



**Wyre Forest District Council**

**Site Allocations and Policies Development  
Plan Document**

**Statement of Consultation (Regulation  
22(c))**

**July 2012**



# Contents

1. Introduction	p.1
2. Issues and Options Consultation	p.3
3. Preferred Options Consultation	p.5
4. Consultation on Potential Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	p.7
5. Conclusions	p.9

Appendix 1 – List of People Invited to Make Representations at Issues and Options Stage

Appendix 2 – Summary of Issues and Options Responses and how they were Incorporated into the Preferred Options Paper

Appendix 3 - Summary of Preferred Option Responses and how they were Incorporated into the Publication Document

Appendix 4 – Summary of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites Consultation Responses and Wyre Forest District Council Responses

Appendix 5 – Summary of Responses to Consultation on Additional Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites

The appendices to this document are available electronically on the Council's website [www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk](http://www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk)

If you would like to view a hard copy of any of the appendices please contact the Planning Policy Team on 01562 732928 or email [planning.policy@wyreforestdc.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@wyreforestdc.gov.uk)

ADDENDUM: Paragraph 4.6, bullet point one states that Letters to all people listed on the database which includes statutory consultees, landowners, businesses, and local residents and all those people who had responded to the previous consultation. However, it should read:

- Letters to properties on Sandy Lane Industrial Estate, statutory consultees and relevant general consultees.
- A Public Consultation Information Pack was produced.

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This document has been prepared to meet the requirements of Regulation 22(c) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The document will be submitted alongside the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). It sets out the consultation which has been undertaken during the preparation of the DPD and in order to meet the requirements of the Regulations it sets out the following information:

- Who was consulted.
- How they were consulted.
- A summary of the main issues raised in response to consultation.
- How representations made have been taken into account in the Publication DPD.

1.2 This statement will be made available alongside the Publication DPD. Following the Publication period, a separate statement will be prepared setting out how many representations were received in relation to the Publication document and a summary of these representations. Should no representations be received, a statement will be prepared setting out that no such representations were received. Following the Publication period, the DPD, together with the consultation statements, copies of all representations received in relation to the Publication period, and all other submission documents, will be submitted to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination.

1.3 Development Plan Documents are required to be prepared in accordance with the District Council's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The SCI sets out how the District Council will consult with stakeholders and the community. Wyre Forest District Council adopted its SCI in April 2006. The Site Allocations and Policies DPD has been prepared in accordance with the procedures set out within it.

1.4 Consultation has been undertaken at a number of stages during the preparation of the DPD. The table below sets out the various stages in the production of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Stage of Preparation</b>
<b>April 2008</b>	Consultation on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Reports
<b>January 2009</b>	Consultation on Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Paper
<b>May 2011</b>	Consultation on Preferred Options Paper and Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report
<b>July 2012</b>	6 week Publication period
<b>Anticipated October 2012</b>	Submission of Site Allocations and Policies DPD for independent Examination in Public
<b>Anticipated February 2013</b>	Inspector's Report received
<b>Anticipated February/March 2013</b>	Adoption of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD

1.5 It should be noted that the Regulations governing the preparation of development plans have changed during the preparation of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. Each of the stages set out below will refer to the Regulations which the stage was carried out under.



## 2. Issues and Options Consultation

2.1 The Issues and Options consultation was undertaken during January 2009 under Regulation 25 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. The Issues and Options consultation took place between 15<sup>th</sup> January and 6<sup>th</sup> March 2009. At this time the District Council also consulted on its Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper.

2.2 Appendix 1 sets out a list of people invited to submit representations at this stage. This list includes stakeholders and members of the public, and all of those people who have registered to be notified of Local Development Framework consultations.

2.3 In order to maximise the number of people involved in the consultation, the following consultation techniques were used:

- A representation form was produced to allow people to respond to the consultation.
- The Issues and Options Paper was published on the District Council's web-site and representations could be made electronically.
- A number of exhibitions were held within the District's towns and villages. The exhibitions consisted of a number of display panels setting out the background to the LDF, the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper and the key issues addressed raised within the Site Allocations and Policies and Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan Issues and Options Paper and the options for addressing them. The panels also set out details on the evidence base and the Sustainability Appraisal process as well as details on how to get involved with the consultation. The documents and the evidence base were also available to view at the exhibition, and the consultation documents were available to loan. As well as this, at least two staff were on hand to answer questions about the LDF process and the consultation throughout the duration of the exhibitions. A full list of exhibition venues together with the numbers of people attending is set out in the table below. The exhibitions were advertised through the consultation leaflet, the District Council's website, the consultation notification letters, mini-displays at the Hubs and through posters which were displayed in Post Offices and convenience stores across the District. Visitor numbers were particularly low at Blakedown and Wolverley due to adverse weather conditions.

Date	Location	Time	Number of Visitors
19/01/2009	Bewdley Library	10-7	82
21/01/2009	St. Wulstan's Church Hall, Stourport-on-Severn	10-7	17
22/01/2009	Corn Exchange, Town Hall, Kidderminster	10-7	90
26/01/2009	Sports Pavilion, Callow Hill, Rock	1-7	34
27/01/2009	Upper Arley Village Hall	1-7	12
28/01/2009	Cookley Sports and Social Club	1-7	27
03/02/2009	Blakedown Parish Rooms	1-7	4
04/02/2009	Chaddesley Village Hall	1-7	32
10/02/2009	Wolverley Memorial Hall	1-7	3
11/02/2009	Stourport-on-Severn Civic Centre	10-7	35
12/02/2009	Corn Exchange, Town Hall, Kidderminster	10-7	74

- A letter was sent to all Town and Parish Councils in advance of the consultation to highlight the fact that it would be taking place and to offer presentations to

Town and Parish Councils at their regular meetings. Presentations were given at Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council, Bewdley Town Council, and the Campaign to Protect Rural England.

- All material was made available on the District Council's web-site to view and download, and comments could be submitted on-line through the consultation portal.
- The consultation documents were displayed in the Hubs and libraries within the District and copies of the representation form were made available in these locations.

2.4 A total of 692 comments were received from 125 respondents.

<b>Response Method</b>	<b>% of Responses</b>
E-mail	28
Post – via letter or response form	54
On-line Response Form	18

2.5 Responses received on the Issues and Options document generally focussed on the issue of potential new residential sites, with many of the comments relating to sites that are considered at this stage to be contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy of the Core Strategy. Many local residents were concerned about the potential for development of the land to the south of Spennells, which was put forward by landowners. Residents considered that this would have a detrimental impact on infrastructure; the loss of Green Belt land; the loss of agricultural land and the impact on wildlife within this area.

2.6 Other main concerns from local residents were the proliferation of caravan sites within the District and the wish to restrict any further development. Generally, however, there was a great deal of support for identifying brownfield sites for further development whilst ensuring that the environment, including flooding, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) and 'Green Infrastructure' was a key future consideration in all development.

2.7 The representations received were used to inform the development of the Preferred Options Paper. The table at Appendix 2 sets out summaries of the representations received and details of how they have been incorporated into the Preferred Options Paper.

### 3. Preferred Options Consultation

3.1 The Preferred Options consultation on both the Site Allocations and Policies and Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan DPDs took place between 26<sup>th</sup> May and the 8<sup>th</sup> July 2011 under Regulation 25 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008. At this time, the District Council also consulted on the draft Churchfields Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Appendix 1 sets out the full list of people invited to make representations at this stage. This list includes stakeholders and members of the public, and all of those people who have registered to be notified of Local Development Framework consultations or who responded to the Issues and Options consultation.

3.2 In order to maximise the number of people involved in the consultation, the following consultation techniques were used:

- A representation form was produced to allow people to respond to the consultation.
- The Preferred Options Paper and Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report were published on the District Council's web-site and representations could be made electronically.
- A number of exhibitions were held within the District's towns and villages. The exhibitions consisted of a number of display panels setting out the background to the LDF and the key issues from both the Site Allocations and Policies and Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan Development Plan Documents as well as information on the Churchfields Masterplan SPD. The panels also set out details on the evidence base and the Sustainability Appraisal process as well as details on how to get involved with the consultation. The documents and the evidence base were available to view at the exhibition, and the consultation documents were available to loan. As well as this, at least two staff were on hand to answer questions about the LDF process and the consultation throughout the duration of the exhibitions. The exhibitions were advertised through the consultation leaflet, the District Council's website, the consultation notification letters, mini-displays at the Hubs and libraries. The exhibition schedule was as follows:
  - Saturday 28<sup>th</sup> May 2011 – Stall at Kidderminster Market, 10-4
  - Saturday 4<sup>th</sup> June 2011 – Bewdley Museum 10:30 – 4
  - Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> June 2011 – Kidderminster – Rowland Hill Centre, 11-5
  - Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2011 – Stourport-on-Severn – Lloyds Garage - 11-5
- A member of the Planning Policy Team was available at the Worcestershire Hub in Kidderminster on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays between the hours of 11 and 1 for the duration of the consultation period.
- A letter was sent to all Town and Parish Councils in advance of the consultation to highlight the fact that it would be taking place and to invite representatives to attend a presentation and discussion session on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June. Representatives from the following Town and Parish Councils attended the meeting:
  - Broome Parish Council
  - Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council
  - Rock Parish Council
  - Stourport-on-Severn Town Council
  - Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council
- All material was made available on the District Council's web-site to view and download, and comments could be submitted on-line through the consultation portal.

