. GBBR part II - site WFR/WC/16 (land south of Park Gate Road) - support conclusion that development here would not be out of character or proportion with area.</p> <p>GBBR Part I on parcel N6 also noted - contributes to purpose of preventing encroachment into open countryside. Gladman consider that this parcel should have been considered in part II and should be considered for release for development. It is well contained and with careful masterplanning could contribute positively towards establishment of strong new relationship between town and country.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2682</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The population of Kidderminster over the last few years as remained fairly static and this proposal will unnecessarily attract more people into the area with the following consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of a tremendous amount of Green Belt and agricultural working farm land.</li> <li>• The loss of wildlife in the nearby woodland areas. The Council has a duty to protect</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>woodland and the wild life under the UK BIO Diversity Action Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of valuable heavily used recreational spaces for the local populace of all the age groups to enjoy.</li> <li>• Disruption of local footpaths and bridleways.</li> <li>• Loss of the natural break from the other nearby communities, creating an ugly urban sprawl.</li> <li>• More, excessive, housing would increase the Carbon Footprint.</li> <li>• Heavy traffic on local roads which are not suitable for the amount of housing proposed. They are always in a poor state of repair.</li> <li>• The proposed housing is situated too far for most people to be able to walk into town so additional bus routes would be needed.</li> <li>• There will be an over capacity for local schools, doctors and hospitals. .</li> <li>• At a time when the nearest fully functioning hospital is already stretched to capacity and under special measures and the local Kidderminster hospital is operating as a “drop in centre”, what guarantees can the Council make that the necessary amenities for healthcare would be actually provided?</li> <li>• Where will the extra funding come from at a time when the public finances in general, face sharp cuts over the next decade in face of the potential austerity brought about by BREXIT?</li> <li>• What Job opportunities are there for this added population in a run down and depleting Kidderminster, where shops and businesses are closing at an alarming rate?</li> </ul> <p>I urge the council not to consider building on the Green Belt or farmland, but to utilise as much brownfield sites as possible, and to spend the money on regenerating a rundown Town Centre.</p> <p>I strongly object to all proposals to build extra houses on Green Belt land and therefore reject option (A) of the council plan entirely for the reasons given above. However, if housing has to be built then option (B) is my preference.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2738</a>	Policy 31	Object	We would like to strongly object to this ridiculous plan.
	<a href="#">LPPO3460</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>We do not and should not build on Green Belt. There are many empty buildings in Kidderminster.</p> <p>It will cause lots of traffic on our road and create a lot of noise.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3472</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The Council has commitment and planning policy to protect the open countryside. They should therefore follow its own policies in this regard.</p> <p>Some proposed development areas are on good agricultural land (e.g. land around Spennells) and could be a visible intrusion on the landscape and detract from the surrounding landscapes with further development eroding the rural character of the area Two proposed sites (rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road) are elevated. Development here would be very visible and not blend within the area. There would also be a loss of trees and hedgerows, community leisure spaces and public rights of way.</p> <p>In addition, some proposed development sites have steep gradients (land at Baldwin Road and near Hurcott for example) and parts of the sites which could cause flooding issues from run-off. Some fields afford natural drainage and there could be increased problems in the Spennells area where STW have already had to address flood defences.</p> <p>Some proposed sites are very near SSSIs. The land behind Baldwin Road and either side of A456 and at Spennells are teemed with wildlife – in particular a number of breeding skylarks, linnets, corn buntings, yellow hammers, house sparrows, sparrow hawks, owls, herons, plus badgers and bats. Development could result in loss of wildlife habitat and permanent urbanisation of important landscapes.</p> <p>Some areas of proposed housing development and the associated increase in vehicular movement would have a further detrimental impact upon air quality within the existing</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>AQMA and residents' health plus the increase in noise. Some of these proposed developments would therefore be contrary to the NPPF. E.g. increase in traffic to the Horsefair from proposed housing around Hurcott Village (both sides), Lea Castle site and Sladen School site. The A449 and A451 lead to the Horsefair, so does Hurcott Road which would see a large increase in traffic. This would cause longer tail-backs either side of the lights, increased air pollution and potential for increased damage to vehicles.</p> <p>Road capacity is lacking and some roads simply cannot be enhanced to take extra capacity. Means of access to some proposed sites would be difficult to overcome. There is a shortage of primary school places – many primary schools in WFDC area are already full to capacity (e.g. Offmore and Spennells are full and can not be expanded). Many GP surgeries in WFDC area are already fully stretched, as are hospitals. It is also very unlikely that new open spaces, parks or community centres would be provided by any of the developers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2566</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I <u>strongly object</u> to Option A in particular East of Kidderminster for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt and threat of loss of existing rights of way. If all brownfield sites are used then only a small amount of the least environmentally-attractive Green Belt is needed.</li> <li>• The new development will increase pressures on schools, hospitals, doctors and social care.</li> <li>• There is little chance of employment development or growth in Kidderminster and job prospects are bleak. Either Option A or B will result in Kidderminster becoming an even larger commuter town, resulting in traffic gridlock at peak times.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>I am proud of Kidderminster and the surrounding countryside, please think again and not be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				driven by hungry developers who will be here today and gone tomorrow.
	<a href="#">LPPO2668</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>Why desecrate good farm land while these eyesores remain?</p> <p>Not to mention the loss of habitat to wildlife and recreational facilities. The area is already crowded and does not need further housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2712</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I <u>strongly object</u> to Option A in particular Policy 31.5 - Kidderminster Urban Extension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing rights of way. Only a small amount of Green Belt is needed if all brownfield sites identified are used in the first instance.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. This area is home to Kingfishers, Skylarks, Corn Bunting, Song Thrush and Mistle Thrush, bats, grass snakes, badgers all protected species.</li> <li>• Increase pressures on schools, hospitals, doctors and social care.</li> <li>• There may be TPOs at the far end of Captains Pool.</li> <li>• There are interconnecting brooks/streams between Captains Pool and other pools in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Surely this area for consideration under Option A must be a 'SITE OF BIODIVERSITY AND GEOLOGICAL CONSERVATION VALUE' in particular the pools, streams and brooks that support our varied wildlife and if not it should be. See attached document.</p> <p>What assurance is given from WFDC that if Option A was chosen that all necessary legislation has been complied with backed up field studies in order to maintain a wider buffer wildlife corridor to protect all pools, streams, brooks, trees and hedgerows so that any one part of the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>system will not fail and cause the drying out of any of the above. If yes is this information available.</p> <p>If work commences at Captains and the Lodge off Kittiwake Drive where will the access be located. Recent planning permission for additional storage of caravans on this site was refused due in part to access and Green Belt issues. (Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/09/2118087 Captains, Bromsgrove Road, Stone, Kidderminster, DY10 4AJ) In addition I believe Tree Preservation Orders exist in this area have all TPO's been identified</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2872</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>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.</p> <p>Development within the Green Belt to the east and south of the town, including Option A, will lead to considerable increased congestion. This is acknowledged under the section in the review "Transport and Accessibility"</p> <p>There is no clear indication of how the development to the south and east of the town would be accessed. The estate roads on Spennells and Offmore are already congested and of insufficient width to take additional traffic.</p> <p>Even without the proposed new development car ownership is projected to grow in the coming years providing greater pressure on the existing estate roads. Further new developments are also being proposed on brownfield sites within the existing town with a bias to the eastern side namely the Stourminster school site (56 dwellings), Comberton Place (23), Victoria Carpet Sports Ground (45) as well as numerous other brownfield sites within the town which will put pressure on the arterial roads of the town.</p> <p>There is already considerable congestion at the roundabouts on the Worcester Road with Wilden Lane and the Chester Road South and also the Worcester Road Stourport Road</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>roundabout.</p> <p>At rush hour there is congestion on roads out of Kidderminster particularly at Mustow Green and on the Worcester Road.</p> <p>Near doubling of the Spennells estate would completely alter its character and due to its size and isolation from the towns facilities may lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>The proposals would lead to the loss of amenity and good agricultural land. The area behind Spennells (Option A) is high quality agricultural land. It provides an attractive barrier to the Spennells and provides valuable walking and recreational facilities for the estate. In addition these fields provide a wildlife habitat for protected species such as Bats and Skylarks. The Sustainability Appraisal recognises this 'this option would have an impact on the Green Belt, a loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land and would have a significant effect on the character of the area.'</p> <p>There are many mature and attractive trees growing along the A448 into Kidderminster. It is not clear how the necessary estate roads would link into the A448 and the eastern relief road if built. It is likely that the A448 would need substantial improvement which would lead to loss of this attractive corridor of trees which provide an attractive barrier to the road. Any proposal needs to safeguard this corridor.</p> <p>For these reasons Option A should not be adopted. If Green Belt land is required that should not be substantially based to the east of the town due to the likelihood of congestion and loss of amenity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3161</a>	Policy 31	Object	Development in the Green Belt should NOT be considered until all possible brown field sites and areas of dereliction have been utilized.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>If we are that short of housing why on earth did you sanction a KFC and a Starbucks on Stourport Road. There are plenty fast food establishments in Kidderminster.</p> <p>The council would be better to promote affordable housing on that site than sanction fast food outlets in the middle of an obesity epidemic!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3272</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I object to development at Cookley, Hurcott and Spennells.</p> <p>Large numbers of additional housing on one side of Kidderminster will put strain on the inadequate infrastructure, increase congestion, pollution and change the character of independent communities, particularly Cookley, Hurcott and Stone.</p> <p>Development will encroach onto pasture land, green field and Green Belt areas. This will affect wildlife and remove amenity areas enjoyed by the communities.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3282</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I disagree with the proposal of option A for a number of reasons. This would impact deeply on the Green Belt area which is an important part of keeping the town separate from the West Midlands Conurbation. The main focus of this proposal seems to be the Eastern Bypass which would be extremely expensive and surely adding a bridge over the railway near Hartlebury would solve the need for this road as Lorries would be able to access the roads that go around the town. This Bypass would also have to be elevated which means there would need to be a buffer from the traffic noise. This along with development behind Baldwin Road which would be considerably higher than the houses that are there at the moment and would put a great deal of extra pressure on Hurcott Lane.</p> <p>Having developments behind Baldwin Road and Hurcott would impact the wildlife habitats around Hurcott woods. There is also apparently endangered bird species in this area: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers and Skylarks.</p> <p>I also do not see how the school provision would work with a development behind Spennells</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and Offmore. Even if an extra Primary school was built how would the local High Schools be able to cope especially as they are situated on sites with restricted space.</p> <p>I think there should be some development on the Lea Castle site and the development should be dispersed. There is already a great deal of development on the Silverwoods sites which are not all occupied it seems silly to concentrate all the developments in one area if they might not be filled. I also think that the situation in the Town Centre could be addressed. The council own 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. Even though it probably costs more to develop these areas than the Green Belt I think it should be done. There are a number of primary school sites that are still unused- Sion Hill school still stands and probably costs a fortune to protect from vandalism.</p> <p>I also think that there should be more development in Stourport, there would be scope for another High School which would give people more choice.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3449</a>	Policy 31	Object	Green Belt land is essential to maintain wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO3458</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Environmental Damage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on brown field sites should be executed before Green Belt is even considered.</li> <li>• The vehicle increases are at odds with the commitments to improve air quality in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Impact on local wildlife</li> </ul> <p>Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of local community</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Infrastructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our local schools, GP surgeries and road systems are already stretched</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3471</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The Council has commitment and planning policy to protect the open countryside. They should therefore follow its own policies in this regard.</p> <p>Some proposed development areas are on good agricultural land (e.g. land around Spennells) and could be a visible intrusion on the landscape and detract from the surrounding landscapes with further development eroding the rural character of the area Two proposed sites (rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road) are elevated. Development here would be very visible and not blend within the area. There would also be a loss of trees and hedgerows, community leisure spaces and public rights of way.</p> <p>In addition, some proposed development sites have steep gradients (land at Baldwin Road and near Hurcott for example) and parts of the sites which could cause flooding issues from run-off. Some fields afford natural drainage and there could be increased problems in the Spennells area where STW have already had to address flood defences.</p> <p>Some proposed sites are very near SSSIs. The land behind Baldwin Road and either side of A456 and at Spennells are teemed with wildlife – in particular a number of breeding skylarks, linnets, corn buntings, yellow hammers, house sparrows, sparrow hawks, owls, herons, plus badgers and bats. Development could result in loss of wildlife habitat and permanent urbanisation of important landscapes.</p> <p>Some areas of proposed housing development and the associated increase in vehicular movement would have a further detrimental impact upon air quality within the existing AQMA and residents’ health plus the increase in noise. Some of these proposed developments would therefore be contrary to the NPPF. E.g. increase in traffic to the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Horsefair from proposed housing around Hurcott Village (both sides), Lea Castle site and Sladen School site. The A449 and A451 lead to the Horsefair, so does Hurcott Road which would see a large increase in traffic. This would cause longer tail-backs either side of the lights, increased air pollution and potential for increased damage to vehicles.</p> <p>Road capacity is lacking and some roads simply cannot be enhanced to take extra capacity. Means of access to some proposed sites would be difficult to overcome. There is a shortage of primary school places – many primary schools in WFDC area are already full to capacity (e.g. Offmore and Spennells are full and can not be expanded). Many GP surgeries in WFDC area are already fully stretched, as are hospitals. It is also very unlikely that new open spaces, parks or community centres would be provided by any of the developers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3488</a>	Policy 31	Comment	Please ensure that the Husum Way Junction on the A459 Birmingham Rd junction is made safe.
	<a href="#">LPPO3502</a>	Lea Castle General	Comment	<p>Any adopted option for the development of the Lea Castle Hospital site should not result in "joining" existing development at the north of Kidderminster to create a continuous "sprawl" and that the Green Belt buffer is maintained or increased.</p> <p>Develop Lea Castle so as to be "self-contained".</p> <p>The village of Cookley is a clearly defined settlement and its existing services (e.g. primary school, doctors surgery) would be unable to cope with further demand from the Lea Castle Hospital development.</p> <p>The crossing of the A449 near the Cookley turning is notorious accident blackspot and consideration should be given to the Lea Castle proposal to have vehicular access to the development at the junction of the A449/The Crescent.</p> <p>Include sustainable transport provision such as cycle lanes/bus services, esp. between the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				new settlement/Broadwaters and Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO3283</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I disagree with the proposal of option A for a number of reasons. This would impact deeply on the Green Belt area which is an important part of keeping the town separate from the West Midlands Conurbation. The main focus of this proposal seems to be the Eastern Bypass which would be extremely expensive and surely adding a bridge over the railway near Hartlebury would solve the need for this road as Lorries would be able to access the roads that go around the town. This Bypass would also have to be elevated which means there would need to be a buffer from the traffic noise. This along with development behind Baldwin Road which would be considerably higher than the houses that are there at the moment and would put a great deal of extra pressure on Hurcott Lane.</p> <p>Having developments behind Baldwin Road and Hurcott would impact the wildlife habitats around Hurcott woods. There is also apparently endangered bird species in this area: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers and Skylarks.</p> <p>I also do not see how the school provision would work with a development behind Spennells and Offmore. Even if an extra Primary school was built how would the local High Schools be able to cope especially as they are situated on sites with restricted space.</p> <p>I think there should be some development on the Lea Castle site and the development should be dispersed. There is already a great deal of development on the Silverwoods sites which are not all occupied it seems silly to concentrate all the developments in one area if they might not be filled. I also think that the situation in the Town Centre could be addressed. The council own 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. Even though it probably costs more to develop these areas than the Green Belt I think it should be done. There are a number of primary school sites that are still unused- Sion Hill school still stands and probably costs a fortune to protect from vandalism.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				I also think that there should be more development in Stourport, there would be scope for another High School which would give people more choice.
	<a href="#">LPPO2894</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>Concerned resident living on the A456 in Hagley.</p> <p>The air pollution that this road creates will potentially cause significant health problems.</p> <p>If we have further development on the south eastern side of Kidderminster this will result in a further increase in traffic volume causing further traffic congestion and increased pollution.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4176</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>The proposed expansion can only result in Kidderminster becoming a satellite town for Birmingham. Joining the existing dormitory towns of Bromsgrove, Redditch, Lichfield and Tamworth WFDC may refer optimistically to new employment coming into the town with the new housing. 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. Therefore, the only result of in-migration will be an increase in commuting. Incoming families will shop where they work in Birmingham - consequently money will not go into the local economy.</p> <p>From the West Midlands agricultural land survey, it can be seen that the site of the proposed housing development lies within an area of agricultural land graded as ‘Very Good’ by Natural England. Land with 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO160</a>	Policy 31	Comment	What sort of housing is planned in Kidderminster extension? Is it all detached family houses or are bungalows or flats proposed? Concerned about impact on roads which are already congested. Offmore primary is full and little room to expand. No mention of community

