

Matter 6 – Dr Peter King

With the exception of comments on WA/KF/3 (Kidderminster) and LI/11 and MI/38 (Stourport), all submissions refer to Bewdley and rural sites (including reserved ones). Hagley PC takes no view on most of these, the exception being WFR/CB/3.

Q6.1 to 6.4 We have no objection generally in principle.

Q6.5 *Taking account of the specific characteristics of the allocation sites that are currently within the Green Belt, are there exceptional circumstances that justify the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundary?*

While school buildings are certainly previously developed, associated playing fields are not: they are recreational facilities of a kind generally allowed in the Green Belt. Nevertheless, we accept that some modest loss of Green Belt is inevitable. We are thus not objecting to:

- LI/11 and MI/38 Land associated with former schools. This is an option causing the least damage.
- WA/KF/3 This in effect continues the existing development on the west side of Habberley Road. Ideally CPRE would like this not to be developed, so that open countryside began on B4190 at the Habberley roundabout, but if Green Belt land is needed, this is one of the least bad options.
- WA/BE/3 This site is well contained between Bewdley Bypass and the urban area of Wribbenhall. We are glad that the hilltop site Maypole Piece is not proposed for development.

We are however objecting to:

- WA/BE/1 As one travels west along Bewdley Bypass, on passing under the railway bridge, one emerges into open countryside. Wribbenhall is currently well contained by a brook (presumably called Sandbourne – the name of a former house next to it). Substantially the only building south of it is Bewdley Sports Centre, which is ancillary to the use of its playing fields and its buildings lie close to the brook.
- WFR/CB/3 Land at Blakedown Station. We welcome the proposal that this should be a rail-related Park and Ride car park. As outlined under Matters 2 and 11, there is a need for more such parking along the Stourbridge Line and this is the only site available. However we consider that the whole site should be allocated for car parking, perhaps with the northern section being reserved for future car parking expansion. We do not consider that the need to pay for this car park is a sufficient reason for allowing housing to be built on some of it. Open land next to a railway station is a scarce resource and should not be frittered away. The provisions related to the development of this site also need to include the provision of traffic lights at the junction of Station Road with A456.
- WA/BE/5 We regret the need to develop this land, but we accept that it is probably unavoidable. However, the development of this land provides an opportunity to avoid the complexity of travelling along B4190 from Wolverley to Bewdley. As the roads are laid out at present it is necessary to turn left and then make a U-turn around the roundabout at the end of the bypass. This land provides an opportunity for a link road from B4190 direct to the roundabout. The brief for developing this land should be amended accordingly.

Q6.6 *(i) With reference to Policy 7B for the reserved housing sites (a-d) that are defined as Areas of Development Restraint in the adopted development plan, is there adequate justification for not releasing them for development in this Plan, while removing other sites from the Green Belt for development during the Plan period? (ii) Is there adequate justification for the identification of Lawnswood, Cookley (Policy 7B(e)) as a reserved housing site? (iii) Are Policy 7B and the reasoned justification in paragraphs 7.17-7.21 consistent with one another and with national planning policy on safeguarded land?*

We are somewhat concerned about the inclusion of WFR/WC/12 Lawnswood as reserved land as this is part of a very narrow strategic gap between Cookley and Lea Castle. This would certainly fill in a corner of the settlement of Cookley, but we doubt this is necessary. We consider that this should be returned to the Green Belt and excluded from the Cookley village envelope.