- The consultation documents were displayed in the Hubs and libraries within the District and copies of the representation form were made available in these locations.

3.3 A total of 350 comments were received from 72 respondents.

<b>Response Method</b>	<b>% of Responses</b>
E-mail	68
Post – via letter or response form	13
On-line Response Form	19

3.4 The majority of the consultation responses were supportive towards the document and the proposals set out within it. The key areas which have raised specific objections are:

- The allocation of the former Blakedown nurseries site for residential development which has received a number of objections from local residents raising concerns including traffic and parking issues, impact on services and more.
- The allocation of the Lea Castle site has generated a number of positive responses relating to suggested land uses but has also generated a number of responses which express concern over the impact which development at the site may have on traffic through Hurcott village.
- A number of landowners have objected to, or suggested amendments to, policies in relation to certain sites including the former British Sugar Site and the West Midlands Safari Park.

3.5 The representations received were used to inform the development of the Publication document. The table at Appendix 3 sets out summaries of the representations received and details of how they have been incorporated into the Publication document.

## 4. Consultation on Potential Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

4.1 The Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options and Preferred Options Papers did not include specific sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The decision was taken to consult on these sites separately so this single issue did not overshadow consultation on the other issues addressed through the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. The District Council appointed consultants Baker Associates to carry out an assessment of potential sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Following receipt of the final report, Cabinet agreed at their meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> September to undertake a consultation on 7 possible sites.

4.2 The consultation took place between 7<sup>th</sup> October and 18<sup>th</sup> November 2011. The following engagement techniques were used in undertaking the consultation:

- Letters to all people listed on the database which includes statutory consultees, landowners, businesses, and local residents.
- Letters to all properties who share a boundary with the sites.
- A Public Consultation Information Pack which was published on the web-site and made available at libraries and Hubs across the District.
- A hard copy response form.
- An interactive response form.
- A series of public meetings in areas close to the affected sites.
- Press releases to publicise the consultation details and public meeting details.

4.3 A total of 1604 representations were received from 1211 respondents. 16 of the respondents were statutory consultees and the remainder were general consultees.

4.4 The table below shows the breakdown of representations received by site.

Site Name	Total Number of Respondents	Total No of Responses	Comments	Objections	Support
Lea Castle	566	583	18	557	8
Sion Hill	273	307	7	297	3
Manor Farm	271	327	4	322	1
Stourport Road Bewdley	185	240	14	214	12
Saiwen	21	21	2	15	4
Nunns Corner	18	18	3	11	4
The Gables	20	20	3	14	3
Not Site Specific	72	88	61	17	5
	<b>1426*</b>	<b>1604</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>1447</b>	<b>40</b>

\*There were 1211 respondents in total. Some respondents have been counted more than once where they have made representations on more than one site.

4.5 In addition to these responses, a number of petitions were received as follows:

Sion Hill	411
Sion Hill	179
	<b>590</b>
Lea Castle - From hirer of facilities at Lea Castle	464
Lea Castle Petition handed in by Gill Hill	416
Lea Castle - Cookley Action Group - Signed Comment Forms	256
	<b>1136</b>
Manor Farm - Petition - Facebook -Online	<b>2640</b>

4.6 The representations have each been commented on individually by officers and will be reported to Members through the January committee cycle. Tables setting out the summaries of each of the representations received and the District Council's responses to these will be made available on the District Council's website. In light of the comments received, a number of further sites have been investigated to see if they are potentially suitable for allocation as sites for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople. Following these investigations, consultation took place on three further potential sites between 7<sup>th</sup> February and 20<sup>th</sup> March 2012. The following consultation techniques were used:

- Letters to all people listed on the database which includes statutory consultees, landowners, businesses, and local residents and all those people who had responded to the previous consultation.
- Letters to all properties who share a boundary with the sites.
- A Public Consultation Information Pack which was published on the web-site and made available at libraries and Hubs across the District.
- A hard copy response form.
- An interactive response form.
- Press releases to publicise the consultation details.

4.7 A total of 20 representations were received from 17 respondents. Of the respondents, 47% were statutory consultees and 53% were general consultees. 5 of the representations were from people who did not wish to make any further comments at this stage.

4.8 The following table sets out an overview of how the representations were submitted:

<b>Response Method</b>	<b>% of Responses</b>
E-mail	25
Post – by letter or response form	69
On-line Response Form	6

## **5. Conclusions**

- 5.1 It is considered that the level and method of consultation undertaken throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy has complied with the relevant regulations and the District Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

**Appendix 1 (part 1) – List of People Invited to make Representations at Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Consultation (October 2011)**

**Specific Consultees**

**Wyre Forest District Parish/Town Councils**

Bewdley Town Council  
Broome Parish Council  
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council  
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council  
Kidderminster Charter Trustees  
Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council  
Rock Parish Council  
Rushock Parish Council  
Stone Parish Council  
Stourport-on-Severn Town Council  
Upper Arley Parish Council  
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council

**Adjacent Parish Councils**

Abberley Parish Council  
Astley & Dunley Parish Council  
Bayton Parish Council  
Belbroughton 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  
Milton & Neen Sollars Parish Council  
Pensax Parish Council  
Upton Warren Parish Council

**Other Specific Consultees**

Advantage West Midlands  
Bridgnorth District Council  
British Telecom  
Bromsgrove District Council  
Central Networks  
Department of Work and Pensions  
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Government Office for the West Midlands  
Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership  
Hereford & Worcester Ambulance Service  
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Service  
Highways Agency  
Highways Agency Network Strategy West Midlands Group

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*  
List of Consultees



## **Appendix 1 (part 1) – List of People Invited to make Representations at Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Consultation (October 2011)**

Homes & Communities Agency  
Malvern Hills District Council  
Ministry of Defence  
Mobile Operators Association  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail  
Office of Government Commerce  
Office of Rail Regulation  
Oil and Pipelines Agency (The)  
PINS - GOWM  
Severn Trent Water Ltd  
Shropshire Council  
South Shropshire District Council  
South Staffordshire District Council  
South Staffordshire Water Plc  
Staffordshire County Council  
Staffordshire Police Authority  
Telewest Communications Network Ltd  
The Coal Authority  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Transco West Midlands Local Distribution Zone  
West Mercia Constabulary  
West Midlands Leaders Board  
West Midlands Regional Assembly  
West Midlands South Strategic Health Authority  
Worcestershire County Council  
Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership  
Worcestershire Primary Care Trust  
Wychavon District Council

### **General Consultees**

Act on Energy  
Age Concern Wyre Forest  
Aggborough & Spennells Community Action Group  
All Rivers Hydro Limited  
Arley Area Environmental Group  
Arts Council West Midlands  
ASHA Wyre Forest  
Association of Retired and Persons over 50  
Bewdley Chamber of Trade  
Bewdley Civic Society  
Bewdley Development Trust  
Bewdley Town Centre Management Forum  
Bill Wiggin MP  
Bishops Wood Centre  
Bodenham Arboretum & Earth Centre  
British Geological Survey

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*  
List of Consultees

**Appendix 1 (part 1) – List of People Invited to make Representations at Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Consultation (October 2011)**

British Horse Society  
British Waterways  
Buddhist Community  
Business Connections 4 North Worcestershire  
Campaign for Real Ale Ltd (CAMRA)  
Campaign to Protect Rural England  
Carr Gomm Society Limited  
Centro- WMPTA  
Chaplaincy for Agricultural & Rural Life  
Chiltern Railways  
Church Commissioners  
Civil Aviation Authority  
Commission for New Towns & English Partnership  
Community - The Union for Life  
Community Action Wyre Forest (CAWF)  
Community First  
Community Spirit Broadwaters  
Council for British Archaeology West Midlands  
Council for the Protection of Rural England (Wyre Forest District Group)  
Country Land & Business Association  
Crown Estate Commissioners  
D & G Coach & Bus Limited  
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
Design Council  
DIAL North Worcestershire  
Disability Action Wyre Forest  
English Heritage  
Farming and Rural Conservation Agency  
Federation of Small Businesses, Herefordshire & Worcestershire  
First Group Plc  
Forestry Commission  
Freight by Water Freight Transport Association  
Freight Transport Association  
Friends Families and Travellers  
Friends of Broadwaters  
Friends of the Village Association  
Fusion Online Ltd  
Garden History Society  
GPU Power UK  
Gypsy Council (The) For Health, Education and Welfare  
H.M. Prison Service  
Health and Safety Executive, Chemical and Hazardous Installations Division  
Heart of England Tourist Board  
Help the Aged  
Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust  
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce  
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Connexions Service  
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust  
Home Builders Federation (Midlands and South West )  
Home-Start Wyre Forest  
Horsefair, Broadwaters & Greenhill Partnership

**Appendix 1 (part 1) – List of People Invited to make Representations at Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Consultation (October 2011)**

Hurcott Village (Management) Ltd  
Independent Advisory Group for Black & Ethnic Minority Issues  
Islamic Mosque  
Jephson Housing Association  
Kidderminster & District Scout Group  
Kidderminster and District Archaeology & Historical Society  
Kidderminster Civic Society  
Kidderminster Cycle Club (Cyclists Touring Club)  
Kidderminster Horticultural Society  
Kidderminster Swan Centre Manager  
Kidderminster Town Centre Partnership  
Learning & Skills Council  
Little Lakes Leisure Ltd  
Local Resident and Tenant Associations  
Local schools and colleges  
London Midland  
MADE  
Marches Energy Agency  
Marches Housing Association Ltd  
Mark Garnier MP  
Meeting Deaf Community  
Museums, Libraries and Archives, West Midlands  
National Air Traffic Services Ltd  
National Farmers Union  
National Farmers Union West Midlands Region  
National Playing Fields Association  
National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners  
National Travellers Action Group  
National Trust  
Natural England  
Nexus Housing Association  
NHS Estates  
Odell Trust  
Offmore Comberton Action Group  
Oldington & Foley Park Community Network  
Oldington & Foley Park Pathfinder  
Other interested parties including:

- agents
- developers
- land owners
- local interest groups
- local residents
- members of the public

PHAB Ltd  
Pipeline Management Land & Wayleaves Ltd  
Ramblers Association  
Renewable UK  
Rooftop Housing Group  
Royal British Legion  
Royal Mail Property Holdings  
Royal Town Planning Institute

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*  
List of Consultees

**Appendix 1 (part 1) – List of People Invited to make Representations at Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Consultation (October 2011)**

RSPB Midlands Regional Office  
Rushock Traders Association  
Severn Navigation Restoration Trust  
Severn Valley Railway  
Sir Thomas White's Charity  
SPA Housing Association  
Sport England  
Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal Society  
Stonham Housing Association  
Stourport Business Association  
Stourport Cricket Club  
Stourport Forward Ltd  
Stourport-on-Severn Civic Society  
Stourport-on-Severn Horticultural Society  
Stourport Rugby Football Club  
Stourport-on-Severn Town Centre Forum  
Strategic Health Authority (Estates - Midlands Division)  
Sure-Start Wyre Forest  
Sustainability West Midlands  
Sustrans  
The Community Housing Group  
The Diocese Board of Finance Worcester  
The Equality and Human Rights Commission  
The Georgian Group  
The Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Coalition  
The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch)  
The Lawn Tennis Association  
The Showman's Guild of Great Britain Midland Section  
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings  
The Theatres Trust  
The Victorian Society  
The Wyre Forest Agenda  
Tourism West Midlands  
Transition Bewdley  
Travellers Advice Team  
Twentieth Century Society  
Ukrainian Club  
Warwickshire & Worcestershire Rural Partnership  
Warwickshire Primary Care Trust  
West Mercia Probation Service  
West Midlands Consortium Education Service for Travelling Children  
West Midlands Planning Aid Service  
West Midlands Region RSL Planning Consortium  
Whittles Coaches  
Wolverley Allotment Society  
Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust  
Worcestershire Biodiversity Partnership  
Worcestershire County Association of Local Councils  
Worcestershire Girl Guides  
Worcestershire Greenpeace  
Worcestershire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust

**Appendix 1 (part 1) – List of People Invited to make Representations at Issues and Options and Preferred Options Stages of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD and on the Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site Consultation (October 2011)**

Worcestershire Racial Equality Council  
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust  
Wyre Forest Action Group for Older People  
Wyre Forest Advocacy  
Wyre Forest Bangladeshi Forum  
Wyre Forest Citizens Advice Bureau  
Wyre Forest Cycle Forum  
Wyre Forest Dial A Ride  
Wyre Forest District Youth House  
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth  
Wyre Forest Lifelong Learning Partnership  
Wyre Forest Matters LSP Chair  
Wyre Forest Race Relations Council  
Wyre Forest Schools Partnership  
Wyre Forest Society  
Wyre Forest Tourism and Leisure Network  
Wyre Forest Women's Aid  
Wyre Forest Youth Strategy Group

**Notes:**

- i. As the consultation stages have taken place, groups, organisations and individuals have been added or removed from the consultation database. Some organisations no longer exist and some have changed name.
- ii. During the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation, October 2011, adjoining neighbours of the proposed sites were consulted.

## **Appendix 1 (part 2) – List of People Invited to make Representations on the additional Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultations (February 2012)**

### **Specific Consultees**

#### **Wyre Forest District Parish/Town Councils**

Bewdley Town Council  
Broome Parish Council  
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council  
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council  
Kidderminster Charter Trustees  
Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council  
Rock Parish Council  
Rushock Parish Council  
Stone Parish Council  
Stourport-on-Severn Town Council  
Upper Arley Parish Council  
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council

#### **Adjacent Parish Councils**

Abberley Parish Council  
Astley & Dunley Parish Council  
Bayton Parish Council  
Belbroughton 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  
Milson & Neen Sollars Parish Council  
Pensax Parish Council  
Upton Warren Parish Council

#### **Other Specific Consultees**

British Telecom  
Bromsgrove District Council  
Central Networks  
Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council  
English Heritage  
Environment Agency  
Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership  
Hereford & Worcester Ambulance Service  
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Service  
Highways Agency  
Homes & Communities Agency  
Malvern Hills District Council  
Mobile Operators Association  
National Grid  
Natural England  
Network Rail

## **Appendix 1 (part 2) – List of People Invited to make Representations on the additional Gypsy and Traveller Site Consultations (February 2012)**

Office of Rail Regulation  
Oil and Pipelines Agency (The)  
Severn Trent Water Ltd  
Shropshire Council  
South Staffordshire District Council  
South Staffordshire Water Plc  
South Worcestershire Development Plan  
Staffordshire County Council  
Staffordshire Police Authority  
The Coal Authority  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Transco West Midlands Local Distribution Zone  
West Mercia Constabulary  
West Midlands Strategic Health Authority  
Worcestershire County Council  
Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership  
Worcestershire Partnership  
Worcestershire Primary Care Trust

### **General Consultees**

Bill Wiggin MP  
Business Connections 4 North Worcestershire  
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group  
Federation of Small Businesses, Herefordshire & Worcestershire  
Friends Families and Travellers  
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce  
Mark Garnier MP  
National Travellers Action Group  
Stourport Business Association  
Stourport Forward  
Stourport-on-Severn Civic Society  
Stourport-on-Severn Town Centre Forum  
The Equality and Human Rights Commission  
The Gypsy and Traveller Law Reform Coalition  
The Showman's Guild of Great Britain Midland Section  
West Midlands Consortium Education Service for Travelling Children  
Worcestershire Racial Equality Council

### **Notes:**

- i. During the Gypsy and Travellers consultation February 2012, neighbouring properties, including the whole of Sandy Lane Industrial Estate, were consulted

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 1 – Local Development Framework – The Wider Picture

Organisation/ Respondent	Response Reference	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
The Inland Waterways Association	<b>SALIO68</b>	Local Development Context Para 1.8	Sets out the history and role of the Inland Waterways Association (IWA).  Comments that the document and the IWA have no comments to make in regard to the discussion areas.	Noted
The Inland Waterways Association	<b>SALIO79</b>	Local Development Context Para 1.8	IWA suggests further documents to be considered under the Plans, policies and programmes section as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Environment Agency's Severn Catchment Flood Management Plan</li> <li>• The Environment Agency's Severn River Basin Plan (currently in draft)</li> </ul> <p>DEFRA's present review of Waterways for Tomorrow which is likely to be a subsidiary document of the 2000 version rather than a rewrite.</p>	This response relates to Question 1 of the questions set out within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and as such will be considered when further Sustainability Appraisal work is undertaken.
The Inland Waterways Association	<b>SALIO80</b>	Local Development Context Para 1.8	Q2 - notes that Scheduled Ancient Monuments are not mentioned under the "Better Environment" section of the main report and requests that these are identified separately.	This response relates to Question 2 of the questions set out within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and as such will be considered when further Sustainability Appraisal work is undertaken.
The Inland Waterways	<b>SALIO81</b>	Local Development	Raises concern that the inclusion of the canal and basins within the Alcohol	This response relates to Question 3 of the questions set out within the



**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>Response Reference</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
Association		Context Para 1.8	Restriction Zone may put innocent boaters, who often eat and drink on the towpath in nice weather, at risk of prosecution.	Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. However, the comment relates to the area covered by the ARZ which is a matter to be referred to the District Council's licensing department.
The Inland Waterways Association	<b>SALIO82</b>	Local Development Context Para 1.8	4. Q.3 (2) Stourport Canal Basins (p21) have now been restored so therefore the statement is out of date.	This response relates to Question 3 of the questions set out within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and as such will be considered when further Sustainability Appraisal work is undertaken.
The Inland Waterways Association	<b>SALIO83</b>	Local Development Context Para 1.8	Identifies that the River Severn and the railways can not be used to transport freight in a sustainable manner unless waterside wharves are provided.	This response relates to Question 4 of the questions set out within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and as such will be considered when further Sustainability Appraisal work is undertaken.
The Inland Waterways Association	<b>SALIO84</b>	Local Development Context Para 1.8	5. Q5 - We have nothing to add or remove.	This response relates to Question 5 of the questions set out within the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and as such will be considered when further Sustainability Appraisal work is undertaken.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 1 – General Comments

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO364	General Comment	<p>GOWM recognises the effort that has been put into producing this document and the progress in bringing it forward. Overall the document appears to be well presented, however it could be improved by incorporating more maps to help better identify specific sites.</p> <p>You have provided a useful overview at the beginning of the document that links in with the development of the Core Strategy; this provides a good context for the Site Allocations DPD. However as you develop this document further it will be necessary to have a greater focus on delivery, setting out how the identified sites will be brought forward. We would expect to see further detail on the justification and identification of any proposed sites.</p>	Noted. Maps will be included in the next publication to increase legibility. Greater focus on delivery will be identified through the next stages in order to justify the site selection process.
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO374	General Comment	The new LDF system places an emphasis on the delivery of proposals rather than simply the allocation of areas for particular forms of development. One of the tests of soundness is that there are clear mechanisms in place for implementation and monitoring. It is important that the development proposals are brought forward in accordance with a specified	Noted and agree. The final plan will focus on the delivery of sites as well as the selection. Stakeholders will continue to be engaged throughout the process, not just at the formal stages, but also through other 'continuous engagement' exercises