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>facilities for the Hurcott Road development but this number of houses will mean significantly more people for school, shops etc.</p> <p>Would like to see more imaginative solutions provided for housing than just big blocks of new development. Are there old industrial sites or town centre buildings that could provide some property and move people to the town centre to use shops there?</p>
Kidderminster Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1168</a>	Lea Castle - General	Support	The Lea Castle site should be used to its maximum potential as this parcel of land, with the extension, will provide many residential units, including affordable and social housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO696</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<u>Policy 7 and 31</u> — We agree with the notion that the Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC. since the 1970s and note WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district. This policy draft states that the Spatial Strategy seeks to minimise impact on the Green Belt. Minimal impact would be better achieved as discussed above, by removing a larger volume of smaller sites across the district rather than a smaller number of large sites which will have greater impact. This would better contain development and prevent urban sprawl in larger volumes in more limited areas which is in conflict with the requirements of the Green Belt as outlined in the NPPF
	<a href="#">LPPO1890</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Opposed to developing on greenfield land. All the lovely walks will be gone – our wildlife and nature is already under threat – please do not assume that green land doesn't matter to us, as it really does.</p> <p>Concerned about traffic congestion in Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2046</a>	Policy 31	Object	Kittiwake Drive is listed as having a flood risk. Any extra building upstream of this will increase this risk. If these developments go ahead the culverts, that the Hoo Brook flows through, will need to be a lot larger. Presently, it would not take much drift wood and rubbish to block the culvert near the junction of Kittiwake Drive and Herons Wood Road.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Chester Road and Spennells Valley Road regularly becomes grid locked in the mornings and sometimes in the afternoons, or when there is a problem with the M5 or 6. Any more housing and you can forget about getting through Kidderminster at all.
King Charles I School, Kidderminster	<a href="#">LPPO2285</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>The Governing Body has considered the Wyre Forest Local Plan proposals and the two options contained therein in the context of their possible impact on the educational needs of the community for the future.</p> <p>We are satisfied that our School has sufficient capacity to deal with the effects of both options which are under consideration should either ultimately be adopted.</p> <p>We intend to follow closely the progress of the Review process and to assess its potential impact on the provision of secondary education locally so we will be in a position to accommodate the children of families who in due course come to reside in any new residential developments in Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2342</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I object to building adjacent to Spennells/Comberton &amp; Offmore:</p> <p>Traffic/pollution would increase</p> <p>Pressure on school places/Drs, Hospitals/Opticians and Dentists.</p> <p>Regenerate Brownfield site e.g. Lea Castle, the old war hostel in Stone inc Grain Dryer, the former Glades site, Crown House and the empty buildings in Park Lane, Kidderminster plus any others in Bewdley/Stourport.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2343</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I object to building adjacent to Spennells/Comberton &amp; Offmore:</p> <p>Traffic/pollution would increase</p> <p>Pressure on school places/Drs, Hospitals/Opticians and Dentists.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Use Brownfield for regeneration which would save the Green Belt/wildlife:  e.g. Lea Castle, the old war hostel in Stone inc Grain Dryer, the former Glades site, Crown House and the empty buildings in Park Lane, Kidderminster plus any others in Bewdley/Stourport
	<a href="#">LPPO2396</a>	Policy 31	Object	I have recently returned back home to Kidderminster after 3 years at University. As someone who in the near future will be looking to move out of my parents' home and into my own property, I would like to express my opinions about the planning proposals.  Both proposals A and B propose to build houses on green land behind established housing estates. Not only do I believe that this will destroy beautiful nature and land, I also believe that it would make the houses less desirable for incoming residents. Plans A and B would leave house hunters dissatisfied. These developments would have no heart, and would leave house hunters reluctant to move here due to the lack of school places available with Offmore Primary being full.
	<a href="#">LPPO2681</a>	Policy 31	Object	I hope the Council watched Dispatches about the big builders carving up the Green Belt land for development.  Don't make the same mistakes please with Kidderminster
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1198</a>	Policy 31	Object	Concern with proposed Kidderminster Urban Extensions:  WFR/WC/15 – Lea Castle Hospital – Site Allocations Plan identifies Lea Castle Hospital site as suitable location for business (B1), health and sports facilities, residential institutions (C2) and residential (C3) uses. Policy advice is that any application for C3 dwellings must be accompanied by a viability assessment that supports a case for the proposed mix, tenure and overall quantum/density of housing on the site to facilitate the other uses. The emerging plan has moved away from this approach by suggesting that the site should be developed for 600



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>dwelling. Not aware of evidence to demonstrate that the site has been properly marketed as a mixed use led scheme with enabling residential development. Inappropriate for the status of the site to be changed from that in the Site Allocations Plan. SHLAA advises the site is considered to be 'achievable' subject to 'site viability'. Not aware of detailed evidence that explores the viability of the site for residential development and the implications for affordable housing provision. This allocation is inappropriate.</p> <p>BW/4 – Hurcott ADR – The site is also clearly a sensitive Green Belt site and this must be weighed up as part of the “exceptional circumstances” test when considering releasing the site from the Green Belt. This process has not been undertaken, as such the allocation should be removed.</p> <p>WFR/CB7 et al – East of Kidderminster Road – Concerned about this allocation given the conclusion of the Green Belt assessment. Parts of the site are identified as having a 'significant contribution' to the Green Belt by the Green Belt assessment (e.g. WFR/CB7 addition). The Green Belt assessment looks at each individual parcel of land for its contribution towards the Green Belt in isolation. 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.</p> <p>Sections of this site would not be permitted for development by the land owner according to the SHLAA (site OC/6 for example). The availability of all the site is, therefore, questionable.</p> <p>Questionable whether such a large amount of housing in this location could be built out during the Plan Period. Core Sites to the east of Kidderminster are in close proximity to one another. This is also true of the further urban extensions proposed under Options A and B. Between them these sites have the capacity to deliver between 3,615 and 2,895 dwellings. Will take a number of years before a start can be made on site, dwellings likely to be delivered during last ten years of the plan period. The housing market will not sustain the number of sales to deliver this quantum development in close proximity to another. If these</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>sites are allocated they will deliver long beyond the plan period. As such, the capacity of the sites during the Plan Period should be significantly reduced. In our view a 50% reduction should be the minimum.</p> <p>WFR/WC/16 and WFR/WC/32 – Lea Castle Hospital Extensions – Not possible for the east of Kidderminster to sustain the completion rates required to deliver the urban extension allocations in this location during the course of a plan period. In addition, this site is 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1604</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Objects to sites being allocated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on highways</li> <li>• impact on wildlife</li> <li>• loss of good agricultural land</li> <li>• loss of and impact on Green Belt</li> <li>• loss of amenity</li> <li>• noise and air pollution</li> </ul> <p>(also see comments raised on various sections of the document)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2694</a>	Lea Castle General	Object	<p>I had a few concerns regarding the housing development of the Lea Castle site. I understand the plans have gone ahead for housing but many are concerned it is aggressive and will have an impact on the nearby villages. Cookley is a village that is separate from Kidderminster. I therefore hope that a large majority of the Green Belt land can be saved to maintain the beautiful landscapes and the village.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3005</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly object to any proposal to add pockets of new housing around the area, specifically the rear of Baldwin Road, around Offmore and Comberton towards Hodge hill, and extending the Spennells estate. Green Belt land ought to be protected; it is home to a variety of animal species, including some endangered birds, and the Green Belt is what</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>separates Kidderminster from the West Midlands conurbation. 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.</p> <p>Aside from the destruction of wildlife habitats and open green spaces which so many enjoy, the proposals to add pockets of housing are not viable owing to a lack of infrastructure to support a growing population. New primary schools will be required and Offmore School cannot expand further. The roads around the area suffer from congestion most times of the day, whether it is school holidays with people travelling through for the safari park, or term time when people are simply trying to get to work. Current proposals would require a major Eastern bypass otherwise even the current rat runs will become congested. However such a road would need an expensive railway bridge and a 30m min tree screen to buffer housing from traffic noise. Pockets of linear housing would have no facilities such as a school or community centre.</p> <p>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. Yet we now suffer from a major drug crime epidemic and anti social behaviour as the town centre gradually becomes derelict; this is especially true around Worcester Road and Bromsgrove Street since the leisure centre facilities moved out of town. 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3183</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>Any objections we raise are motivated by a desire to keep our rural environment – to keep things how they were when we decided to live where we live and to preserve as much as we can the value of our home.</p> <p>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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				relief road doesn't materialize? Presumably chronic congestion on the existing estate roads.
	<a href="#">LPPO1887</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Overall, object to both options A and B.</p> <p>The eastern side of Kidderminster would bear the brunt of development and a higher proportion of Green Belt would be lost than the figures quoted – thus bringing us nearer to the West Midlands conurbation.</p> <p>The land around Offmore is very versatile agricultural land. There are no public rights of way so it is a wildlife haven for bats, owls, foxes, badgers, hares and many endangered species of birds. Development would destroy their habitat. Previous planning at Offmore Farm was very restricted because of the bat roost. The suggested relief road would not relieve traffic in Kidderminster, only more problems to another replace. It would only serve as a distributor road to service any new housing development. One or possibly two railway bridges would be necessary to take any road to join A456, the cost of this would be prohibitive and no private developer would pay for it. If funded by central government the cost would then fall to the tax payer. The prospect of a relief road running into Husum Way is extremely worrying. The junction is already dangerous and then even more heavy traffic is alarming.</p> <p>Blakedown station has inadequate parking facilities and a large influx of people would cause more problems for local residents.</p> <p>We feel that brownfield sites and ex-factory building etc. should be prioritised and land in and around Lea Castle would be expanded to Axborough Land, to build homes. This would have less impact on local residents and the environment. It also has better access than land around Offmore and Comberton. The Lionfields site should be used for affordable and social housing to bring vitality into the town centre.</p> <p>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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				We oppose to both option A & B for the reasons stated.
	<a href="#">LPPO2005</a>	Lea Castle General	Comment	Comment on the Lea Castle site:  We need shops, school, doctors, and some activity for children.
	<a href="#">LPPO2171</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to keep the Green Belt land.</li> <li>• SSSI in the area re important for our future.</li> <li>• There are other areas to develop.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2284</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>To loose Green Belt on the eastern side of Kidderminster would make our town just like all the faceless areas of Birmingham and the West Midlands. 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, otherwise who would know if you are just arriving or leaving Kidderminster, also to loose the fields on the eastern side of our town would tragically see the end of the most the wildlife living there.</p> <p>There is wheat growing in the field at the moment and produce has been grown there every year since we came here fourteen years ago. Surely getting rid of all that farmland would reduce the amount of local food produce available to us.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3442</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will totally destroy beautiful countryside.</li> <li>• It will take habitat away for any wildlife, trees and plants.</li> <li>• Using Green Belt land will also cause more pollution.</li> <li>• Schools, GP practices, hospitals are already bursting with the capacity.</li> <li>• It will make the town over populated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3450</a>	Policy 31	Object	The area is a treasured green field site and is home to many different plants and wildlife. The area is also useful for leisurely activities.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2528</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposals to extend Kidderminster in a north-easterly direction as proposed by Policy 31. The proposed plan Policy would cumulatively create a linear extension of Kidderminster towards the north-east and the merging of the built form with the southern edge of Cookley, resulting in loss of Green Belt land and unacceptable urban sprawl by creating a corridor of continuous development between the two settlements.</p> <p>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. Whilst acknowledging that the Lea Castle hospital site has been previously developed, the site is distant and disconnected from Kidderminster town centre and the proposed policy, in utilising the site for housing, in combination with either Option A or Option B sites does not provide for any gain or improve the sustainability of the location. Limited public transport facilities, combined with the lack of retail provision, would result in residents would be reliant upon car transport to access services. A more sustainable use of the site, utilising the existing building footprints and acknowledging the parkland setting should be sought.</p> <p>Inclusion of these parcels of greenfield, Green Belt land for development combined with the Lea Castle site will actively encourage urban sprawl to the north-east and thus should be removed from the Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2532</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I write to express my grave disappointment that the council would even consider the destruction of the Green Belt surrounding Kidderminster, let alone the apparent large-scale disregard that the local plan review seems to favour.</p> <p>We live in Cookley which, I am sure you are aware, is one of the many established, self-sustaining villages around Kidderminster and is inset in Green Belt. It, and the surrounding villages, is/are not extensions of Kidderminster and destruction of the Green Belt in order to make this so by building more houses than any available paperwork (other than the local plan) suggests are needed meeting the need of Cookley as an inset village (and the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>surrounding inset villages) which the WFDC is supposed to have an obligation to protect?</p> <p>Therefore we oppose the Local Plan Review for usage of the Green Belt but are happy for usage of brownfield sites without extension onto the Green Belt (such as removal of the woodland around the Lea Castle Site).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2535</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to Options A and B (all development on Green Belt land).</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to large scale development on Green Belt land. I believe the land should be protected from development as Green Belt status should ensure. I feel that there are plenty of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest that could accommodate the proposed housing development.</p> <p>I also do not feel that the sites have the infrastructure to cope with the additional population. Traffic on the Spennells estate at peak times is already extremely heavy. I do not believe that the link road being proposed would do anything to alleviate the problem as it would have to cross one of the major routes hereby creating further congestion. There is also insufficient educational provision for the additional population. There are not enough school places in the local schools and no new school is included in the plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2295</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I do not think the benefits of easier school provision and eastern bypass option outweigh large scale expansion east of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3769</a>	Policy 31	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. 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>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>
	<a href="#">LPPO3787</a>	Policy 31 - Urban Extensions	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</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>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 &amp; 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><b>Hurcott Woods and Village</b></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<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 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>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2708</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the Local Plan Review because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Green Belt should be protected land that preserves the rural nature of the community and stops urban sprawls into the countryside.</li> <li>2. There are ample brown field sites in the District, that should be developed first: empty industrial factories, waste land and empty shops.</li> <li>3. Kidderminster is already a busy commuter town. Adding major developments to the Spennells estate would just exacerbate problems: commuting during peak times, added demands to local schools, hospitals, doctors, road structure, car pollution, etc.</li> <li>4. If you allow any more development in the Green Belt, there will be no stopping it and whole villages will be swallowed up by larger towns.</li> <li>5. Existing Green Belt is for wildlife, flora and fauna. Not for further housing developments.</li> <li>6. If you approve the local plan, then Option B is preferred because it shares the development around the District, rather than just putting it all together on the Spennells, Offmore and Comberton Estates. Other parts of the District should share the developments and responsibility.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3577</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>You are taking away the Green Belt land which is home to a massive amount of wildlife. We teach children to preserve and look after this wildlife but this ideal is lost when money is involved.</p> <p>I am 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. The additional pressure on hospitals, doctors, dentists and schools, it was really quite the challenge to get appointments at my doctor's surgery that they changed the appointments system as it is!</p> <p>I bought my house with the view that I have and I love it, this will be destroyed when the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				houses are built.  We have a very beautiful countryside that is right on everyone's doorstep, people can access the wildlife, birds, badgers, hedgehogs, bats, flowers, rabbits etc on our lovely public walkways and paths. I appreciate the need for more housing, but there is also a need for a healthy population, as humans we have a need for a quiet environment, this area gives us endless health benefits and therefore we should preserve what we have.
	<a href="#">LPPO3580</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Concerned about Hurcott Village as it is already used as a rat run.</li> <li>Road is not large enough to take the traffic now - this can only get worse.</li> <li>All infrastructure in the area is already under considerable pressure.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3509</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>It will create more congestion in that area.</p> <p>So of the 2 options I prefer the more dispersed one.</p> <p>I am not convinced of the need to build so much housing on virgin land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4529</a>	Lea Castle General	Support	I believe that the building should actually be in Lea Castle as this would be of benefit to that area and sustain schools in that area such as Wolverley.
	<a href="#">LPPO3571</a>	31.1	Object	The 'necessary housing' has been falsely derived by a flawed OAHN report. This document dismisses three independent analysis in favour of one that supports the Council's original agenda. The Council has misled the Community with the scale of future provision. The scale of development will unbalance the town of Kidderminster converting it into an urbanised sprawl

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>unattractive to tourist so vital to the economy. It is unnecessary to pave over Green Belt when other forms of buildings can be considered within the curtilage of the existing town boundary utilising modern design of apartments to suit affordable housing. The idea to continually spread out over fields is ill thought through and destructive to the wider landscape, viability of remaining farming and detrimental to wildlife. The proposed mitigation in the form of education and community facilities simply undermines the relevance of the town centre. The proposed relief road will simply attract more vehicles along the A449/A456 route decreasing safety and isolating the town centre from custom. The statement is in direct contradiction to 25.2. I object strongly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4570</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc “ However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> <li>3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley &amp; Cookley Parish.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4571</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc “ However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley & Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO1080</a>	31.1	Object	<p>31.1 states “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 would counter that for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brown field sites that are not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park, Wolverley, partially owned by the Council and with limited economic benefit to the area; and the site of the old quarry on the opposite side of the B4189 to the above site. There is brownfield land still not built on behind The Range at Crossley Park in Kidderminster.</li> <li>• I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any 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”. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4560</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc “ However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> <li>3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley &amp; Cookley Parish.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4576</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				land...etc “ However:  1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others. 2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers 3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley & Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4699</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4700</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4708</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4846</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4767</a>	31.2	Comment	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. I wonder if you could explain to me please why it is felt necessary to desecrate an area of woodland and destroy the homes of countless species of wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO4575</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4930</a>	31.2	Comment	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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO5134</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4764</a>	31.2	Comment	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. I wonder if you could explain to me please why it is felt necessary to desecrate an area of woodland and destroy the homes of countless species of wildlife?
	<a href="#">LPPO4559</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO2317</a>	31.2	Object	The outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO2609</a>	31.2	Object	On page 178, 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. In the face of climate change, Green Belt land has an increasingly important role in the storing of carbon and in preventing flooding and is a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection.
	<a href="#">LPPO456</a>	31.2	Comment	WFR/WC/15  Extend the Lea Castle site to use the land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of the Lea Castle site and extending the site up to Axborough Lane.  This would alleviate the need to build housing at the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Estate. It would create a sustainable community with its own Primary School, Doctors' surgery, shops etc. It would also alleviate any issues that a smaller site would have on Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO363</a>	31.2	Comment	I think that you really need to have a robust plan for traffic management - although I don't live near the Lea Castle site, I do drive past frequently: at certain times of the day, there is a



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				big queue down to the traffic lights on the A449 from Wolverley. The junction by the park gate onto the Stourbridge Road is quite blind and would need remodelling. For such a large housing development, I'd consider the instigation of a new public transport service an essential item.
	<a href="#">LPPO446</a>	31.2	Object	This paragraph refers to the 'proposed' development of up to 600 homes at Lea Castle. Once the outline planning consent has been approved, it is no longer a proposal. I've objected here, but it makes no difference at all, as you are not consulting - the decision has been taken. So this is not a consultation, it is a presentation after the fact.
	<a href="#">LPPO1081</a>	31.2	Object	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4569</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4568</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4665</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4673</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4820</a>	31.2	Comment	31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland (Green Belt) on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4885</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4906</a>	31.2	Comment	On page 178, 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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4938</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4942</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4816</a>	31.2	Comment	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).
	<a href="#">LPPO4889</a>	31.2	Object	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4934</a>	31.2	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO501</a>	31.3	Object	<p>Document is too long, too technical and too prescriptive. Ridiculous to expect people to read and digest it then comment on specific points. The timing of this review coincides with the summer holidays and the period allowed is far too short for people.</p> <p>No specific reference to proposed development along Hurcott road a single carriageway prior to entering the village of Hurcott. I wish to make an objection to any development that can be seen from the above mentioned road or Hurcott Pools nature reserve itself. Both the road and the nature reserve are used by local residents on a regular and frequent basis for recreation and appreciation of the special nature of this area. Any development which impinges on the seclusion of the road and the reserve will be detrimental to the health of the site and the well-being of a significant number of local people. In addition, any development in this area will effectively end the status of Hurcott as a village, resulting in the loss of a picturesque setting which is loved by both residents and those who visit it en route to the nature reserve, ANY development here should not happen.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO179</a>	31.3	Object	Increased development will encroach on the SSI at Podmore and increase pressure on the natural wildlife, planning was restrained in the past because of studies of the wild life and ecology of the area This must in your archives.
	<a href="#">LPPO260</a>	31.3	Object	<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.</p> <p>The proposed pathway will leave the SSSI more venerable to unwanted visitors who could harm the ecology and do untold damage to wildlife.</p> <p>In short the greater the access the more unwanted criminal activity will arise</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO716</a>	31.4	Comment	Concerned that there is no core infrastructure for all these houses. Schools/doctors in Cookley/Wolverley are full. Main roads already busy will cause gridlock.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1417</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Details of the so-called “Eastern Relief Road” are vague and not in a form that can be fairly assessed in this consultation. There is only one large-scale map with a dotted line running from approximately the junction of Stanklyn Lane with the A449 to Hodgehill. If this were the route, 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.</li> <li>2. No definitive route or traffic model has been provided for this proposal, meaning that local residents are not being provided with sufficient details to make an informed judgement. This is in breach of Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice. Local people are unable to evaluate the true effects of a proposed new road when there is no definitive route indicated.</li> <li>3. Estimation is provided in the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) of the</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>cost of building such a road to be £17.5m. A route must therefore have been put forward to enable preliminary costings and this information should have been transparent in the local plan review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The idea that this would create the means for traffic to by-pass Kidderminster en-route to Birmingham or the M5 is misleading since the A450, less than 2 miles to the east, already provides this facility. If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450 without constructing an entirely new road over Green Belt land and potentially through a new housing development, together with the hazards to residents and children this would involve. Improving the A450 would provide relief to any congestion on the A449, without bringing increased air, light and noise pollution to the already heavily-populated Spennells estate.</li> <li>5. We 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.</li> <li>6. An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster since any regeneration is desperately needed within the run-down town centre, not on the outskirts in Green Belt land.</li> <li>7. A new road would create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife (as shown in further sections below).</li> <li>8. A new road such as that floated within the Kidderminster Local Plan would cause catastrophic effects by crossing existing wildlife corridors. The Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and its green corridors would be compromised by the building of a new road – a road which is not needed for the purpose presented in the Local Plan.</li> <li>9. There would be difficulty for such a road to pass through the proposed development at OC/13 south which crosses the water course incorporating Captains Pool and the Green corridor to Stanklyn Pool in order to then link up to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</li> <li>10. 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.</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>11. A more likely route for Eastern Relief Road would necessitate the construction of an elevated bridge in order to cross the railway line, near Easter Park. Allowance would be needed for electrification of the rail line uses in the future. This would cause significant visual and noise impact upon existing Spennells residents to their obvious detriment in both health and wellbeing. The road would also have an adverse effect upon people who currently live on the Spennells estate due to increased ambient lighting, increased traffic noise, air pollution and additional traffic vibration.</p> <p>12. The construction of the Eastern Bypass is likely to encourage more car journeys to be undertaken. Although the Local Plan Review says that S-NE traffic will be diverted away from the town centre, locally generated traffic on the eastern side of Kidderminster could use the bypass as a shortcut between areas. This could lead to increased pollution including emission of CCGs, more road casualties, a reduction in walking and cycling and a consequent rise in obesity and associated health conditions.</p> <p>13. The claim that the Eastern Relief Road will facilitate an improvement in AQMA at Churchfields is bogus, since it goes nowhere near this area. The AQMA at Churchfields/Horsefair will be improved with the proposed new roads and one-way routes in the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1826</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	An eastern bypass from the A456 to the A449 is not sufficient to alleviate the traffic problems in Kidderminster, especially at weekends. What is really required is a bypass for the A456 road, to remove all the traffic congestion around the ring road past St Marys, and on the Bewdley Road.
	<a href="#">LPPO3821</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed eastern bypass will require two railway bridges at the A449 and A456 trunk roads which would be wholly or partially funded by the developers as a condition of their approval by the local authority and it may not be acceptable to developers to incur the cost of building railway bridges in add</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2496</a>	Eastern Relief	Object	I believe the consultation is not in accordance with the guidelines for Public Consultation and