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			programme. The final document will need to include in detail how proposals will be implemented, by which organisation and when. It is important that this also reflects the role of wider strategic partnership working and the investment programme of stakeholders. As you develop the plan further you should be able to demonstrate a clear framework for delivery of those options. You will need to ensure that all stakeholders are fully engaged in the process and that they support the proposals as far as possible.	
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO196	General Comment	This DPD is still at the issues and options stage. Later stages of the DPD production will provide more clarity as to the approach of Wyre Forest to addressing the options and hence the direction of travel of the DPD, thereby enabling a more straightforward conformity assessment against the WMRSS to be undertaken. Notwithstanding this, many of the options presented raise local issues only that have no implications for WMRSS conformity.	Noted.
Advantage West Midlands	SALIO697	General Comment	Provides an outline as to the work of Advantage West Midlands and indicates the important role of the West Midlands Economic Strategy (WMES) in providing part of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework.	Noted. Ensure that the objectives of the WMES are taken into account during document production

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Environment Agency	SALIO555	General Comment	<p><b>Pollution prevention and regulating existing/new industry:</b></p> <p>Overall sensitivity of groundwater is based on the groundwater vulnerability classifications and the source protection zones. In general the higher the groundwater vulnerability and the nearer the site is to a groundwater source/source protection zone, the more stringent the protection measures will be. Certain activities e.g. disposal of foul drainage to ground or a proposed petrol station in a source protection zone 1 would not be permitted. Highlights the Agency's document 'Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice Part 4 (legislation and policies)'.</p> <p>Believes reference should be made to the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>Believes reference should be made to The River Severn Draft River Basin Management Plan which will develop measures to achieve good ecological status in as many water bodies as possible by 2015, and in all water bodies where it is technically feasible by 2027.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Background information on groundwater sensitivity is useful. The Water Framework Directive has been scoped as part of the SA process. Provision of facilities for recycling within new developments is addressed under the policy on Sustainable development Standards within the Core Strategy. All new developments will need to comply with this once adopted.</p>

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>Acknowledges that waste is primarily a County function but believes that reference should be made to the WEEE Directive 2002/96/EC and 2003/108/EC - which set a responsibility to provide Designated Collection Facilities to allow the public to dispose of their WEEE for recycling.</p> <p>Need to target waste across all sectors, not just household and also need to decouple economic growth and growth in waste. New residential developments should make it easy for people to recycle.</p>	
Environment Agency	SALIO552	General Comment	<p>Identifies that many proposed sites are brownfield which have the potential for contamination. Whilst redevelopment of these sites may lead to a lower risk to groundwater, strict conditions must be applied to any developments in these locations and remediation may be required to ensure the continued protection of the public water supply. The acceptability of the proposals will also depend upon the proposed land uses.</p> <p>The District is underlain by several aquifers which can support abstraction. It is essential that in areas with no other source of drinking water these supplies</p>	Comments are noted and useful. Contamination issues will need to be considered in the allocation of sites for particular types of development.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>are not threatened.</p> <p>The Triassic Mercia Mudstone is classed as non-aquifer. It must however be acknowledged that where more permeable sandstone bands are encountered, the Mercia Mudstones have the potential to provide locally important groundwater supplies for domestic, agricultural and commercial properties.</p> <p>With regards to protecting groundwater supplies there are numerous issues which must be considered via planning:</p> <p><b>Redevelopment of land affected by contamination e.g. developments on former manufacturing sites or carpet factories.</b></p> <p>Provides background information on the importance of characterising sites adequately before redevelopment in order to prevent any difficulties associated with the disturbance of contaminants.</p> <p>Refers to PPS23 regarding the protection of controlled water. It is essential that this guidance is reflected within the document to avoid delay in delivering the LDF.</p>	

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
English Heritage	SALIO424	General Comment	<p>Local Development Documents should shape and sustain the historic environment in ways that allow people to use, enjoy and benefit from it, without compromising the ability of future generations to do the same.</p> <p>Concerned about the adverse impact of change on the distinctive character of urban and rural landscapes. not just those which are designated but the others which give a locality its distinctive identity</p> <p>Throughout the Development Plan Document the historic environment should be broadly defined. All historic places, whether designated or not, should be taken into account since features of local historic or architectural interest can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity and to helping deliver other social and economic objectives. (buildings, structures and features, archaeological remains, historic open spaces and the historic character)</p> <p>Strongly recommend that the Council's and County Council's historic environment officers are involved at the earliest opportunity in the preparation of the</p>	Noted. The Historic Environment is a key consideration for the LDF and will be reflected more thoroughly within subsequent stages of this documents production.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			document. Other relevant heritage sector groups should also be engaged, such as local civic societies.	
English Heritage	SALIO425	General Comment	Concerned about the current evidence base pertaining to the historic environment. The evidence base should draw on data sources such as the County Council's Historic Environment Record, local lists, and characterisation tools, such as conservation area appraisals, historic landscape characterisation and urban characterisation.	Noted. More work will need to be undertaken, with colleagues, to discuss the evidence base pertaining to the Historic Environment. This will be reflected within subsequent stages of the documents production.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO472	General Comment	Notes that many of the options in the DPD were questions rather than options and that the County were unable to make comments on the individual sites within the appendices due to the large number of sites included. Recommend that talks are held with relevant County colleagues on issues such as historic environment and transport and that a number of county documents be used as evidence base sources to inform the plan.	Noted. Seek to liaise with County colleagues and use evidence base sources as listed.
The Coal Authority	SALIO87	General Comment	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.	Noted
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO444	General Comment	Generally we welcome and support the WFDC in preparing and producing the Core Strategy and supplemental papers	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Upper Arley Parish	SALIO445	General	We are enthusiastic about the way in	Noted. Seek to simplify language and



**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
Council		Comment	which the papers have been developed, their layout, and the use of the Jargon Guide. But we feel that the process could have been taken further and that the language could have been further simplified with the removal of some planning jargon	planning terms in the future, where possible.
Pound Green Group	SALIO421	General Comment	Expresses the healthy quality of life in the countryside and the enjoyment of having visitors who respect the countryside. Does not want to be urbanized and surrounded by ugly developments.	Noted. Rural areas of the District will be safeguarded into the future through the development of a Landscape Character SPD. Any future development should be sympathetic and in-keeping with the surroundings.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 4 – Key Spatial Issues

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	SALIO352	Key Spatial Issues - Para 4.1	Addition of geodiversity to bullet point 9... "Maximise opportunities to safeguard and improve biodiversity <b>and geodiversity</b> within new development"	Noted.
Centro- WMPTA	SALIO91	Key Spatial Issues	Welcomes and supports the overall vision and objectives of all three Local Development Framework (LDF) documents and would like to emphasise that it is important that there are strong correlations between the objectives set out in the three LDF documents and the principles laid out in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (WMRSS), in particular Policies T1-T12, the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) and the West Midlands Local Transport Plan.	Noted. Support for the vision and objectives of the document is welcomed.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO136	Key Spatial Issues	It would be nice if the issue "to safeguard and improve biodiversity in new developments" also included "and their surroundings"	Noted. Look to include revised wording within the next stage of the documents production
Shaylor Construction Ltd	SALIO202	Key Spatial Issues - Para 4.1	Support the identification of Kidderminster Town Centre as a focus for leisure, retail, employment and housing developments alongside the conservation of its historic character. Is anticipated that Kidderminster as a visitor destination is encouraged through the provision of Tourist attractions, encouraging the	Support for the spatial vision is welcomed. Encouraging the provision of tourist attractions, encouraging the evening economy and providing appropriate facilities will be a key component in regenerating the town centre.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>evening economy and providing further hotel accommodation within the Town Centre area.</p> <p>In addition to this, Kidderminster should be promoted as a sustainable location for residential development especially in respect of specialist accommodation such as the provision of Extra Care dwellings</p>	
Kidderminster Property Investments	SALIO357	Key Spatial Issues	Support for a number of key spatial issues including; promoting Kidderminster as a strategic centre for the District; providing more housing choice; reducing the need to travel and balancing regeneration.	Noted. Support is welcomed.
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO46	Key Spatial Issues	There should be a specific reference in the Spatial Vision to improving and expanding the role of tourism facilities	Noted. The Spatial Vision list within the Site Allocations is not an exhaustive list. Will look to include reference to tourism within the next stages of document production.
Hill Mr R	SALIO15	Key Spatial Issues	With regard to land off Church View, Bewdley - This site is currently a natural open space on a steep hillside. As such it provides a useful, identifiable and desirable 'natural 'edge' to the Bewdley Town Conservation Area. The site should be clearly and suitably zoned as green space to preserve a distinctive green border between the historic centre and the more modern development above the town.	Noted. This parcel of land will need to be looked at in more detail as the plan progresses. Identifying this area as urban green space will be considered through the preparation of the next stages of the plan.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 6 – Delivering Housing Choice

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO147	General Comment - Option 6.1	Appendix A lists 110 sites and asks for views as to their potential for residential development. In assessing the sites' suitability for development, regard should be had to the relevant emerging WMRSS policies, notably those in Chapter 6 Communities for the Future, in particular policy CF2 parts B and C, and in Chapter 5 Rural Renaissance. Account should also be taken of emerging WMRSS policy SR2. The Appendix also lists 21 sites included in the Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan Issues and Options Paper. Reference should be made to the conformity assessment of this document.	Comments noted. Emerging RSS policy will be taken into account when deciding which sites to bring forward. All sites being brought forward for development must be in conformity with the strategic principles set out in the Core Strategy which is itself in conformity with emerging RSS.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO146	General Comment - Option 6.1	Do not consider there is sufficient environmental information available for the listed sites to allow us to comment on their suitability for development at this stage. We hope that this will come forward in due course so that the sites may be allocated based on a rigorous consideration of the environmental impacts associated with their development. Absence of such information and scrutiny would, in our opinion, render the allocations document unsound. We would further suggest that all site	Comments noted. Sites will be assessed through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Among the criteria taken into consideration will be the environmental impact of any development, including biodiversity issues. A Green Infrastructure policy is set out in the Core Strategy preferred options paper (Core Policy 9 Preferred Approach to Delivering Green Infrastructure and Supporting Local Biodiversity).