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		no rationale reasoning has been given for the need of an Eastern relief road.
	<a href="#">LPPO2607</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Causall.
	<a href="#">LPPO3831</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	The proposed eastern bypass will require two railway bridges at the A449 and A456 trunk roads which would be wholly or partially funded by the developers as a condition of their approval by the local authority. This additional cost of funding the provision of railway bridges for a dual carriageway could well be prohibitive.
	<a href="#">LPPO3957</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Although the draft proposals say that an eastern by pass could be provided, this has been suggested on previous occasions and has not come to fruition due to the cost of development and would be unlikely to be paid for by any developing company whose main priority is profit. There should be no development to the east of Offmore until after an Eastern By Pass has been constructed. To do so would cause further congestion and pollution which is the opposite to what the local plan is trying to achieve.
	<a href="#">LPPO4175</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>WFDC need to explain to voters why this 21 year old proposal has now been resurrected apparently following another “useful contribution” from Greater Birmingham &amp; Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>If this by-pass was, in fact, built can WFDC confirm that there would be no need to connect to Turnstone Road which has, conveniently, been built without a turning head. Most district councils would deem it ridiculous to route additional traffic through the roads of an existing estate.</p> <p>The construction of this road would be purely to enable quicker access to the motorways for overspill commuting to Birmingham plus opening up the possibility of future housing to the south of the by-pass. This is, no doubt, why Greater Birmingham &amp; Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership are willing to contribute to construction costs</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPO4561</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<i>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.</i>
	<a href="#">LPO4929</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall
	<a href="#">LPO4837</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>There is no evidence in the report to show that a new access road, which would be essential to gain access to the sites, would relieve town centre traffic. An effective eastern relief road, relieving congestion, reducing air pollution and linking all major development sites is put forward.</p> <p>Option A would facilitate an eastern by pass and relieve congestion on the A449 and Town Centre? It is difficult to see how it would relieve the town centre. The proposed development would generate more traffic with the new road feeding existing pinch points and causing more congestion elsewhere. A more diverse development programme as in Option B is more likely to spread the load over the highway network as a whole and not have such an impact on pinch points. A traffic modelling exercise could indicate what is likely to happen. I understand that research has been carried out by Halcrow Consultants on behalf of Worcestershire County Council and a 'Wyre Forest Transport Model – March 2013' produced.</p> <p>It was explained that the exact line has, at this stage, not been determined but it would link the A449 to the A448 (Bromsgrove Road) crossing the railway line (presumably with a new bridge or tunnel) and is likely to be to the south of the proposed development, not passing through the centre of it. It is clear that this new access would be needed to serve the proposed development. This led to the examination of other options that would reduce congestion and pollution in and around the Kidderminster Town Centre. One option was to utilise the existing A450, which leaves the A449 at Torton to the south, passes through Mustow Green and joins the A456 just South of West Hagley. As requested, a suggestion is put forward under the 'Consultation Questions' section. The proposal would also reduce congestion and pollution in Blakedown and should not increase traffic volumes in West</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Hagley.</p> <p>The Draft Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017) under 3.1.5 states ‘Once a preferred option has been identified, a comprehensive network wide (Wyre Forest) assessment of the transport network will be undertaken...’. It appears to me that each Option could have a significant impact on infrastructure and this should be taken into account in Option choice. I would recommend carrying out an assessment for each Option.</p> <p>I have included suggestions of how an Eastern Relief Road could work. This would need much greater examination to verify its practicality.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5085</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>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 Bypass is an unnecessary expense with two other routes already linking the A449 to Birmingham and motorways. Both of which could be significantly improved with lesser funding and impact on the local environment. 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. LTP4 identifies the need for WFDC to address public transport issues and support the use of cycle lanes. The air quality on Spennells is not always good especially on a dank day. The nature of its position within the valley and the heavily trafficked Spennells Valley Road plays a large part in this. It would be questionable then to add a relief road to the rear of Spennells and not consider AQI levels for residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5089</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. 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</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>life.</p> <p>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. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5013</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>WFDC presentations / literature give the impression that their preference is option A due to the opportunity it gives to create the Eastern relief road, however I would question why this road is needed and what benefit it would provide? The A450 already links the A449 with the A448 and the A456, taking away the need for the proposed relief road. The only problem with the A450 is the 'Black Bridge' railway crossing at the A450 /A449 junction but this issue can easily be resolved by improvement to the A449 / A442 Somerfield junction to enable heavy goods vehicles coming from the Worcester direction to turn onto the A422 and join up with the A450. Can you please advise if this option has previously been considered?</p> <p>I would welcome an answer to my question regarding my road suggestion, I would also like you to forward me a copy of your environmental impact report for the local plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5082</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The plan shows the creation of an Eastern Relief Road for Option A from the A449 to the A456, this will not alleviate any congestion on the Kidderminster ring road or help poor air quality in the town centre. Travellers from Worcester to Birmingham or vice versa do not need to enter the town centre now, they will continue to use the A450. This proposed road will need to cross the railway line at 2 points, at great expense to local people. It will cause noise and air pollution for everyone on the eastern side of town, as well as a huge loss of wildlife habitat. 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4698</a>	Eastern Relief	Object	<p>The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4734</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	The route of the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road shown in the diagram on page 108 of the plan appears to run from the A449 at Easter Park and end on the A456. It makes little sense to consider building this relief road which will take the traffic back towards town to either the Chester Road or the ring road and will therefore cause jams at these junctions as well as air pollution and the other environmental issues this road seeks to avoid. If traffic wants to head towards Hagley or Birmingham they will use the A450 from the Black Bridge to Hagley and adjustments at Mustow Green to alleviate jams is already being considered. It only makes sense to build this relief road if it continues across Hurcott to the Stourbridge and Wolverhampton roads. Is this the ultimate intention not stated and is this why the development at Lea Castle is split into options? See other comments in about the previous proposal for this road - it never got off the ground as there was no money and no great need. I would refer you to the words in 13.7 'traffic congestion cannot just be tackled by building new roads'.
	<a href="#">LPPO4762</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5088</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. 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.  A <u>new road</u> would simply move traffic a little further away to existing congestion areas on the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Worcester Road, Husum Way, Blakedown, Hagley and Mustow Green/Bromsgrove. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.
	<a href="#">LPPO4605</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4646</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Design an Eastern Bypass road to reduce congestion
	<a href="#">LPPO3937</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>There is no clear information about a proposed Eastern Relief road. At the numerous 'drop in' sessions I attended, the planners acknowledged they did not know where it would go. There is however a costing for it within the WFIDP, so therefore some knowledge is available, but it is has failed to appear in the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>It would therefore suggest the necessity for further scrutiny and subsequent review to ensure transparency.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4132</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>We fail to understand how this ribbon development can be contemplated without first considering an eastern bypass. A true bypass, from the A449 Worcester Road to the A449 Wolverhampton Road, whilst desirable, is probably a pipedream, as the cost of two new railway bridges, at least three traffic islands and associated works would no doubt be deemed prohibitive.</p> <p>It is unarguable that a development to the east of Offmore would provide a faux bypass with consequent dangers in the development itself and traffic delays at Hoo Brook, Spennells Valley and the Chester Road A456 junction at Land Oak.</p> <p>A long narrow development such as this, with access only from Spennells Valley and the A456 will act as a high speed bypass through the very centre of a large housing estate. This is evidenced by the very real problems experienced at the moment in Tennyson Way and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Husum Way. This despite the speed cushions in Borrington Road, these estate roads are used as a rat run by large numbers of cars and even articulated HGV's. A speed measuring device placed half way up Husum Way near to the Shakespeare Junction would demonstrate the problem at minimal cost. To even consider a large new development with a nice new racetrack through the middle is madness. Please note that a speed limit is irrelevant, as demonstrated by the problems in Husum way.</p> <p>We would also point out that the proposal that we are asked to comment on is falsely entitled as a Plan. A sketch of an area with portions coloured in and with no indications of existing road numbers, proposed roads and junctions, no infrastructure, no community facilities and no indication of the number of dwellings involved in each part of the plan, nor how the choice of each plan would affect the other is not a plan. Asking for constructive criticism of such a vague unformed "plan" means residents will end up with a development that suits and enriches only the developers, not the town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4847</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4919</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is no meaningful information about the proposed new road in the Local Plan. There is a costing for it within the WFIDP so someone must have an idea of its location but has failed to put it in the consultation. I believe the consultation is not in accordance with the guidelines for Public Consultation and falls short of both YouGov and Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice.
	<a href="#">LPPO4709</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley
	<a href="#">LPPO4714</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	A potential Eastern Relief Road is drawn on Map A, which appears to bisect the residential area, although this would depend on government funding and approval. A relatively high speed road would lead to a reduction in air quality in what would be a residential area and

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				make any existing rights of way unattractive for recreational activities, especially important in Kidderminster, with its relatively obese and elderly population. There would be a deterioration in the quality of life, both for existing and future inhabitants of the area. The Spennells Valley Road already links the main Worcester Road with the Bromsgrove Road and could potentially be improved, with traffic lights to allow ease of access to the two roads into the estate. A much shorter extension would then connect the Bromsgrove Road to the Birmingham Road. Footbridges should be provided for both pedestrians and cyclists.
	<a href="#">LPPO4701</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Causall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4768</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Causall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4776</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Details of the “Eastern Relief Road” are vague and not in a form that can be fairly assessed in this consultation. There is only one large-scale map with a dotted line running approximately from the junction of Stanklyn Lane with the A449 to Hodgehill on the A456. If this were the route, 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.</p> <p>No definitive route or traffic model has been provided for this proposal, meaning that local residents are not being provided with sufficient details to make an informed judgement. This is in breach of Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice. Local people are unable to evaluate the true effects of a proposed new road when there is no definitive route indicated.</p> <p>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 sense in terms of where</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>bypass traffic is expected to go from there – clearly the A456 and the Land Oak junction would experience higher traffic flows. A Kidderminster bypass would attract traffic from the M5 and A450 and contribute to noise, air light pollution in the District.</p> <p>Estimation of the cost of building such a road is £17.5m, so a route must therefore have been put forward to enable preliminary costings and this information should have been transparent in the local plan review.</p> <p>The idea that this would create the means for traffic to bypass Kidderminster en-route to Birmingham or the M5 is misleading since the A450, less than 2 miles to the east, already provides this facility. If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450 without constructing an entirely new road over Green Belt land and potentially through a new housing development, together with the hazards to residents and children this would involve. Improving the A450 would provide relief to any congestion on the A449, without bringing increased air, light and noise pollution to the already heavily-populated Spennells estate.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A new road would create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The proposed new road would impact environmentally sensitive areas with increased air pollution, more noise pollution, light pollution and the destruction of large amounts of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>natural habitats.</p> <p>A more likely route for Eastern Relief Road would necessitate the construction of an elevated bridge in order to cross the railway line, near Easter Park. Allowance would be needed for electrification of the rail line uses in the future. This would cause significant visual and noise impact upon existing Spennells residents to their obvious detriment in both health and wellbeing. The road would also have an adverse effect upon people who currently live on the Spennells estate due to increased ambient lighting, increased traffic noise, air pollution and additional traffic vibration.</p> <p>The construction of the Eastern Bypass is likely to encourage more car journeys to be undertaken. Although the Local Plan Review says that S-NE traffic will be diverted away from the town centre, locally generated traffic on the eastern side of Kidderminster could use the bypass as a shortcut between areas. This could lead to increased pollution including emission of CCGs, more road casualties, a reduction in walking and cycling and a consequent rise in obesity and associated health conditions.</p> <p>An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster since any regeneration is desperately needed within the run-down town centre, not on the outskirts on Green Belt land. The claim that the Eastern Relief Road will facilitate an improvement in AQMA at Churchfields is bogus, since it goes nowhere near this area. The AQMA at Churchfields/Horsefair will be improved with the proposed new roads and one-way routes in the area.</p> <p>There is <b>NO</b> justification for the Eastern Relief Road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4802</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The Preferred Options Document suggests linking the A449 at Easter Park to the A448 and A456 without any analysis other than relieving Chester Road. Having lived in Kidderminster for 38 years I have never found Chester Road North or South a major problem.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>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. Such roads already exist linking the A449, A448 and A456 with the A450. The railway bridge (Black bridge) at Torton on the A450 is, however, too low for HGVs and a short crossing over the railway could be built, between Torton and east of Hartlebury, to connect the A449 and A450.</p> <p>A more extensive relief road linking the A449 north and south of Kidderminster would encourage M5 and M6 traffic to leave the motorway and hence increase the passing traffic, particularly HGVs, around Kidderminster. Such a by-pass would increase pollution and noise with a detrimental impact on the health of the community</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4811</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>When asked where the Eastern bypass may be, there are vague ideas. When better options are shown, the officials are not aware of the Kidderminster road topology. Especially the A450 and minor roads. The majority of this route 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. The vague options for the Eastern bypass go through, or on the edge of, the proposed local plan, putting pollution right on their doorstep?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4830</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>There is mention of an eastern relief road. This has been a long held aspiration abandoned in the 1990s along with the western orbital motorway. The Review states that if the core sites development goes ahead without the Spennells Option A development then the relief road would not be built. This would then lead to unacceptable congestion on the existing highway network.</p> <p>If the By Pass was built but without the previously mooted western orbital motorway it is only</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				likely to increase the severe congestion in Hagley and further along the A456 through Halesowen into Birmingham.
	<a href="#">LPPO2899</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The Local Plan Review includes the proposal for a so called Kidderminster East Relief Road. And the not-to-scale plan shows an indicative line that it might take once constructed.</p> <p>This road will connect the A456 Birmingham Rd, the A448 Bromsgrove Rd and the A449 Worcester Rd by means of passing via the proposed developments adjacent both Spennells and Offmore Farm Estates. It will serve no other purpose than to give access/egress to the new developments. And it will not relieve any congestion on the A456, A448 or A449 since the points at which it will dissect the existing roads fall well outside of any congestion that congregates on those routes during rush hour.</p> <p>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. Similar major engineering works will be required to merge onto the A456, A448 &amp; A449.</p> <p>WFDC cite that any developers will be required to provide funding toward this road, and I assume that this will probably be via a section 106 agreement. But those developers will only contribute toward the easier/cheaper engineering which cross through virgin land, they will not expect to fund major engineering works.</p> <p>The Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery plan sec. 3.1. confirms that Worcestershire County Council will decide upon the exact route of the relief road once the local plan options have been finalised.</p> <p>Given that the proposed road will not relieve any existing congestion on the aforementioned routes, and that its primary function will be to serve new housing developments, it is factually incorrect to promote it as a relief road or by-pass. In fact it will be a local distributor road the definition of which is <i>“a low-to-moderate capacity road which serves to move traffic from local streets to arterial roads. Distributor roads are designed to provide access to residential</i></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p><i>properties</i>". There can be no other designation for this road whilst remaining within fact.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review Page 178 para 31.5 cites that a relief road "<i>would help to alleviate the severe congestion currently experienced along the A449 Chester Road</i>". Once again this is factually incorrect for the simple reason that traffic movements congesting on that road are making journeys into Kidderminster and not past it. The relief road will merge onto A449 &amp; A448 at points on the outer approaches to Kidderminster beyond the end of the line that the current congestion already exists. The so called relief road will not provide an alternative to the current congestion on A449 or A448.</p> <p>I can see no justification for the local authority to spend public funds constructing a road that will only serve the interests of the developers in terms of profit from house sales and will not immediately address any traffic congestion on the approaches to Kidderminster. Likewise there is no evidence being offered as to where this relief road will actually give relief in Kidderminster and there is no evidence of any traffic survey data to prove such a road is required.</p> <p>Local authorities should not be spending public money on schemes that have no direct benefit to the community at large.</p> <p>In summary I object to the proposals in the Wyre Forest District Council Local Plan Review.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4577</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p><i>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.</i></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4691</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocated as Green Belt for significant reasons.</li> <li>• Wildlife - Endangered species e.g. Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers, Deer, Barn Owls and bats also live in these fields.</li> <li>• Railway bridge needed for development and massively increased flow of traffic through Comberton impacting on mental health of local residents. Hurcott Road will</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>become a dangerous rat run.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial development will ruin the area.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3328</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The proposed route would open up Green Belt to unnecessary development.</p> <p>The Green Belt separates Kidderminster from other conurbation and protects delicate eco systems.</p> <p>There is no excess traffic on Tennyson Way to warrant a bypass. More development is not sustainable as the town's infrastructure is not sufficient for the existing population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO498</a>	31.5	Object	<p>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 brown field part of the site but believe that a 540 unit development for elderly persons would be more suitable and safer.</p>
Hurcott Village Management Committee	<a href="#">LPPO1628</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>Regarding the Eastern By-Pass. Is it not premature to be changing the Green Belt designation of this land? Would it not be more appropriate that any final decision is left at least until not only its route is definitely known but also that it is actually to be built?</p>
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO562</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Not necessary to allocate this land if consideration given to allowing development outside Green Belt on the western side of District.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1592</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The extent of the proposals include a new Eastern By-pass. This will have to incorporate at least one bridge over the railway and the topography suggests some sections would need to be elevated above the surrounding land. This will cause a massive loss of amenity to the Residents via noise, visual amenity, pollution and additional vehicle traffic. The A456 is</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>restricted to single carriageway through Blakedown and further to the east at Hagley where recent residential development has added to the traffic congestion problems. A by-pass would also cause road traffic congestion problems elsewhere on the existing road network. In particular on the A456 which is the main route for access to the M5 and M42 motorways from Kidderminster and Bewdley. Road widening at Churchill and Blakedown as well as at Hagley would be required.</p> <p>A by-pass would need to pass on from the A456 north to the A451 and A449, otherwise the narrow Hurcott Lane would become a “rat run” and create further traffic issues into Kidderminster at the Land Oak cross road to the west and Blakedown to the east.</p> <p>An Eastern By-pass would need to be built before any other development occurs.</p>
Kidderminster Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1170</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Any option that includes a relief road should not be followed without a guarantee that the relief road would be constructed.
	<a href="#">LPPO2012</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is absolutely no rationale given for why an eastern relief road should reduce congestion?! No evidence is given of traffic flows that need to by pass Kidderminster in such a way as to require a relief road such as this. No research has been done to show that carving up our Green Belt land for such a road would serve the purpose, had such research been done it would have been provided in the document for all to understand!
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPPO1732</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>After twice previously failing to gain acceptance for an Eastern Relief Road, the Council appear to have taken the opportunity to resurrect the chance of proposing the construction of an Eastern Relief Road tied in with the perceived need for more housing in Wyre Forest.</p> <p>This is contested on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road would require two expensive road bridges over the railway line; from the A449 somewhere near Easter Park and near Husum Way on to the A456. This expenditure is totally unjustified, since the A450 already serves the purpose of an</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>eastern bypass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As no definitive route or traffic model has been provided residents are unable to evaluate the true effects and make an informed judgement.</li> <li>• An estimation of cost is provided in the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) so a route must therefore have been put forward to enable preliminary costings. This information should have been transparent in the local plan review.</li> <li>• The idea that this would create the means for traffic to by-pass Kidderminster en-route to Birmingham or the M5 is misleading since the A450, less than 2 miles to the east, already provides this facility.</li> <li>• If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450. Improving the A450 would provide relief to any congestion on the A449, without bringing increased air, light and noise pollution to the already heavily-populated Spennells estate.</li> <li>• We 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.</li> <li>• An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster since any regeneration is desperately needed within the run-down town centre, not on the outskirts on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The proposed new road would totally destroy this environmentally sensitive area and create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife. There would be catastrophic effects by crossing existing wildlife corridors. The Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and its green corridors would be compromised by the building of a new road – a road which is not needed for the purpose presented in the Local Plan.</li> <li>• There would be significant visual and noise impact upon existing Spennells residents to their obvious detriment in both health and wellbeing. The road would also have an adverse effect upon people who currently live on the Spennells estate due to increased ambient lighting, increased traffic noise, air pollution and additional traffic vibration.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is virtually no room for such a road to pass through the proposed development at OC/13 south which passes the Spennells Valley water courses incorporating Captain's Pool and the Green corridor to Stanklyn Pool in order to then link up to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4674</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Causall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4677</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The proposed road is supposed to relieve air quality on the Horsefair and take traffic away from the ring road. I do not believe this is the case. The A450 already accommodates the need for the majority of traffic going towards Birmingham, and the intended 'end' of your new road would not benefit anyone as the A450 comes out much lower down with quicker access to the A456. The proposed new road is basically a parallel road to the A450 along the Spennells fields, and 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.</p> <p>The junctions either end of Stanklyn Lane are extremely risky and difficult to pull out of, and the increase in traffic trying to get on to the 'new' road would make this even more difficult. The close proximity of the Roxel site should also be considered as there have been incidents that affected residents and safety should be considered.</p> <p>The cost of building bridges to get over the railway will be very large, and this money would be better used in supporting town centre infrastructure or the area around Lea Castle to support users of roads out of Cookley and surround so they can bypass the town centre and relieve the air quality of Horsefair. 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3931</a>	Eastern Relief	Object	The necessary housing figure is derived from a flawed OAHN report, dismissing 3 independent

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		<p>analyses in favour of one that supports the Council's agenda so misleading the community with the scale of future provision.</p> <p>The scale of development will make Kidderminster unattractive to tourists.</p> <p>Use Brownfield sites before Green Belt saving landscape, farming and wildlife.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation undermines the relevance of the town centre and the proposed relief road will attract more traffic affecting safety and isolating the town centre. The statement is in contradiction of 25.2 and I strongly object.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4687</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Finally - The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended, (something which the district council have no control over) as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. The increased traffic of potentially up to well over 2000 vehicles coming from the housing sites using the A449 and adjoining roads will create huge congestion issues, impacting on the local countryside and environment and access issues from the village and surrounding areas. Planning new housing needs to consider this and take a more staggered approach - building smaller housing sites across the area, not concentrating housing in a way that will create the above congestion issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4781</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>This appears to have been resurrected apparently again due to another 'useful contribution' from the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP.</p> <p>This was originally due to start in 1996 but was abandoned in November of the same year presumably due to shortage of finance. In 2004 WFDC ceased to protect the line of the road.</p> <p>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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>motorway network for the proposed and any future Birmingham overspill.</p> <p>The construction of this link would enable quicker access to the motorways for overspill commuting to Birmingham and the possibility of further housing to the south of the by-pass. Presumably this is why the LEP are willing to contribute to the costs of construction. They would be unable to do this unless they could substantiate the longer term advantages to their board.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4784</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>I fail to see how the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would help reduce town centre traffic. Apparently, a new cinema complex may be built on the old Glades site, so any person or family wishing to access this, or the town centre shops will have to use the Ring Road. If all the housing is built in one area that will overload these already busy roads from one direction and cause even more traffic mayhem. The very idea that a road on the outskirts of town will relieve town centre traffic, a place which all residents need to access, is absolutely ridiculous and incomprehensible. The town centre will become busier than ever, with such a substantial growth in population. All residents require access to the town centre and only an element is through traffic. Perhaps an improved public transport system would better achieve this objective, with more reliable and better quality buses, unlike the current buses, which are run down, highly polluting (very evident if you have ever driven behind one) and regularly cause traffic jams due to breakdowns.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3932</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The statement is in direct contradiction to 25.2. The proposed relief road will increase traffic on the A449/A456 route decreasing safety and isolating the town centre. I object strongly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4072</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p><b>Eastern Relief Road</b> 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. In the future maybe a link from the A541 to the A456 is possible as this would reduce the need for traffic to go through Broadwaters, Horsefair, and Land Oak. I appreciate relief roads are not popular but neither is congestion and poor traffic flow and in the modern world this is an ever increasing problem. Relief roads, done in the right way, help control this. I trust any relief road would be built</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>sympathetically to the surroundings taking nature and wildlife into consideration. Circumventing the town to commuting traffic is important and better for everyone. You cannot expand the housing in Wyre Forest successfully with the current road systems in place. If not dealt with, traffic flow will be a problem and will create unhappy residents and Kidderminster will not be as an attractive place to live. On this subject 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.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4146</a></p>	<p>Eastern Relief Road</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>I would like to see the detailed work on traffic flows around Kidderminster that demonstrates that an Eastern Bypass is viable financially, practically and ethically.</p> <p>Over the past few years, Kidderminster has seen a new road that cuts across ‘Silver Woods’ and links through to the Stourport Road. Although beneficial, it seems that not enough work was put into considering traffic numbers and flow as the road has resulted in much traffic back-log up the A449 towards Worcester. Many times traffic is backed up as far as Hartlebury.</p> <p>Coming along the A449 there are already the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Island at Mitre Oak</li> <li>2. Island at Esso garage</li> <li>3. Traffic lights at Black Bridge</li> <li>4. Traffic Lights at Droitwich Road</li> <li>5. Island at Easter Park</li> <li>6. Island at Hoobrook</li> <li>7. New traffic Lights at Silverwoods link</li> <li>8. Island at bottom Worcester Road (Aldi)</li> </ol> <p>A new road – Eastern Bypass will require another junction/island/traffic lights.</p> <p>There are already many islands and traffic lights on the A449 approaching Kidderminster and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>often traffic build up. The planner that I spoke with talked about a new road across Spennells fields stopping Stanklyn Lane being used as a 'rat-run'. This is not the case – the only time we see through traffic on Stanklyn Lane is when there is an accident, or once a month for the Stone sale. A new junction near to the vehicle testing station would only consolidate the existing traffic problems. It would be unfair to the residents of Stanklyn Lane who would then have roads on 2 sides. It would not stop vehicles who want to travel to Kidderminster or Stourport. The only people who would use it would be those who live along it and perhaps others travelling to Wolverhampton side of Kidderminster. Where is the data to show the need?</p> <p>A road bridge over the railway would be extremely costly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4480</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>31.5 I Strongly Oppose OPTION A and the massive road expansion scheme proposed.</p> <p>This would have huge impact on the area ad advised in terms of health, well-being, crime, and safety, congestion in Spennells, Schools, community facilities, wildlife, and characteristics of Kidderminster.</p> <p>The road network would serve to bypass the town when you have proposed to develop the town. This is contradictory.</p> <p>There are no proposals for Spennells road network.</p> <p>This is Green Belt land and you have not demonstrated the requirements necessary under the NPPF to fully justify building on this land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3969</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>In regards to the details of the so-called “Eastern Relief Road”, these are extremely vague and not in a form that can be fairly assessed in this consultation. If the proposed route for this “Eastern Relief Road” were the route, 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>at Offmore. Estimation is provided in the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) of the cost of building such a road to be £17.5m. I struggle to believe that this local council would be willing to spend this amount of money. Also, the vagueness of any proposals for this road suggests that there is a lack of commitment for this road. Including how many homes would have already been built before construction of the road begins.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4034</a></p>	<p>Eastern Relief Road</p>	<p>Object</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would also like to challenge the building of what is described as a "Relief Road" between the A449 Worcester Road and the A448 Bromsgrove Road and then onto the A456 Birmingham Road</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Building of a "Relief Road"</u></b></p> <p>I strongly object to the building of a "Relief Road" which may become a "Bypass" as I do not believe you have carried out any form of survey or census on any of the roads feeding to and from this "Relief Road" and if you were to simply look at a map would realise that the only traffic that would use this proposed road now would be lorries travelling between Hartlebury / Worcester and Birmingham or Birmingham and Hartlebury / Worcester that are not allowed to use the Black Bridge on the A450. All other forms of transport have no need to use it as it doesn't go in the direction people want to travel.</p> <p>For example somebody coming into Kidderminster on the A449 wanting to go to Kidderminster Town, Stourport, Wolverhampton if they went along this road would not be going in the direction they wanted and would end up in one of the other pinch points on the Chester Road namely Comberton Road to turn right or Birmingham Road to turn right.</p> <p>The only people perhaps to use it would be Offmore residents coming from the Worcester direction.</p> <p>If option A development were to go ahead along with core sites then these would probably</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>need to use this road as an access point, so it's an access road not a "Relief Road".</p> <p>Please look at a current map of this area and you will see this is not a problem solving road, the only way it would be if it was a bypass that went from Worcester Road to Wolverhampton Road.</p> <p>The location of this Relief Road has not been defined but it has to go from the Worcester Road over the railway and across to the Bromsgrove Road. Presumably at each end will be a roundabout then at the Worcester Road end the road will need to rise in a bridge / flyover over the railway creating both an eyesore and would result in a substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area giving both visual and noise problems to new builds and the existing back of Spennells. Similarly at the other end there is a line of woodland from Captains Pool to Stanklyn Lane with two further pools inset, the woodland is subject to Tree Preservation Orders ( TPO 285 and TPO 213 ) so a Relief Road here would require either removal of protected woodland, filling in of pools or another flyover giving further substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area and giving both visual and noise problems to new builds and the existing back of Spennells in Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive. There would be a huge amount of investigations and reports needed with regards to the flora and fauna and whether a road would be justified or not.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>There is no need for a "Relief Road" this could easily be substantiated with a survey and census to judge likely usage.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4572</a>	Eastern Relief	Comment	<i>If extended as far as the A449, the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would cause congestion</i>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		<i>further up the A449 so affecting the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.</i>
	<a href="#">LPPO4581</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	No reason given for a relief road. No traffic census done. No reason to why or how this will reduce congestion.
	<a href="#">LPPO4664</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO3618</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>When attending a consultation event the titled “Eastern Relief Road” was brought up. I was talking to the route on which it was going to run. This was a very vague description as it was explained no route had been decided yet and that the road would only be built if the extra housing was built on the Spennells fields. This was one of the reasons why option A of the local plan was being pushed.</p> <p>The route which was vaguely explained would run from the A449 near where the disused VOSA inspectorate is, across the fields crossing the A448 Bromsgrove road and meeting up with the A456 Birmingham road. I was told this route was chosen because it was identified that the majority of traffic using this road would come from Worcester travelling to Birmingham. When pointing out that there were two main roads from Worcester to Birmingham already in use, M5 and A38 and why the need for this road to be built an answer couldn’t be provided. The fact is that the road in this format is of no use at all.</p> <p>If an Eastern relief road is to be built the road needs to extend from the A449 as planned to the A449 on the other side of town creating an outer ring road. In its current format there are major towns and a city (Stourbridge and surrounding area, Kingswinford and surrounding area and Wolverhampton) travelling in on the A451 &amp; A449, coming together at Broadwaters. If any traffic wanted to go to Worcester then it would still have to go along the A449 Chester Road to get there. Any traffic wishing to go to either Bewdley or Stourport would either use the same A449 Chester road or go through the A451 Stourbridge road via the Horse Fair to the Kidderminster ring road. As stated in the Local plan the Eastern relief road would be built</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>to relieve the traffic pressure on the Horse Fair. This could not be the case as the relief road would not be accessible if you were travelling from these places.</p> <p>I believe also that if Option A was chosen and an Eastern relief road was built it would be a pointless road and rarely used. The reason being is that if people wish to travel into town they would still only have three main access roads, the A456 Birmingham road, A448 Comberton road and the A442 Worcester road. When using the Eastern relief road traffic would still have to turn onto these roads to access town. At the present moment in time the junctions of these roads with the A449 Chester and the Spennells Valley road are heavily congested and would only get worse with all the extra traffic that will be created with the extra houses being built.</p> <p>This is another reason why I think the WFDC Local plan is flawed and needs to be revisited with a more considered look into the Eastern relief road and whether it is even required.</p>
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO2250</a>	31.5	Support	<p><b>Landscape Sensitivity</b></p> <p>Preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) undertaken. Identifies key constraints and opportunities and likely impacts of proposed development. Landscape mitigation strategy proposed. Western boundary is woodland along watercourse and residential estates. E/SE edges - localised ridgeline. Substantial landscaping buffer can be developed on E and S edges. Greatest visual effects will be from locations on or directly adjacent to site. Aim to maintain and enhance existing Green Infrastructure network by using existing landscape components. This will also help to set an appropriate and robust Green Belt boundary.</p> <p><b>Accessibility to Amenities</b></p> <p>Proposed site has good access to services and town centre. Provision of relief road would help to ease congestion. Plans also include potential land for new primary school and other community facilities. Potential pedestrian/cycle links to neighbouring estates with local retail</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and other services.</p> <p><b>Highways and Transportation</b></p> <p>Site access possible from roundabout off Spennells Valley Road. Southern part of site could be accessed from new roundabout junction on A448 as part of proposed relief road. Northern part can be accessed off Husum Way. Site is also well placed for Kidderminster Rail Station. Given scale of development it is likely that a bus route will be diverted through site. (see Highways and Transportation Technical Note). 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.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk and Drainage</b></p> <p>Majority of site is Flood zone 1. However, Hoo Brook traverses site with small areas of zone 2/3 alongside. These areas will be left undeveloped. There are also several watercourses, drains and ponds on site. Majority of water storage will be in form of balancing ponds with swales and linear features adjacent to the watercourse if required. Site drains naturally to W edge (lowest point). Sandstone site - good drainage likely.</p> <p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Unlikely to be significant issue. Dwellings will be set back from main roads and railway. Landscaping will be used together with careful orientation of dwellings.</p> <p><b>Ground Conditions</b></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Initial Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment undertaken. Not contaminated land.</p> <p><b>Utilities</b></p> <p>Sewers present near roundabout on A448. There are surface water outfalls into watercourse on W boundary. No sewers or main water within site. Electricity, gas and phone diversions will also be needed.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Land Classification</b></p> <p>Natural England's Land Classification Map for the West Midlands shows majority of site is Grade 3 (good to moderate) with rest being Grade 2. This is the case around most of Kidderminster.</p> <p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>Taylor Wimpey is please to see these sites form part of proposed Kidderminster Urban Extension.</p> <p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <p>Agreement in place with landowner to facilitate development. Technical work undertaken shows no physical or other constraints likely to render site undeliverable within Plan period. Many potential impacts can be mitigated through design, and in most cases a positive outcome can be achieved. Site is deliverable and immediately available subject to allocation and removal from the Green Belt. Development of land to south of Comberton Road is dependant upon securing route through to Worcester Road A449.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2784</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Abandon the aim of building an Eastern Relief Road which logically cannot be seen to be