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			allocations include sufficient space for relevant Green Infrastructure and the maintenance and creation of ecological corridors.	
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO90	General Comment - Option 6.1	Generally, development should be restricted to brownfield sites within Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley. Where a need is identified, limited residential development should be undertaken in the rural areas of the district.	Noted and agree
Sport England	SALIO262	General Comment - Option 6.1	<p>The following sites identified as potential residential sites should not be released until an updated planning pitch assessment has been commissioned and adopted as a playing pitch strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site H043 Broadwaters Community Centre, Upton Road, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• H050 Chester Road Bowling Club, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• Site H057 Land to the rear of 32-51 Franche Road, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• Site H057 Land of Broomfield Close, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• Site 058 Playing field adjacent to St Mary's School, Stourvale Drive, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• Site H064 Playing field off Sutton</li> </ul>	Noted. The Site Allocations process will be informed by the PPG 17 Audit of leisure and open spaces within the District undertaken in 2008. All of the sites identified are being considered through the SHLAA process which also looks at the existing constraints of sites.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>Park Rise, Kidderminster;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site H074 Blakebrook school, Bewdley Road, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• Site H089 King Charles I school, Comberton Road, Kidderminster;</li> <li>• Site H019 Lickhill Lodge School, Almond Way, Stourport-on-Severn;</li> <li>• Site H034 Bewdley Primary School, Hedge Road, Bewdley ;It should be noted that where the site is clearly a playing field unless there was an assessment in place or one accompanying a planning application Sport England would most likely automatically object to any development.</li> </ul>	
Hardwick Mr R	SALIO254	General Comment - Option 6.1	I believe no Greenfield/Green Belt land should be built on whilst there is still plenty of brownfield land available	Noted. This is the preferred approach that is being taken within the Core Strategy.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO304	General Comment - Option 6.1	We have undertaken individual brief desktop analyses of all the sites included in the same bracket, considered through the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options.	Noted.
Blissett Mr P	SALIO302	General Comment - Option 6.1	To deprive Bewdley of any realistic residential development over the next 15 years is totally wrong as this may well lead to unsuitable development being forced	Noted. A number of sites are being considered for Bewdley through the SHLAA process. However, due to the nature of the town and its historic

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			upon the town and local vicinity, such as 'residential caravan/holiday park' homes, which is becoming very prominent in the locality. Accordingly, a substantial site should be allocated within Bewdley Town to provide new housing within the Plan period. This would also provide an opportunity to meet the affordable housing needs for the town within a sizeable development. The location should be east of the River Severn where flatter land can be found and where good public transport links to Kidderminster are readily available.	patterns brownfield sites are in short supply.
Natural England	SALIO579	General Comment - Option 6.1	The consideration of the suitability of sites needs to be informed by the Worcestershire Habitat Inventory, data from the Biological Records Centre and the findings of the in-house Green Infrastructure Study when complete.	Noted and agree.
Hillcrest Residents Association	SALIO469	General Comment - Option 6.1	<p>Potential Residential Sites:</p> <p>Identifies that the potential residential sites total approx 250 hectares, including 16 sites which already have permission. The five largest sites alone equal 187 hectares. The display material indicates that 2800 further dwellings need to be completed over the plan period to meet RSS targets, however, based on an</p>	Comments are noted. A large number of sites have been identified for consideration for residential development through the SHLAA process. However, a number of these will be eliminated as the process progresses. The remaining sites will provide a portfolio for residential sites to be selected from - not all sites will be allocated for residential development, only enough land to meet the

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>average of 40 d.p.h, there is enough land to meet 4 times the requirements.</p> <p>Development should not be allowed on land vulnerable to flooding. Lifetime Homes standards increase flooding by not allowing a step up to the house. Lifetime Homes requirements are common sense, making life easier for all, not just the elderly or disabled.</p> <p>Argues that document is weak on provision for older people and suggests the District Council ear-mark specific sites for older persons accommodation. Suggests Sutton Reservoir as a possible location.</p> <p>Generally the document is well laid-out.</p>	<p>requirements of the RSS will be allocated.</p> <p>Housing for older people is a key consideration within the LDF and as such, specific sites will be allocated to meet the accommodation needs of older people where appropriate.</p>
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO373	General Comment - Option 6.1	<p>With reference to your list of potential development sites, only those in excess of 20 hectares in the area, and those that are likely to involve the loss of 20 hectares or more of the best and most versatile agricultural land are of concern to us. Those that fall into this category are; Lower Habberley Farm; Land South of Spennells, and Lea Castle Hospital. We would want to be assured that you will fully consider the agricultural implications of the</p>	<p>Noted. The potential of these sites to accommodate development are being evaluated in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Ensure that agricultural implications are taken into account.</p>



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			potential loss of land in these sites to development.	
Oldington & Foley Park Pathfinder	SALIO698	General Comment - Option 6.1	While it may be more difficult - has sufficient consideration been given to identifying areas of low density and poor housing quality that would benefit from redevelopment? This is being used successfully with the maisonettes in Hurcott Road and we would suggest similar opportunities exist in the Rifle Range area.	Comments noted. Consider potential for this type of development, although the main benefit may would be a better living environment rather than providing additional residential units.
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO448	General Comment - Option 6.1	It is significant that in the Site Allocations Paper at Section 6 and Appendix A that no sites have been identified in the Parish. If there are no sites identified for significant residential development, then on what basis can it be argued that the placing of mobile homes or chalets is suitable?	Noted. However this part of the process, as well as identifying possible sites, asks for further sites to come forward and it may be that as part of this exercise sites do come forward. Furthermore, there is one suggestion for a site within Upper Arley Parish, which is site 133: Land at Shatterford.
English Heritage	SALIO426	General Comment - Option 6.1	For all the sites listed in Appendix A we strongly recommend that these are assessed for potential implications for the historic environment. As indicated above this should be based upon a broad definition of the historic environment, including designated and non-designated assets and their settings, in addition to potential impacts on the historic character of the landscape and townscape.	Comments noted. Look to include this assessment through further stages of evidence base production. Seek to engage with English Heritage more on this at the meeting in March

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			At our meeting in March we would be happy to discuss any sites which may have implications for the District's historic environment resource.	
Environment Agency	SALIO578	General Comment - Option 6.1	<p>For all of the above sites we would expect the LPA to consider the Sequential and Exception Tests where appropriate using the SFRA as evidence.</p> <p>Sites within the town centre, we acknowledge the need for town centre regeneration however Sequential and Exception Tests will be needed. Flood levels and availability of access would be important in these locations</p>	Comments noted. The Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will provide greater information on flood risk for potential development sites. The sequential and exception tests will be a key consideration as will flood levels and access within the town centre locations
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO533	General Comment - Option 6.1	<p>Areas of Greenbelt or Greenspace should be left unspoiled. We would want to look at any proposals for the former Lea Street School carefully. The former Purac building could make a nice residential use in an area that is predominantly residential. Redevelopment of the Hurcott Maisonettes would seem attractive but will it add any/many new dwellings?</p> <p>Broadwaters Community Centre would be better kept for community purposes. Demolition of existing Public Houses should be avoided where there is any chance of them remaining viable as they are an important local amenity and too</p>	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Issues raised regarding the sites outlined above will be used to inform the process.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			many have already been lost. We would want to look very carefully at any development at the King Charles I School site and Hillgrove House and perhaps other important buildings there should be preserved.	
Cox Mr T	SALIO4	H001 Bewdley Medical Centre	I think within this development there is opportunity for affordable housing such as 1 or 2 bedroom flats.	Agree that site has potential to deliver some affordable housing
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO384	H001 Bewdley Medical Centre, H003 Texaco Garage, H034 Bewdley Primary School	We consider Bewdley Medical Centre Redevelopment, Texaco Garage and Bewdley Primary School in Shaw Hedge Road may be suitable, either wholly or in part, for residential development perhaps as part of larger mixed use for the sites. We consider no other land in Appendix A as suitable for residential development particularly those sites located on the flood plain, in the green belt or in Landscape Protection areas. In particular, no more housing west of the river which would add to the already unacceptable level of traffic through Welch Gate and Park Lane.	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Cox Mr T	SALIO5	H003 Texaco Garage, Bewdley	The fuel station should not be developed into any residential housing. It is vital that Bewdley retains a fuel station both for fuel security and the provision of a late night / early morning basic shop for Wribbenhall residents	Noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Environment Agency	SALIO574	H006 TP Toys,	Bank of the Severn, near confluence.	Comments Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Cheapside	There are potential flood risks at this site though the rear of this site may be elevated, we would look to re-establish river corridor, frontage at this location.	
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO92	H014 Former Lea Street School	Former Lea Street School - considered for affordable housing - conversion not feasible, would require new build. Scheme needs to be sympathetic to local street scene. Good location for access to station and town centre	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO305	H014 Former Lea Street School	Questions availability of the Lea Street school for residential development.	This site is being considered through the SHLAA process and discussions are being held with Worcestershire County Council over its deliverability.
Environment Agency	SALIO577	H015 78 Mill Street	Largely within flood zone 3, A FRA would be required to demonstrate this site is appropriate and can be redeveloped safely	Comments noted.
Interest in North of Baldwin Road	SALIO256	H017 H084 H106 Baldwin Road	Would like the Council to consider allowing a holistic development of land to the north of Baldwin Road in Stourport for residential development. It is considered that this parcel of land is ideally suited for a residential development incorporating an element of public open space. It should be noted that the current area of 'Urban Open Space', affords no public access due to it being landlocked by land in private ownership and by land to the east, south and west and a steep embankment which forms its northern boarder. In line with	Noted. The sites listed are being considered through the SHLAA process. If considered suitable for development in the future, one option would to be to look at the land in a holistic manner, which is likely to require a development brief. This would require the discussion of land assembly and consider issues such as the public open space that exists within this area.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			PPS3 it is considered that the site is available and deliverable to come forward for residential development within the next five years. The development of sustainable brownfield sites in the existing urban areas, such as Baldwin Road, should be a priority over greenfield sites in the Green Belt. At this stage no weight should be given to the allocation of greenfield sites within the Green Belt for future housing development.	
Natural England	SALIO600	H019 Lickhill Lodge School	The proximity to the River Severn and existing footpaths should be promoted. Existing open space should be maintained and enhanced.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO101	H020 Carpets of Worth	Carpets of Worth, Severn Road, Stourport on Severn: The scheme is too large for just residential development. However, the development should include some residential dwellings, with some allocated for affordable housing.	Comments noted. The site is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Tesco Stores Ltd	SALIO347	H020 Carpets of Worth	Table A.1 - SHLAA sites: refers to Carpets of Worth site in Stourport with an area of 6.06ha, believe this is an error as site subject to current residential planning application is only 4.5ha.  Recommend that reference is made to the suitability of the entire site for a mix of uses, including retail as set out in the	Noted. Seek to amend site size reference as indicated above.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Severn Road Development Brief.	
Natural England	SALIO611	H022 Land at Hemming Way	Aerial photographs indicate possible allotments, which may have biodiversity interest.	Comments noted.
Natural England	SALIO621	H025 KTC.3 Worcester Street	Any development here should enhance the River Stour	Comments noted.
Natural England	SALIO622	H027 Timber Yard, Park Lane	Any development here should enhance the River Stour	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO93	H030 Chester Road South Service Station	Chester Road South Service Station: Surrounded by residential so would be an appropriate site. Might be costly to decontaminate.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO306	H030 Chester Road South Service Station	Albeit the site is adjacent to residential dwellings, one obvious constraint in the current market conditions is the contamination from the longstanding petrol filling station use; reclamation could be costly. Also, the proximity to the railway line in terms of noise and disturbance is a consideration. We would be concerned that development of the site is not currently achievable.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO580	H030 Chester Road South Service Station	Could the adjacent golf course provide open space opportunities?	Comments noted. Need to consider this option further should the site be considered suitable for residential development within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO307	H031 Oldnall Road	Site H031 - Oldnall Road	Comments Noted. However, the site has been given permission for development

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			This is a steeply sloping site, which could be a constraint to the road layout of a higher density scheme. The suitability of the site is questionable.	for a Nursing Home.
Natural England	SALIO581	H031 Oldnall Road	Could the adjacent golf course provide open space opportunities?	Comments noted. However, the site has been given permission for development for a Nursing Home.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO308	H032 Former Purac Building, Birmingham Road	Site HO32 - Former Purac Building  Potential for contamination depending on the historic use of the site. Residential development would be constrained by position of the nearby industrial unit, dwellings adjacent and green space to the fore.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Cox Mr T	SALIO6	H034 Bewdley Primary School	Support redevelopment of this site. Believe affordable housing along with a nursery would be brilliant. Development should be limited to school building footprint and should be low level. Believe school field should not be developed but be connected to Wribbenhall Millennium Green as it is would make a perfect park for the Wribbenhall estate as it lacks one!	Noted. A scheme for affordable housing development is being drawn up by Wyre Forest Community Housing
Natural England	SALIO604	H034 Bewdley Primary School	Existing open space should be maintained and enhanced.	Comment noted.
Natural England	SALIO623	H040 Long Meadow Mills	Any development here should enhance the River Stour	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO125	H041 Rifle Range Shops	Rifle Range shops : 70% affordable housing	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Agree that any scheme at this location should have a mix of tenures
British Sugar Plc	SALIO309	H041 Rifle Range Shops	HO41 - Rifle Range Shops  This group of shops is recognised in the extant Local Plan and identified in Appendix 11 as having an important local role. The occupiers may have long lease agreements.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO582	H041 Rifle Range Shops	Near to Devils Spittleful SSSI (open access land) and a National Cycle Route - green infrastructure connections.	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO95	H042 Hurcott Road Masionettes	Hurcott Road Maisonettes: the redevelopment of the maisonettes will kickstart the regeneration of the Horsefair area of Kidderminster and facilitate a better standard of accommodation	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO122	H042 Hurcott Road Masionettes	Hurcott Road Maisonettes : 70 - 100% affordable	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver additional housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO310	H042 Hurcott Road Masionettes	HO42 Hurcott Road Maisonettes  It is unlikely that any significant contribution could be made towards the housing target through redevelopment of this site. A net loss of houses would be a more likely outcome.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
British Sugar Plc	SALIO311	H043 Broadwaters Community Centre, Upton Road	Site H043 - Broadwaters Community Centre  Can the loss of public open space be justified?	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO583	H043 Broadwaters Community Centre, Upton Road	Existing open space within this site should be maintained and enhanced. The footpath connections to the canal, Stourvale Marsh SSSI and Puxton Marsh SSSI should be promoted as a part of green infrastructure.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Environment Agency	SALIO573	H045 Riverside Business Centre	Consider much of site to be inappropriate for re-development - is in flood zone 3.	Comments noted.
Natural England	SALIO624	H047 Industrial Estate, Park Street	Any development here should enhance the River Stour	Comments noted.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO312	H049 207 Birmingham Road	Site H049 - 207 Birmingham Road  The development may result in tandem development, presenting problems in terms of service provision and residential amenity.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO313	H050 (L122) Chester Road Bowling Club	Site H050 - Chester Road Bowling Club  Loss of public sports facility is likely to be fundamentally opposed by Sport England. Would conflict with the Council's Open Space Audit which identified a deficiency of informal and formal open space across the board.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Natural England	SALIO584	H050 (L122) Chester Road Bowling Club	The Greenfield land should be maintained and enhanced as greenspace within any development.	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO629	H053 Churchfields Business Park	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Comments noted
Kidderminster Property Investments	SALIO359	H053 Churchfields Business Park	<p>The site most suitable for residential development is considered to be the site known as Churchfields Business Park (North) - Former Georgian Carpets and Stoney Lane Industrial Areas. This is the case as this site is centrally located, brownfield, and offers good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. The residential redevelopment of Churchfields North will aid the wider regeneration of the town creating a better environment and an opportunity to enhance the town.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is considered that sites located around the periphery of Kidderminster and Stourport that are Greenfield and constrained by Green Belt or other designations should not be considered for development as they will prejudice the key regeneration of the town centres of both Kidderminster and</p>	<p>Noted. Agree in part - the Churchfields area provides one of the largest and most sustainable opportunities to provide residential development in town. It would also contribute to revitalisation of the town centre and help to create a new residential community in the central area and it is currently being assessed within the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).</p> <p>With regard to the other sites located around Kidderminster and Stourport, these are also currently being assessed by the SHLAA.</p>