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>dependent on the urban expansion of East Kidderminster.</p> <p>The current plan does not include any detail as to the route the relief road is to take other than the reference "from the A449 near Easter Park linking through to the A456 Birmingham Road".</p> <p>Given that this hinted route is within 2 - 3 miles of the centres of Kidderminster and Stourport, what traffic flows are anticipated to use the relief road? When traffic reaches this point on the A449 or A456 its destination is almost -certain to be Kidderminster or Stourport. No traffic census has been included in the plan and thus there is no evidence given of the likely traffic that would use the relief road. Had this road been routed from a point much further away from Kidderminster and extended to the A449 Wolverhampton Road then there might be some justification for its existence but the proposed cost of £17.5 million, being ridiculously low, suggests that this has not been considered.</p> <p>As the plan stands this relief road will have a major impact on the Green Belt; certainly raising the % of Green Belt taken shown in Option A. In addition the resultant congestion, noise and air pollution will increase greatly and will aggravate further, rather than lessen, the health and safety of both the existing and potential residents of Spennells and Offmore.</p> <p>The plan under Option A is proposing a further new estate road that also runs from the A449 to the A448. Does this road in effect become another relief road or "rat run" compounding the consequences of traffic congestion, abnormal noise levels and poor air quality as well as using more Green Belt land?</p> <p>The present Local Plan should be significantly rewritten to include the full impact of both of the above road proposals so that the residents of Kidderminster can have a much clearer understanding of the impact they will have on theirs and future generations' lives before giving their verdict on the proposed urban extensions.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1660</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4935</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4939</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5071</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is passing information about the eastern relief road, hidden within the depths of predominately technical, jargon enriched scopes of planning/proposal documentation. These technical documents show contradictions and are open to differing interpretations. Any infrastructure plans for relieving the east of Kidderminster (A449/A456) would have to take into consideration the effect on the railway. The last time this proposal was looked at was in the days of the “Western Orbital”, kicked into the long grass by John Prescott.
	<a href="#">LPPO5105</a>	31.5 Eastern road	Object	There is a budget of £17.5 Million in the plan for this Eastern Relief Road hut, as it would appear to require a fairly substantial carriageway capable of carrying, in both directions the cars and heavy commercial vehicles that currently use these aforementioned roads, this budget seems grossly under-estimated, especially considering that the Worcester Road to Silverwoods Link Road cost in the region of £6.5 Million. If there is evidence that traffic flows require to by-pass Kidderminster then surely there are other roads that serve this cross-country purpose, further away from Kidderminster without resorting to yet another road carving through the Green Belt, at great cost to the Wyre Forest residents. The plan also mentions that the Eastern Relief road will “provide access for the new development to the east of Kidderminster “. It is not clear whether the aforesaid access will be directly from this road or whether smaller circular roads, linking the A449 to the A448 and the A448 to the A456 would be needed to allow residential traffic to leave the enlarged estates, thus taking up even more of the Green Belt, increasing traffic noise and pollution in the affected areas

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and destroying the habitat for wildlife. More seriously this link will take estate traffic directly on to the A448, A449 and A456, resulting in even more traffic and congestion on these already busy roads. There may also be a danger of creating a “rat-run” situation along this road.</p> <p>The Plan appears to have a strong bias towards the promotion of Option A, seemingly to facilitate the building of an Eastern Relief Road to carry traffic between the A449 Worcester Road to the A448 Bromsgrove Road and onward to the A456 Birmingham Road and the reverse, and thus to take traffic away from Kidderminster. The route of this major road has not been outlined, but it is likely that it would necessitate the removal of even more Green Belt land from the Wyre Forest area. Is this not a resurrection of the ill-fated Kidderminster, Blakedown and Hagley Bypass, the proposed route of which was designed to start in Summerfield, link to an unbuilt Kidderminster Southern Bypass before heading North East to the north of Stone, curving round the Kidderminster urban area, and crossing the A448 before turning eastwards to join the A456 to the west of Hagley Wood? In 1996 that plan was withdrawn.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5144</a>	Eastern relief road	Object	I do not consider that we need an Eastern Relief Road. Traffic is not at a bottleneck in this area, the main permanent traffic jam in Kidderminster is by the hospital, something that this won't help.
	<a href="#">LPPO4905</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4551</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	A particular concern is the proposal within Option A for a relief road between the A456 Birmingham Road, A448 Bromsgrove Road and the A449 at Easter Park accompanied by a very large concentration of new housing (para 31.5). This would result in a significant increase in the traffic levels in the area combining additional through traffic with additional traffic from residents in the new houses travelling south to and from Worcester with the result of a catastrophic increase in the already intolerable congestion on the A449 south of Easter Park, particularly around the Black Bridge. And it would do nothing to alleviate the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				congestion issues at existing pinch points such as Mustow Green, Kidderminster Ring Road and Horsefair because it does not provide an alternative to these routes. Adding further employment use in the area will also exacerbate the congestion issues already caused by businesses in that area such as Roxel having access on to what is an already very busy and congested road. Adding up to 30% to the population of Kidderminster without addressing the extant fundamental transport link issues into and out of the town is a disaster waiting to happen.
	<a href="#">LPPO4821</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4835</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council and the authors of the Report praise the virtues of an Eastern Relief Road, to ease traffic congestion in Kidderminster, together with the perceived benefits of easing air pollution in the Horsefair area of central Kidderminster. This totally ignores the fact that the current A450 road, only 2 miles to the east of Kidderminster already links the A449 Worcester trunk road to the A456 Hagley/Birmingham 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.</li> <li>• The only traffic which currently avoids the A450, due to the low level of the 'Black Bridge' involves large HGV lorries. Surely the authors of this Report are not seriously suggesting building a trunk road suitable for HGVs through a new housing development, with the traffic and pollution hazards which this would essentially involve. If the Council wish to provide a route for HGV's to link these roads more effectively, the obvious choice is to improve the A450 and its access under the 'Black Bridge'.</li> <li>• The claimed potential benefits to air quality in the Horsefair are completely irrelevant to these plans, since only a road improvement built into the Churchfields redevelopment in Kidderminster will provide benefit to the air quality in the Horsefair. The only effect that these proposals would bring would be to cause</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				deterioration in air quality in the Spennells area of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4236</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	An eastern by-pass would be very expensive and would impact on the local countryside. There would be no proper community.
	<a href="#">LPPO4470</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Any new road should run the whole eastern side of Kidderminster from A449 North to A449 South, possibly to A451.
	<a href="#">LPPO4943</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5078</a>	31.5	Object	<p><b>Proposed Link Road:</b> We were informed that an Eastern road link would be built if one option was given the go ahead, linking the A456 to the A448 and onto the A449, what are the benefits of such a scheme which carves up of the country-side to gain so little. We all know that you can build a 6 lane highway but at some point it goes into a 2 lane road, hence a bottle neck in traffic congestion. There is already a road A450 which people use to bypass Kidderminster, many use this route, and there are still bottle necks at each end.</p> <p>I'm not convinced that comprehensive investigation has been carried out to ascertain the true advantage of this proposed link and how it will alleviate congestion; for people trying to travel from the A456 to the A449 or visa versa.</p> <p>One only has to look at the recent opening of the link road from the A451 to the A442 and the Island by Mac Donald's. A small number of vehicles using this new link causes a tail back on the island along the A442, and gaining access from Chester Road South to Wilden Lane is now impossible at certain times of the day. One more bottle neck to navigate through; a big asset this has been to relief congestion, <i>as it now adds at least 10 minutes more to one's journey.</i></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5086</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. 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.</p> <p>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. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5087</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. 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.</p> <p>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. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5127</a>	Eastern relief road	Object	<p>The proposal to build houses behind Spennells goes hand in hand with the proposed Kidderminster Relief Road, which was proposed and rejected in 1981 (house builders would likely contribute funding for the road). There is no need for this road in terms of traffic and no</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				desire for it from Spennells residents or residents of the rest of the district. It would not make travel quicker from residents of Spennells or elsewhere. Traffic jams occur in other parts of Kidderminster such as the Horsefair, for which the Relief Road would not be an alternative.
	<a href="#">LPPO4887</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall
	<a href="#">LPPO4890</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4573</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<i>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.</i>
	<a href="#">LPPO4771</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>With ref to the road proposal, again, no information was forthcoming on how this would cross the railway line, type of road surface, overhead lighting etc. that would be required other than it would serve the houses only and no other traffic would use it. 40 ton trucks along with everyone else will use it to short cut onto the Worcester Road and avoid the Black Bridge height restriction creating a dangerous road for those with young children &amp; elderly parents.</p> <p>The implications of this road to Spennells and local residents would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light pollution – lighting would be required and with 40 ton trucks using it high &amp; bright lighting would be needed.</li> <li>• As you have to cross the rail line a long gradient would be required for said traffic (trucks) which would mean raised embankments across the entire length of Spennells.</li> <li>• Noise pollution – increase in traffic would increase noise levels in the area, the road surface would need to be of a type that keeps noise to a minimum.</li> <li>• Air pollution – Poor quality air will result due to the trucks etc. leading to increased</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>health issues and lowered standard of living.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short cut created – raising safety concerns for children &amp; elderly.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4787</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Eastern Relief Road would be expensive as a railway bridge would have to be built for the new houses and would cut one side of the Relief Road from the other. The siting of a school and other essential facilities would be problematic because of the elongated shape of the Core Sites, something made worse if Option A is also used.
	<a href="#">LPPO4817</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449, further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5148</a>	Eastern bypass	Comment	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5149</a>	Eastern relief road	Comment	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, as indeed so should the plans for further infrastructure development and schools, none of which has been very evident.



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4472</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Many people will object on the important ecological grounds. Everyone talks about global warming and we talk about destroying the countryside. It seems like a ploy to get funding for an eastern bypass, with no thought to wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO4797</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<b>Eastern Relief Road</b> 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. In the future maybe a link from the A541 to the A456 is possible as this would reduce the need for traffic to go through Broadwaters, Horsefair, and Land Oak. I appreciate relief roads are not popular but neither is congestion and poor traffic flow and in the modern world this is an ever increasing problem. Relief roads, done in the right way, help control this. I trust any relief road would be built sympathetically to the surroundings taking nature and wildlife into consideration. Circumventing the town to commuting traffic is important and better for everyone. You cannot expand the housing in Wyre Forest successfully with the current road systems in place. If not dealt with, traffic flow will be a problem and will create unhappy residents and Kidderminster will not be as an attractive place to live. On this subject 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.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO918</a>	31.6	Comment	It would be good to mention in this paragraph too that the low density housing proposed provides adequate space to deal with surface water runoff from the proposed development on the site itself. This might prove essential as currently I am not aware of an existing drainage system near the site that future site drainage could connect to (attenuated). A surface water flood risk has been identified off the site, against the railway embankment (the embankment presumably acts like a dam for land naturally sloping this way). This means that it is extra important that the drainage system of the potential development will not result in any additional flow leaving the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4483</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is no meaningful information about the proposed new road in the Local Plan. There is a costing for it within the WFIDP so someone must have an idea of its location but has failed to put it in the consultation. I believe the consultation is not in accordance with the guidelines

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				for Public Consultation and falls short of both YouGov and Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice.
	<a href="#">LPPO4550</a>	Policy 32	Object	I am writing to give my views on the proposed plans for extra housing and businesses in Stourport. The road infrastructure in Stourport is not adequate to accommodate any further housing. On Bank Holidays especially the roads are grid locked and there have been several occasions recently due to the work on the new pipeline where it has taken around an hour to travel just a few hundred yards. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4115</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the options indicates improvement to the road structure in and around Stourport, which is already badly needed. Councillors should try driving into Stourport on a Friday morning</li> <li>• AKR/14 Pearl Lane and AKR/15 Ribbesford Road – building here would have an immense impact on the already stretched local services; schools, doctors, medical centres, Worcestershire Royal Hospital etc. There are no proposals to help with this</li> <li>• AKR/14 Pearl Lane and AKR/15 Ribbesford Road - since 1963 efforts have been made to have a relief road/second bridge in Stourport. The air at the crossroads of High St, Bridge St, York St &amp; New St is highly polluted so to build at these two sites would be irresponsible. Both Bewdley and Kidderminster have had major road relief, where are the plans for Stourport?</li> <li>• Why are the developer's names not given?</li> <li>• There was no indication of the type of housing that will be built</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2874</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>We strongly object to proposed development plans for Stourport.</p> <p>Infrastructure cannot cope with the volume of traffic and congestion. Schools and Doctor surgeries are already struggling.</p> <p>If this amount of development is needed, and this seems questionable, then develop on the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>other side of Kidderminster where the plans include a relief road which would enable the extra residents viable access to work etc.</p> <p>Stourport could only cope with the extra volume if a second bridge were to be built over the River Severn.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2326</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Without more houses being built there are traffic jams every weekday early morning, mid afternoon and early evening in Kingsway, Windermere Way, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. There are also traffic problems outside the schools in Kingsway/Windermere Way with the school run vehicles.</p> <p>Kingsway is also used as a shortcut for lorries (Talbot largest culprit) and at times when the A451 Kidderminster Road is blocked because the town roads are blocked with traffic.</p> <p>More cars mean more pollution.</p> <p>More cars will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Poor public transport adding to number of cars on the road.</p> <p>The compulsory purchase of a Care Home in Lickhill Road (another kick in the teeth for the elderly of the area), loss of a business and peoples horse riding hobby.</p> <p>Nearest doctors are based in Stourport. They will not cope with the extra numbers of patients. Are there enough places available at the schools?</p> <p>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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2953</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>Have you ever thought of the idea to ask people on beforehand where THEY think more houses (especially social housing) could be built. After all, people living in certain areas will know exactly where spaces are that are either so neglected that you may as well start afresh or where there are brown sites suitable for development.</p> <p>Just think what would happen if hundreds of houses are built in Areley Kings in about 20 years. The cost to the economy (delays on roads) and health (all this pollution from stationary cars) will be enormous.</p> <p>Can we first have a new bridge to cater for all these new inhabitants? Then building new houses in Areley Kings makes sense.</p> <p>Another problem you may face is the effect it will have on local schools.</p> <p>The local High School is already bursting at the seams. They will have a new Sixth Form College but the school will still not be able to have many more children on their books because the current High School building will not be large enough.</p> <p>Areley Kings hasn't even got a Surgery and people have to travel to Stourport (where there is not even any parking) to see a Doctor or Nurse.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1889</a>	Policy 32	Object	Object to all these sites as in Green Belt, plenty of brown sites still available.
	<a href="#">LPPO1632</a>	Policy 32	Object	The redevelopment areas in the Stourport area will impact greatly on the already over-burdened infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, dentists and access for emergency vehicles via already congested roads. There are sufficient brownfield sites everywhere in Wyre Forest area to accommodate housing needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO732</a>	Policy 32	Comment	All this would require: better roads, reliable bus service (national or sub contract).
	<a href="#">LPPO724</a>	Policy 32	Comment	Utilize brownfield sites first as you have a clean canvas for mixed housing

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1</a>	Policy 32	Object	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO207</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>I object in the strongest terms to the proposal to build on Green Belt land in particular the field at top of Kingsway, the field which runs alongside Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road and the fields and land on Lickhill Road.</p> <p>My objections are on the basis that there is already significant house building taking place within Wyre Forest area, the population has been static for several decades (therefore why the need to build so many houses); there are already significant delays on all of the roads in and around these areas, particularly in peak times; the impact on wildlife would be significant in particular building houses so close to the Burlish Top nature wildlife reserve; the road infrastructure, in particular on Kingsway where much of the road has no pathway in either direction, is, unable to cope with the significant increase in traffic which would arise as a result of buildings houses on these 3 fields; there would be a significant impact on air quality, there are no plans to build additional schools or medical facilities which would be required with the influx of so many additional residents. These are my initial objections, having only just become aware of these proposals via a neighbour's Facebook post, I would further comment that the lack of advertising/notification to local residents in relation to these proposals falls well short of what is expected in relation to transparency of local government, coming at the very end of a very long and complex document, where it is not made obvious how to object or comment on the proposals.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO321</a>	MI/18	Support	My client's support the zoning of their two sites for employment purposes and the removal of M1/18 from the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO2337</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way</li> <li>• Traffic congestion already a problem would increase</li> <li>• Affect emergency services access</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Capacity of schools/GPs/dentists</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat esp. on Burlish Top Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• No evidence that there is a housing shortfall that cannot be met by use of Brownfield land</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO984</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>Stourport sites</p> <p>As at Bewdley, there is the dilemma of whether national policy dictates that development should be concentrated on non-Green Belt land west of the Severn or whether Green Belt should be released. On one side of the town, the presence of Hartlebury Common prevents expansion in that direction. On another, it is important that the strategic gap between Stourport and Kidderminster should not be eroded. This leaves the options of further expansion along Bewdley Road north or west of the Severn in Areley Kings</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1799</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Objects to LI/6/7, LI/5, LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure (especially roads) needs to be improved before any development can be considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic - the one way system around the town at key times of the day are often gridlocked. Another bridge over the river Severn would alleviate this.</li> <li>3. The crossroads on the Bewdley Road/Kingsway junction often have long queues again at certain times of the day.</li> <li>4. Putting more demand onto an already overloaded town without infrastructure</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				improvements will destroy residents' quality of life aside from pollution issues.
	<a href="#">LPPO1806</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Increase in local traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1987</a>	Policy 32	Object	No building on Green Belt. Already far too many cars.
	<a href="#">LPPO2000</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Objects to proposal for houses to be built in Stourport and Bewdley due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bridge over Stourport from Areley Kings is always congested.</li> <li>2. More houses on this side of the bridge is not viable, as more traffic will be added.</li> <li>3. There were plans for a by-pass to be built years ago, which would have eased traffic over the bridge but did not materialise.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO245</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>I recognise the need for new housing in the area, I strongly feel that greenfield sites should not be considered while there are still brownfield sites unused; some areas of land have been derelict for many years.</p> <p>More thought should be given to the infrastructure of Stourport, which has no bypass and only one river crossing which causes traffic bottlenecks throughout peak travel times and the summer tourist season.</p> <p>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, and only further adds to the road traffic that causes so many problems in an otherwise picturesque Georgian canal town.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO43</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Main roads into Stourport too small to cope with extra traffic generated by the proposed building.</p> <p>Stourport Bridge, Gilgal and Wilden Lane and approaches are all bottlenecks that have standing traffic at some time every day. In the summer, and at weekends, it is a nightmare.</p> <p>Stourport would need a relief road and another bridge over the Severn before any extra traffic could be considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1633</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status</p> <p>Increase in traffic would affect emergency services response time.</p> <p>Significant increase in traffic on all roads in area which are already very busy.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1076</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>We are not aware of any overriding ecological constraints affecting the majority of sites listed in tables 32.0.1 and 32.0.2 but we note that some (including LI/2 in particular) are close to designated sites and will require particular care in delivery. With this in mind we refer you to our previous comments on the need to update the evidence base for the plan prior to finalising the allocations.</p> <p>We reiterate the need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been considered in the evidence base or SA for these sites. This may have the effect of rendering their allocation unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for sites listed in Table 32.0.1 and 32.0.2 is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2104</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Unacceptable - reasons below:</p>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stourport: already gridlocked, ring road is required.</li> <li>2. Doctors/Hospital/Schools:- capacity</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2327</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p><b><u>RE PROPOSED LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENTS IN STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN</u></b></p> <p>My objections are:-</p> <p><b>There are no plans to provide additional roads to cope with the increased traffic.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I live in Kingsway - there are regular traffic jams at the start and end of the school day and the end of the working day.</li> <li>• The traffic is even worse when there are accidents elsewhere and the traffic is diverted in front of our house.</li> <li>• I have travelled regularly from the roundabout on the Bewdley bypass up the road to the Burlish Crossing traffic lights at approximately 16:00 and this journey can take 20-30 minutes. This trip normally takes 5 minutes to my home.</li> </ul> <p>2. The additional cars from these new houses would create increased air pollution.</p> <p>3. I understand that there are proposals to demolish the Sanctuary Care old people's home. The effect on moving such elderly patients is well documented and can at least be very traumatic, if not fatal. (LI/6/7)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2409</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>We have been to the local plan consultation at Areley Kings village hall, we 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2452</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Stourport on Severn roads are congested and we don't have the infrastructure to house more people. The roads, schools, doctors just won't cope. The schools are full, the roads are not designed to cope with current traffic levels let alone more. One set of temporary traffic lights</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				in this town upset the whole network.
	<a href="#">LPPO3284</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>I 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. Brownfield sites exist all across the district, and surely these must be fully used, before Green Belt land is taken. Many of these sites already have outline planning permission (e.g. Parsons Chain, Old Worth site), what incentives and encouragements are these for these to be fulfilled? As regards Stourport, it is important to retain the character of the town and its separate identity. Further development on the edges of the town would cause deterioration of a valuable landscape, enjoyed by locals and visitors alike, as well as a loss of worked farming land.</p> <p>The document does not seem to appreciate the role of Stourport in the District's economy - the local retail sector in Stourport does not just cater for local needs, as in Bewdley. Its town centre retail outlets, serve both the towns own needs and that of the rural hinterland. Stourport has a significant and growing night-time economy with a number of eating places and live music. 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.</p> <p>In Stourport the local infrastructure and road system are already at full capacity, particularly Stourport Bridge and the town centre one-way system. Stourport is not connected to the national Rail network, as are other parts of the district, neither does it have easy access to the employment centres of Birmingham and the Black Country via the motorway and trunk road network. 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. The areas do not have the infrastructure to support this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3462</a>	Policy 32	Object	Transport: This area around Burlish Crossing is already grid locked in all directions at peak

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>periods. Stourport town centre is always busy even at off-peak times</p> <p>Health: It's difficult enough to arrange a doctor's appointment now.</p> <p>Throw in all the other concerns like parking, environment and pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2646</a>	Policy 32	Comment	Stourport's shopping centre, congestion, air pollution and traffic pinch-points, especially for lorries means that an alternative to the present river bridge is essential.
	<a href="#">LPPO1635</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not notified</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic – Bridge and Gilgal, already a problem.</li> <li>3. Air pollution</li> <li>4. Already sufficient houses in Stourport</li> <li>5. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>6. Capacity Drs/hospitals/schools</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1637</a>	Policy 32	Object	Concerned about increased traffic and loss of Green Belt, consider instead regeneration in urban areas.
	<a href="#">LPPO1638</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/wildlife/view</li> <li>• More traffic = more future pollution</li> <li>• No bypass/ring road.</li> <li>• Lack of GP, schools, dentist.</li> </ul>
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">LPPO1964</a>	Policy 32	Support	In allocating sites we are 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. This will assist with deliverability as well as offering a range of houses to the market. One of the key elements for such sites is that they are deliverable.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1758</a>	Policy 32	Object	Road, doctors, schools etc cannot cope now, never mind more houses.
	<a href="#">LPPO3451</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools – where are the children going to go?</li> <li>• Doctors – difficult to get appointments.</li> <li>• Dentists</li> <li>• Traffic – already difficult at certain times of the day.</li> <li>• Lots of houses already being built in the sugar beet site.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3548</a>	M1/18	Object	<p><b>M1/18 North of Wilden lane industrial site.</b></p> <p>I am hugely opposed to any more industrial units on Wilden lane. We are surrounded by industrial units in this area, many of which are empty.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A majority of the residents of Wilden lane live very close to road and we 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.</p> <p>The traffic congestion on Wilden has become unbearable since the sugar beet development with access out on to the A449 McDonalds island horrendous at rush hour and beyond. – At 6.45pm it took me 25minutes to exit Wilden lane as the traffic generated on the A449 from the new lights do not give way for Wilden traffic. It is much worse at real rush hour with traffic tailing back.</p> <p>Any industrial units will add to noise, air and road pollution and be detrimental to the road</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				and residents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2325</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way</li> <li>• Traffic congestion already a problem would increase</li> <li>• Affect emergency services access</li> <li>• More traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Capacity of schools/GPs/dentists</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat esp. on Burlish Top Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• No evidence that there is a housing shortfall that cannot be met by use of Brownfield land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO167</a>	32.1	Comment	There is a lot of stress on the road network around these proposed sites. Stourport is desperate for relief roads to reduce bottlenecks on Worcester Road, Hartlebury Road, Mitton Street, and Severn Road - primarily caused by the incorrect siting of Tescos. By adding more residential development this will make the current situation worse without additional measures to divert non-Stourport traffic away. Through traffic needs to be diverted away from the one way system and back to the A449.
	<a href="#">LPPO233</a>	32.1	Comment	The planning register shows that Stourport has circa 550 dwellings constructed on the town side of the river in the last 12 years. This represents just under 10% of the population, using reasonable average occupation, from the start of the period. This can not be called a small amount of building. Using an average council tax figure from 2012 this equates to an additional circa £800,000 per year at the end of the period
Place Partnership Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO1095</a>	Policy 33	Comment	The Bewdley Fire Station site is currently allocated under Policy SAL.B1 – <i>Load Street Redevelopment Area</i> of the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan (adopted July 2013).

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>However, this allocation has not been carried forward into Policy 33.</p> <p>Given that the Bewdley Fire Station site will become available for redevelopment, alongside the fact that the new Bewdley medical centre and library on Dog Lane has been delivered, we consider that it would be sensible for Policy SAL.B1 to be incorporated into the new Local Plan in an equivalent form.</p> <p>We suggest that the precise wording of the policy should be agreed via the Place Review of the District that is currently being undertaken by the Council and PPL.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1871</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>There is a need for housing but Bewdley is full up so not possible.</p> <p>There is land available on the outskirts of the town but the roads are not able to cope with the existing traffic, Welch Gate is the most polluted spot in the Wyre Forest because of emissions. Buses are the worst offenders and the most dangerous as they have to drive on the pavement in order to pass sometimes.</p> <p>People prefer to use the route through the town centre. Buses could use the by-pass but do not.</p> <p>There is a primary and secondary school situated on Stourport Rd, another traffic 'hot-spot' at peak times. An increase in housing would add to this problem.</p> <p>Why is the council trying to over-fill a small town with new residents rather than look its existing ones? What is being done to solve the issue of poor air quality in the town centre and the traffic congestion in Welch Gate.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO823</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>Object to any large-scale housing west of the river for reasons of poor infrastructure and sustainability (including a lack of public transport possibilities), the exacerbation of traffic and pollution/air quality problems in the town, the visual impact of the landscape quality of the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				area and surface water drainage issues.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO890</a>	Policy 33	Comment	<p>Additional Suggestions and Omissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Policy to guide and direct the redevelopment and improvement of the Load Street car park area and the development of the former Surgery and Fire station site (as in the previous Local Plan Policy SAL.B1 Load Street redevelopment area). There should be a Policy to produce a Development Brief to comprehensively survey and seek solutions to its pedestrian/vehicular conflicts and visual appearance.</li> <li>• Suggest a policy for the redevelopment and/or enhancement of:                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The riverside buildings from Bridge House to the Rowing Club, perhaps to provide additional housing and car parking.</li> <li>b)The Workhouse site in High Street</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2259</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>It is appreciated that from general political comments there is a need to increase the housing across the whole country and preparation plans are required.</p> <p>Are the 5,500 houses as stated in the conservative newsletter across the whole of the Wyre Forest Area and is that quoted for the Bewdley area the total in the plan up to 2034?</p> <p>If this is the case it equates to just over 4.5% of the total required.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Areas that have better links to major roads and good public transport would be more sensible than those shown for the Bewdley area.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>If the 5,500 houses are as stated I presume this would increase the population of the area by approximately 22,000, would it not be more viable to create say a new town with new infrastructure that would then be viable rather than overloading existing?</p> <p>I do appreciate this would create the release of Green Belt land but it would be a one off strike to satisfy the target over the next 17 years.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4487</a>	Policy 33	Comment	I have heard and read about the development on the Green Belt land off Dry Mill Lane down to Dowles Rd, I have not heard anything about the traffic problems which would occur in Welsh Gate and Dowles Rd and nothing about how would the Medical Centre and the schools cope?
	<a href="#">LPPO3270</a>	Bewdley Site Allocations	Object	<p>I have been very surprised by the volume of traffic in Bewdley town centre and also along the bypass, the thought of the pollution caused by the constant traffic is a big concern. To top this off I'm extremely concerned by the proposed plans to consider building more roads and houses within this already gridlocked little town, almost with no consideration for the additional traffic and pollution this will cause.</p> <p>Over the next 5 years the Bewdley population will be getting younger. With young families moving into the area we need to ensure that there is ample green space for them to walk to without the use of transport, ensure the pollution is kept at a reasonable level and ensure that extra traffic does not become a danger to pedestrians.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4215</a>	Policy 33	Comment	Option A still identifies Green Belt/green field sites (e.g. on Stourport Road/Habberley Road/Highclere etc) which as well as jeopardising scenic attraction also in many cases jeopardises the preservation of the gap between the three towns and consequently their individuality.
	<a href="#">LPPO4423</a>	Policy 33	Support	We wish to support the development of Bewdley, as outlined in policy 33 and the core sites identified.
	<a href="#">LPPO2019</a>	Policy 33	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West of the River is not feasible because of the road structures and because it is</li> </ul>