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Stourport and lead to the decentralisation of these areas and take away the potential for regeneration investment.	
Natural England	SALIO630	H054 Georgian Carpets	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO107	H055 BT Mill Street	BT Mill Street: significant drainage issues in the area so the sewerage system would need upgrading	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO314	H055 BT Mill Street	Site H055 BT Mill Street  Site is principally surrounded by commercial uses. The possibility of a statutory noise nuisance issue should be given strong consideration.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO585	H055 BT Mill Street	This site includes marginal land along the River Stour. The riverbank and floodplain should remain undeveloped and be enhanced by any development	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Environment Agency	SALIO576	H055 BT Mill Street	Largely within flood zone 3, A FRA would be required to demonstrate this site is appropriate and can be redeveloped safely	Comments noted
British Sugar Plc	SALIO315	H056 (L032) Land rear of 32 - 51 Franche Road	Site H056 Land to the rear of 32-51 Franche Road  Distanced from the town centre, greenfield land and used for public open space. Access and land consolidation issues.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO586	H056 (L032) Land rear of 32 -	Urban green space in Kidderminster is limited and should be retained and	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		51 Franche Road	enhanced. Adjacent to Blakemarsh LNR - any development of this site should promote and enhance as a part of green infrastructure.	new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO316	H057 Land off Broomfield Close	Site H047 Land off Broomfield Close  An area of open space. Can the loss be justified?	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO587	H057 Land off Broomfield Close	Urban green space in Kidderminster is limited and should be retained and enhanced. Adjacent to Blakemarsh LNR - any development of this site should promote and enhance as a part of green infrastructure.	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO317	H058 (L118) Playing field adjacent St. Mary's School, Stourvale Drive	H058 - Playing Field adj St Mary's  Appears to be well used public open space.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO318	H059 Yew Tree Pub, Chester Road North	Site H059 - Yew Tree Pub  Loss of public amenity however suitable for residential development.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO319	H060 Rear of the parade, Stourbridge Road	H060 - Rear of Parade Stourbridge Road  Appears to be open space potential with important ecological value and mature trees. Loss of informal open space would	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			conflict with the PPG17 Audit.	
Natural England	SALIO588	H060 Rear of the parade, Stourbridge Road	Urban green space in Kidderminster is limited and should be retained and enhanced. A tributary of the River Stour which flows through the site links Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI, Hurcott Pasture SSSI, Hurcott Wood LNR, Stourvale Marsh SSSI and a series of undesignated pools and wetlands between Kidderminster and Blakedown - the site is therefore a valuable part of green infrastructure and should be protected and its biodiversity value enhanced.	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Environment Agency	SALIO575	H060 Rear of the parade, Stourbridge Road	Is at risk of flooding. Modelling and a detailed FRA may demonstrate that this site is appropriate and can be redeveloped safely.	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO96	H061 Harriers Trading Estate	Harriers Trading Estate, Stadium Close: The existing application offers good quality housing in terms of design, type and tenure.	Comments noted. The application has now been approved.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO320	H061 Harriers Trading Estate	HO61 - Harriers Trading Estate  Recent residential development on Ray Mercer Way bodes well for this site. Represent loss of employment land and noise and vibration from the railway line.	Comments are noted. However, the site has recently received planning permission for residential development
British Sugar Plc	SALIO321	H062 Land South of Bernie Crossland Walk,	H062 - Land to the South of Bernie Crossland Walk	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Chester Road South	Serious detriment to trees and ecology. Recent application for the development of this site refused.	interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Cox Mr T	SALIO7	H063 Butts Town Meadow Caravan Park	The Butt Town Meadow caravan park should never be allowed to be developed into any further residential development. The access with Northwood Lane is incredibly dangerous; since a number of caravan park residents do not have vehicles this is not such an issue. However if the site was redeveloped for housing, they would have vehicles which would compound the danger of this road/ its junction with Kidderminster Road. The area is also in the Bewdley Conservation Area.	Noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Please note that the site lies adjacent to the Bewdley Conservation Area
Bewdley Town Council	SALIO531	H063 Butts Town Meadow Caravan Park	Councillors were opposed to any development because of the flood risk and the potential highway problems associated with an increase in traffic in a road which is unsuitable for large volumes of traffic.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. As part of this assessment issues such as highways and flooding will be considered.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO322	H064 (L599) Playing Field off Sutton Park Rise	H064 - Playing field off Sutton Park Road  Appears to be well used public open space. Loss of this land would conflict with the findings of the Council's open space audit.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO589	H064 (L599)	Urban green space in Kidderminster is	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Playing Field off Sutton Park Rise	limited and should be retained and enhanced. The site is in close proximity to Devils Spittleful SSSI, which enjoys open access. This green infrastructure connection should be promoted.	will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Morgan Advanced Ceramics Ltd	SALIO207	H065 Morgan Advanced Ceramics	<p>Morgan Advanced Ceramics Ltd own and occupy industrial premises in Bewdley Road, Stourport-on-Severn totalling some 8.65ha and identified as sites H065 and the majority of H088 &amp; EMP 11.1 in the Site Allocations Document.</p> <p>MAC has not yet been able to dispose of the front portion of its site comprising 3.502ha to a house builder, but remains committed to do so when national economic conditions and the housing market improve. The company has implemented substantial re-investment in its retained factory site and therefore has no plans in the foreseeable future to leave Stourport. However, as the LDF covers the period until 2026, the company has been advised that it should make representations in order to safeguard its flexibility to pursue other options on its site.</p>	Comments noted. Site H088 is the adjoining site at Midland Industrial Plastics. However, EMP11.1 covers both the MAC and MIP sites. Consider site further in subsequent stages of document production.
Morgan Advanced Ceramics Ltd	SALIO211	H065 Morgan Advanced Ceramics	H065 is a residential commitment and further enhances the residential credentials of the remainder of the MAC	Noted. This site is now being considered through the SHLAA process which will help to inform the Site Allocations

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>site in the future. The site is located in a predominantly residential area, wholly so if site H088 is developed residentially. It will be approached through housing development via a new road junction and service road that will have capacity to accept additional residential traffic.</p> <p>Plans enclosed show retained MAC site and detail of their ownership in the vicinity. The company sports ground can provide excellent opportunities to fulfil the recreational and open space needs of new and existing residents with scope to enlarge the War Memorial Park plus an opportunity for new pedestrian/cycle links to town centre facilities, schools and bus services. Thus the site will have excellent connectivity to services and transport links, and fulfil the requirements of PPS3 in terms of location and the re-use of brownfield land.</p> <p>MAC supports the assessment of its land through the WFDSHLAA process and considers that it has excellent credentials as a residentially led site.</p>	<p>process.</p>
Natural England	SALIO612	H067 Adjacent Chaddesley Corbett Surgery	Connections to Hockley Brook should be enhanced and promoted in the context of green infrastructure.	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO323	H068 Queen Street (Redevelopment )	H068 - Queen Street  Wouldn't produce a higher density therefore no benefit in meeting overall housing requirements.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO631	H070 Lime Kiln Bridge	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing
British Sugar Plc	SALIO324	H071 Hoo Road (Adjacent St. Andrews Green)	Site H071 - Hoo Road  Only a small amount of developable space and it is constrained by trees. Could not be developed to its full potential.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO325	H072 North of Bernie Crossland Walk, Chester Road South	Site H072 - North of Bernie Crossland Walk  Question whether this site could be considered brownfield. Possibility of ecological constraints and noise nuisance from the railway line.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO625	H073 Frank Stones, Green Street	Any development here should enhance the River Stour	Comments noted
British Sugar Plc	SALIO326	H074 Blakebrook School/County Buildings, Bewdley Road	Site H047 - Blakebrook School  Appear that there are few constraints.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
British Sugar Plc	SALIO327	H076 Aylmer Lodge Surgery, Franche Road	Site HO46 - Aylmer Lodge Surgery  Development of the site for more than 3 dwellings unlikely. Would this stack up financially? Would this represent the loss of an important local facility?	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO328	H077 Northumberland Avenue Surgery, Stourport Road	Site H077 - Northumberland Avenue Surgery  Question the viability of such a proposal and whether it would represent the loss of an important local amenity.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Worcester Road Motors	SALIO78	H086 Car Sales, Worcester Road	Site at Worcester Road Motors is surrounded by residential development from around 1990 (former power station site). Re-use of the site for employment purposes is now unlikely. A reallocation to residential use would be more appropriate	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO329	H087 Land at 108 - 109 Bewdley Hill	H087: trees and ecology are potential constraints, plus proximity to junction to Western Way.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Bovale Limited	SALIO16	H088 Midland Industrial Plastics	3.28 hectares of brownfield land off Bewdley Road/Steatite Way, Stourport on Severn - promoted for residential mixed use development comprising nursing home (Class C2) and housing (Class C3)	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO119	H088 Midland Industrial	Midland Industrial Plastics, Bewdley Road Stourport : possible contamination issues	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Plastics	may make housing unviable	considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO98	H089 King Charles 1 School	King Charles 1 School, Comberton Road: Surrounded by residential use. Good central location, near to services and public transport (on a main bus route and near Kidderminster Railway Station). Would like to see a mixed tenure scheme.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO330	H089 King Charles 1 School	H089: If school is really surplus to requirements there should not be any other development constraints. Questions whether the site is available and suitable now.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO590	H089 King Charles 1 School	Any development on this site should provide high levels of green space, delivered in the context of green infrastructure.	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO331	H090 Sutton Arms PH, Sutton Park Road	Loss of a public amenity. However, if this is accepted, the site would appear to be suitable for residential redevelopment.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO121	H091 Titan Steel Wheels	Titan Steel Wheels Cookley : possible contamination issues may make housing unviable	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO376	H091 Titan Steel Wheels	We object to this site for the following	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is located within the Green Belt and residential development would therefore be inappropriate;</li> <li>• Parts of the site may be liable to flooding;</li> <li>• The site represents an important employment site which should be retained;</li> <li>• Development of the whole site would be contrary to the Settlement Hierarchy.</li> </ul>	<p>considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>
Natural England	SALIO616	H091 Titan Steel Wheels	<p>The site is between the canal and River Stour. The site may therefore be better suited to open space and wetland recreation. There is an existing area of wet woodland, a BAP priority habitat, on the opposite site of the River.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO377	H092 Lea Castle Hospital	<p>We object to this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is located within the Green Belt</li> <li>• Is an important employment site</li> <li>• Is in open countryside and not directly related to any existing settlement</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development would be contrary to settlement hierarchy</li> </ul>	
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO218	H093 Kimberlee Avenue ADR	<p>Support for Site H093 Kimberlee Avenue ADR, Cookley for residential development. Our Client is keen to work with the Council and any other adjoining landowners to ensure that this site is developed to provide a mix of housing to meet the needs and requirements of Cookley and the surrounding rural area.</p> <p>full development brief will be prepared for the site to establish the principles of development including the type of development to be accommodated and any additional facilities which should be provided on site.</p> <p>We request that the Kimberlee Avenue ADR land is identified as a housing location for the forthcoming plan period.</p>	Support for the development of housing on this ADR is noted. The Site's appropriateness for residential development is currently being considered through the SHLAA process and will also be subject to Sustainability Appraisal. The position in relation to the identification of ADRs will be reviewed through the Site Allocations process.
Laker Mr S	SALIO471	H093 Kimberlee Avenue ADR	Question the meaning of 'Area of Development Restraint' in relation to the Cookley ADR. Requests information regarding what type of development will be built on the Cookley ADR. Raises the issue of compensation for loss of view and loss of value to property as a result of any new development. Suggests that the Lea	Concerns are noted. An ADR is land which was taken out of the Green Belt through the planning process to meet future development needs. The Cookley ADR is currently under consideration as a residential development site through the SHLAA process, as is the Lea Castle Hospital site. Proximity to services is an