**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>impossible to widen roads in this area, not of course forgetting the bridge which is often congested due to large vehicles and increased number of cars.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While I know 'The Gladman' land is not included in your development plan, my argument is largely the same – roads, traffic and congestion.</li> <li>• I think Wribbenhall will have to bear the development – they may assist with road costs i.e. Safari Park.</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO976</a>	Policy 33	Comment	<p>At Wribbenhall, the bypass provides a strong landscape barrier, and the Green Belt boundary could conveniently be moved out to it. Any development towards Kidderminster should be resisted unless there is substantial planning gain such as new link road between Habberley and Kidderminster Roads. If more sites are needed in Wribbenhall then land off Grey Green Lane may be least damaging. Land along bypass is very open and should be low priority option. Area between town and Forest is very sensitive.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO47</a>	Policy 33	Comment	<p>There are several words or phrases which, when used, preclude rational argument. One example is to call something 'undemocratic'. Another is to describe something as 'uncompetitive'. In the current issue, there is a phrase whose use precludes rational argument. It is 'Green Belt'. Green Belts were, a good idea 60 or 70 years ago, but they have, in certain circumstances, become an obstacle to sensible planning. As a resident of Bewdley, I make frequent trips to Kidderminster for shopping, banking, concerts etc. Very many people who live in Bewdley travel to Kidderminster on a regular basis - rather more than those who come to Bewdley FROM Kidderminster. 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. The Green Belt between Kidderminster and Bewdley contains a successful golf course, a safari park and a hotel with extensive grounds. They themselves provide a green space between the towns. It would therefore seem sensible to confine Bewdley's future housing development to sites east of the river until those sites are fully saturated. It would not be sensible to prefer the Highclere site over the other three sites merely because the latter are 'Green Belt. I contribute this in addition to the two points that Bewdley already has substantial traffic and air pollution problems due in substantial part to the amount of housing</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				east of the town centre, and also remind you of the lack of safe traffic access to an extension of the Highclere housing development, since the only means of access is via the Highclere/Park Lane junction, which leads traffic either down narrow steep Park Lane (no pedestrian footpath) or else, typically past St Anne's School on the way up to the bypass.
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1425</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>Gladman are of the view that the Market Town of Bewdley must take on a supportive role to Kidderminster in the provision of housing, to secure an approach that better responds to the nature of market towns as sustainable locations for growth. The Local Plan should be aiming to focus the development to support the district's wider needs alongside all sustainable towns with established centres and in doing so deliver its aim to make use of existing infrastructure and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Gladman therefore object to the limited scale of growth that is currently proposed from housing allocations in Bewdley (across both options) and consider it necessary to plan for further development in order to fully support the economic and housing needs of the area. The total of 251 dwellings would deliver a mere 75 homes in accordance with the 30% affordable homes requirement, which would be barely sufficient to meet affordable housing needs over the next 3 years, let alone the 213 homes identified as required over the next 10 years and 383 over the plan period.</p> <p>Plan only proposes 4.6% of dwellings in Bewdley. Core Strategy proposed 10%.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1833</a>	Policy 33	Comment	<p>Regarding development proposals in Bewdley, I would strongly oppose development of Heathfield and also the muted Gladman sites. These sites would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inevitably increase traffic down Wyre Hill, Park Lane and Welch Gate and then through Bewdley (which has numerous listed buildings). Welch Gate has very narrow pavements which put pedestrians at risk.</li> <li>• Increase air and noise pollution</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Bewdley centre has lots of empty commercial buildings that should be changed into high quality living accommodation. The former Midland Bank is a good example. Also many shops here have empty space on top for residential use.</p> <p>If development of <b>any</b> green field land is considered essential, then the identified spaces on the Kidderminster side of Bewdley seem to be the least bad option.</p>
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO922</a>	33.2	Comment	<p>My concern regarding the Habberley Road site (WA/BE/5) has been included, but I would propose the following rewording to hopefully better describe the scale of the issue.</p> <p>The relevant sentence reads:</p> <p>“The small site lying south of Habberley Road would need to be carefully designed to take into account the need for a channel to take surface water run-off through the site in times of heavy rainfall.”</p> <p>I propose:</p> <p>“The small site lying south of Habberley Road would need to be carefully designed to accommodate a substantial existing surface water flood flow route through the site so this route remains fully operational during times of heavy rainfall whilst not causing a flood risk for any new development.”</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO586</a>	33.2	Object	<p>2007 serious rainfall in Bewdley. The Safari Park closed one of the sluice gates, which caused serious flood of water. The whole area is delicate with the little stream this does not need to be tampered with. How will with all the housing being built, not cause flooding to us and to them. Will the old wall Sandbourne drive be kept intact, or will this also be knocked down and lose more of Bewdley's character, which looks like is happening all around us, 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				fields, no hedges, no trees, just houses.
	<a href="#">LPPO375</a>	Policy 35 - Far Forest	Comment	A local development plan for Far Forest, addressing the aging population needs, and by addressing this may then free up a lot of under occupied other property, would better address development in Far Forest than by including 6 acres of general housing development.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1084</a>	Policy 35 Villages and Rural Areas Allocation	Object	<p>Proposed allocation BR/RO/4/6 – Although we note the comments set out in paragraph 35.2 of the reasoned justification we wish to object to the allocation of this site. We do not think it likely that the proposed development would be capable of maintaining the orchard (and any unimproved grassland present) to any meaningful degree given the level of housing proposed and we do not agree with the SA conclusion that the site would have a neutral effect on biodiversity (which we assume has been reached because the evaluation only considered designated sites). Traditional orchards are included under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 (and often contain S41 species including the noble chafer, which is known from nearby sites) and we cannot find any justification for the losses that would be likely set out in the evidence base for the Plan. As a result we object to this allocation on current evidence and would strongly recommend that further work be done to determine the impacts prior to any final allocation being accepted. It is important to note that any significant reduction in developable area arising from biodiversity constraints may render the site unviable.</p> <p>Proposed allocation BR/RO/7 – This site is also partly traditional orchard and whilst some level of development may possible the issues set out above still pertain and again we wish to object to its allocation until further evidence is available to demonstrate that development here is sustainable.</p> <p>The majority of other sites proposed under this policy also 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. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been fully considered in the evidence base or SA for the plan. This may have the effect of rendering the plan unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				sites listed in the two allocations tables is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.
	<a href="#">LPPO3844</a>	Policy 35	Comment	The plan does not provide sufficiently for windfall housing sites in areas in the west of Kidderminster, beyond Bewdley. It has a narrow focus on 2 sites in Far Forest, introducing 40 new houses of unknown mix/type/purpose, without safeguards in respect of future housing needs for +65, who are going to be significantly in the majority in local housing. 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
	<a href="#">LPPO3238</a>	Policy 35	Object	<p>This site has become overgrown and dormant for many years however it has a host of wildlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Egress from Plough Lane onto Cleobury Road (A4117) is dangerous and at a steep incline with limited views in either direction. Would WFDC ensure that new road layouts are installed to accommodate additional traffic to and from the site?</p> <p>At certain times of the day New Road becomes impassable due to the number of vehicles dropping off and collecting children from the primary school. Further traffic to and from the proposed site adds to this major problem. School places at Far Forest Primary School is a smaller than average school with 136 pupils on roll. Is there a proposal to expand the capacity at the school?</p> <p>The night sky here is also considered to be one of the rare sites in which to observe the night sky as there is no light pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1695</a>	Policy 35	Object	I am concerned at lorries' speed and their manoeuvring causing traffic problems.
	<a href="#">LPPO1694</a>	Policy 35	Comment	Build affordable housing in Clows Top for people to be close to family and support local

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>businesses/schools e.g. Bayton where a play area would be nice.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• living on a busy fast road that there will be more traffic accidents</li> <li>• Possible problems with sewerage.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1697</a>	Policy 35	Object	<p>Objection to Policy 8f Page 64:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor access from the A456</li> <li>• The unstable land is not suitable for storage of heavy vehicles or caravans due to poor drainage possibly subsidence</li> <li>• With correct infrastructure provided, village land should be used only for the village,</li> </ul>
Horton Estates Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO867</a>	Policy 35	Comment	<p>We wish to highlight that PDL within the Green Belt at Cursley Distribution Park could be made available through site rationalisation which could be allocated for residential development. This site lies within Parcel SE4 of the Strategic Green Belt Review (Strategic Analysis, September 2016) which was assessed as making a “limited contribution” to four of the five Green Belt purposes (NPPF para. 80). As described in more detail above, two areas of PDL (1.5ha and 1.9ha) could be released, each of which could accommodate in the order of 40 dwellings, as indicated on the enclosed Illustrative Masterplan. This would require the land to be released from the Green Belt and allocated under Policy 35.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO319</a>	Policy 35	Support	<p>Supports inclusion of BR/RO/7 as a core site. However, wishes development to be for local needs as defined through an up to date Parish Survey. Also wishes that the development be at a scale and density appropriate for the setting, possibly controlled though a ‘Master Plan’ approach</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1696</a>	Policy 35	Support	<p>I would like new houses built in Clows Top for young people and to support local</p>


**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				shop/schools.
Rock Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1162</a>	Policy 35	Comment	<p>Council wished to draw your attention to the following points raised at our meeting by concerned residents of Far Forest namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential loss of wildlife and harm to the landscape</li> <li>• Various protected species are located on the proposed development land</li> <li>• Harm to the Landscape Protection &amp; Hedgerows</li> <li>• The Primary School at Far Forest cannot accommodate additional pupils</li> <li>• Concern at the increase of traffic in New Road especially after the last schools review</li> <li>• Road Safety in and round Cleobury Road &amp; New Road</li> <li>• No Car Park for Far Forest Church causes problems</li> <li>• Plough Lane used as Bus Stop for school children in morning</li> <li>• Sewerage System in Far Forest is still a major ongoing issue as the upgraded system cannot cope with the current dwellings</li> </ul>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1426</a>	Policy 35	Comment	<p>Careful consideration needs to be given to the role of rural settlements within the context of the spatial distribution of development. All sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district's requirements. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate deliverability and success.</p> <p>PPG advises that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas. Blanket policies restricting development should be avoided unless supported by robust evidence. It is also vital that sufficient development in rural settlements is enabled to support the District's housing market in providing a choice of accommodation that responds well to local needs and create a better balanced population structure</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO256</a>	35.2	Comment	See my comments on the Far Forest allocations under Policy 35, with some objections and some support.
	<a href="#">LPPO257</a>	35.5	Support	I support the redevelopment of Alton Nurseries. Consider a mixed use site with a residential

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35**

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				element. There are already 3 x residential properties on this site and next to it, and supported by a bus stop, additional residential properties would aid the development of a community at this location, rather than a group of isolated houses.
	<a href="#">LPPO28</a>	35.2	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building on field adjacent school in Far Forest would spoil the landscape/cause further traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Building houses on Plough Lane behind Tolland Bungalow would increase traffic and impact on wildlife</li> <li>• New estates are not needed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO365</a>	35.3	Support	Local employment ideas are to be commended. However, WFDC must be careful not to negate agricultural/rural opportunities by removing arable/other agricultural land.



 <p><b>WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL</b></p>	<p><b>Wyre Forest District Council Local Plan Review</b></p>	<p><b>FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY</b></p>
	<p><b>Preferred Options Document Consultation June 2017</b></p>	Response Number: <input type="text"/>
		Date Received: <input type="text"/>  Date Acknowledged: <input type="text"/>

## DETAILED RESPONSE FORM

This response form accompanies the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review Preferred Options document consultation. The Council welcomes your comments on the document. Please note that any comments made will not be treated as confidential and may be made publicly available.

Please use additional sheets if required, clearly marking the part of the document to which the comments relate e.g. option / paragraph / page number.

**Comments must be received by 5pm on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> August 2017.** Comments can be submitted in the following ways:

- online via the consultation portal <http://wyreforestdc-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/>
- by email to [LPR@wyreforestdc.gov.uk](mailto:LPR@wyreforestdc.gov.uk)
- via post to Planning Policy, Wyre Forest District Council, Wyre Forest House, Finepoint Way, Kidderminster, DY11 7WF

1. Personal Details	2. Agent Details (if applicable)
Title <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Title <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
First Name <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	First Name <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Last Name <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Last Name <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Job Title <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/> <small>(where relevant)</small>	Job Title <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/> <small>(where relevant)</small>
Organisation <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/> <small>(where relevant)</small>	Organisation <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/> <small>(where relevant)</small>
Address Line 1 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Address Line 1 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Line 2 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Line 2 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Line 3 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Line 3 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Line 4 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Line 4 <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Post Code <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Post Code <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
Telephone Number <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	Telephone Number <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>
E-mail address <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>	E-mail address <input style="width: 90%;" type="text"/>

Please tick if you are happy to receive future correspondence by email.

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

3. Please indicate which part of the document you would like to comment on (e.g. paragraph, policy, map, table or figure reference)

4. Do you want to support/object/comment on this part of the document?

Support

Comment

Object

5. Please set out your comments below clearly stating which part of the Local Plan Preferred Options document each comment relates to (e.g. question / option / paragraph / page number).

Signature:

Date:

**Data Protection and Freedom of Information**

All personal information that you provide will be used solely for the purpose of the Local Plan consultation. Please note that each comment and the name of the person who made the comment may be featured on the Wyre Forest District Council website, comments will not be confidential. Full comments, including addresses, may also be available to view on request. **By submitting this form you are agreeing to these conditions.**

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

APPENDIX 5 – LIST OF STATUTORY CONSULTEES

**Statutory Consultees:**

British Telecom  
Centro- WMPTA  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Directorate of Adult Services and Health (DASH)  
EE  
Environment Agency  
Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership  
Hereford & Worcester Ambulance Service  
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Service  
Highways England  
Historic England  
Homes & Communities Agency  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
NHS Commissioning Board  
NHS Property Services  
North Worcestershire Housing & Water Management  
North Worcestershire Water Management  
Office of Rail Regulation  
Oil and Pipelines Agency (The)  
Place Partnership Ltd  
Severn Trent Water Ltd  
South Staffordshire Water Plc  
Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner  
The Coal Authority  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Three  
Vodafone and O2  
West Mercia Police  
Western Power Distribution  
Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership  
Worcestershire Local Nature Partnership  
Worcestershire Partnership  
Wyre Forest Clinical Commissioning Group

**Wyre Forest Parish and Town Councils:**

Bewdley Town Council  
Broome Parish Council  
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council  
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council  
Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council  
Kidderminster Town Council  
Rock Parish Council  
Rushock Parish Council  
Stone Parish Council

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

APPENDIX 5 – LIST OF STATUTORY CONSULTEES

Stourport on Severn Town Council  
Upper Arley Parish Council  
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council

**Neighbouring Authorities:**

Birmingham City Council  
Bromsgrove & Redditch DC  
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council  
Malvern Hills District Council  
Sandwell Council  
Shropshire Council  
Solihull Council  
South Staffordshire District Council  
South Worcestershire Development Plan  
Staffordshire County Council  
Walsall Council  
Wolverhampton City Council  
Worcester City Council  
Worcestershire County Council  
Worcestershire Regulatory Services  
Wychavon District Council  
Staffordshire County Council

**Neighbouring Authority Parish Councils:**

Abberley Parish Council  
Alveley and Romsley Parish Council  
Astley & Dunley Parish Council  
Bayton Parish Council  
Belbroughton and Fairfield Parish Council  
Clent Parish Council  
Cleobury Mortimer Parish Council  
Dodford with Grafton Parish Council  
Elmbridge Parish Council  
Elmley Lovett Parish Council  
Hagley Parish Council  
Hartlebury Parish Council  
Highley Parish Council  
Kinlet Parish Council  
Kinver Parish Council  
Lindridge Parish Council  
Mamble Parish Council  
Pensax Parish Council  
Upton Warren Parish Council