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>Castle Hospital site would make a more suitable location for residential development. Concerned that further development in Cookley will put pressure on over stretched services.</p> <p>Raises concern that consultation events were held during bad weather which prevented people from attending.</p>	<p>important consideration in order to make new development sustainable and reduce reliance on the private car. The Site Allocation process must be closely informed by Sustainability Appraisal and this will help determine which sites are within the most sustainable locations. The LDF will reassess the position in relation to the ADRs and their sustainability credentials.</p> <p>Unfortunately adverse weather conditions were experienced during the consultation, however, this is out of our control.</p>
Natural England	SALIO591	H094 Hurcott ADR	<p>The site is adjacent to Hurcott Pasture SSSI, Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI and Hurcott Wood LNR. The site itself is known to have biodiversity interest including hornet robber fly, a BAP priority species, and semi-improved grassland. We recommend the site is maintained and enhanced as green space and for its biodiversity value, and possibly designated as a Local Nature Reserve</p>	<p>Comments noted. Consider opportunity for designation as a Local Nature Reserve, however the potential of this site to deliver housing is also being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>
British Sugar Plc	SALIO332	H094 Hurcott ADR	<p>H094: ADR includes active agricultural land and part appears to be used for public open space. Site has no clear boundaries and future extensions may be difficult to resist. Site is not considered to</p>	<p>Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.</p>

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			be suitable for residential development.	
Ian Murray Associates	SALIO36	H095 Blakedown Nurseries ADR	Pleased to note that Blakedown nursery site (H095) has been put forward as a potential location for residential development	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO102	H095 Blakedown Nurseries ADR	Blakedown Nurseries: site would be suitable for housing but is too large for solely affordable housing.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Rawlings Mr P	SALIO22	H096 Allotments off Chester Road North	Regarding the allotments at Offmore Lane - I have been to court regarding access to my plot, we could have gone for a judgement to knock down the nearby school as our access has been blighted by yourselves. I would like to see the site change for development. I am happy to listen to offers from yourselves for the purchase of my land, enabling you to develop the site for affordable housing as you could then grant yourselves access via Keats Place or Hardy Ave. You have blighted my access. I suggest you purchase my land otherwise I will have to go to another court hearing so as to protect my interests. This could, as agreed by the judge in my last appearance, ultimately result in the nearby school being demolished so as I can once again have full access to my land.	This site is being considered through the SHLAA process, which will help to inform the Site Allocations. It will also need to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal and it would need to be demonstrated that it would be deliverable within the LDF timeframe.
Bond Mr D	SALIO14	H096 Allotments	Would like the Offmore Lane Allotments to	Comments noted. The potential of this

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		off Chester Road North	be re-allocated for residential development.	site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Rawlings Mr S	SALIO20	H096 Allotments off Chester Road North	Would like the Offmore Lane Allotments to be considered for redevelopment for residential purposes	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO108	H096 Allotments off Chester Road North	<u>Allotments off Chester Road North, Kidderminster</u> . This is a Greenfield site and potentially difficult to develop due to having to change the use of the land from allotments	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Natural England	SALIO592	H096 Allotments off Chester Road North	Urban green space in Kidderminster is limited and should be retained and enhanced.	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO333	H096 Allotments off Chester Road North	H096: redevelopment would lead to loss of allotments which would conflict with PPG17 audit findings. Residential use is not appropriate	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Delo Mrs J	SALIO355	H096 Allotments off Chester Road North	I part own an allotment off Chester Road North opposite the cricket ground. I would be interested to sell if proposed for building land. I would like to be kept informed of any future development.	Comments are noted. The site is currently being considered for residential development through the SHLAA process.
Natural England	SALIO627	H098 Carters Site, New Road	Any development here should enhance the River Stour and Canal	Comments noted.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO378	H099 Land adjacent 29 Castle Road, Cookley	We object to this site as it is located within the Green Belt and alterations should only be made in exceptional circumstances	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO109	H100 R&D Aggregates (Lisle Avenue)	R&D Aggregates site: possible contamination on site may make housing unviable	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Natural England	SALIO593	H100 R&D Aggregates (Lisle Avenue)	The site could play a part in green infrastructure in connection with the canal - we recommend its promotion as such	Comments noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO334	H100 R&D Aggregates (Lisle Avenue)	H100: Raises concern over loss of employment land and over economic viability of the site.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Goldthorn Property Developments Ltd.	SALIO30	H101/102 Oasis Arts and Crafts	Would like the Oasis Arts & Craft site in Goldthorn Road, Kidderminster, to be considered as a site for affordable housing. The factory is plagued by vandalism and this vandalism has a major disruptive effect on the company's activities. It is also felt that a change to residential use would be more in-keeping with the surrounding area.  A further back to back benefit might be the	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			possible re-housing of the Tenant at the Sugar Beet Site or to a factory near this location. May we ask you to give this proposal serious consideration. It will minimally safeguard jobs and help support other connected industries servicing Oasis Art & Craft Products Ltd in the area. Furthermore, it will locate housing where housing already exists and neaten up the demarcation lines of industry and domestic living. It will also reduce the traffic flow that has caused local residents much concern	
British Sugar Plc	SALIO335	H101 & H102 (Oasis and Reilloc Chain)	Sites H101 and 102: recommends that if developed these sites should be developed as one. Maintaining commercial use of sites may be more viable. Query whether loss of employment land is acceptable.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO110	H102 Reilloc Chain	Reilloc Chain: possible contamination on site may make housing unviable	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO106	H104 Sebright Road	Sebright Road Fairfield: the site has been identified as a possible site for affordable housing	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO129	H104 Sebright Road	Sebright Road Fairfield should be for 100% affordable housing	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				Agree that this site should be for affordable housing only
Natural England	SALIO601	H108 Four Acres Caravan Site	The site is immediately adjacent to Hartlebury Common and Hillditch Coppice SSSI and Hillditch Pool LNR. The SSSI is suffering from overuse, which further development could exasperate. Any development here would have to be carefully considered.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Any future development would need to take account of the adjacent natural features.
Natural England	SALIO613	H109 Chaddesley Corbett School	Existing green space should be maintained and enhanced within any development.	Comments noted.
Morris Mrs J	SALIO441	H109 Chaddesley Corbett School	Regarding the sites in Chaddesley Corbett only one site, the school, is considered the best option. This site is brownfield and I would object to greenfield sites being used for future development. We have had major incursions into the greenbelt in the past few years. There is a desire to keep the village from becoming straggly and suffering from ribbon development.  I did not receive any notification of an exhibition at the Village Hall on the 14th February.	Comments noted. Consider the possibility of development of the school site through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.  Apologies that you were not notified of the exhibition; leaflets were distributed to every household in the District and notification made through the website and in the local press. Furthermore, each of the Parish Councils were notified as to when and where each of the exhibitions would take place.
Natural England	SALIO602	H111 Wilden Top ADR	Aerial photographs indicate that the site may have biodiversity interest. There are hedgerow trees and hedgerows connect to woodland. This would need further investigation. The site offers green	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			infrastructure potential through its proximity to the railway path and existing footpath links to the River Stour. Public transport options may be limited.	
Natural England	SALIO628	H113 Netto, New Road	Any development here should enhance the River Stour and Canal	Comments noted
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO99	H114 The Briars Hotel	The Briars Hotel, Habberley Road: although the existing scheme has no requirement for affordable housing, this would be a good location to site some appropriate affordable family housing	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO123	H114 The Briars Hotel	The Briars Hotel, Kidderminster: 100% affordable housing	Comments noted.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO336	H114 The Briars Hotel	Loss of public amenity. However, if this is accepted, the site would appear to be suitable for residential redevelopment.	Noted. Planning permission has now been granted for this site for residential development.
Baker Mr J	SALIO29	H115 Oxbine	This site at Callow Hill is totally inappropriate for multi-residential redevelopment. It suffers from a restricted access, environmental issues and would be totally out of character/keeping with the long established residential style.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO104	H115 Oxbine	<u>Oxbine, Callow Hill</u> : Would be suitable for a small affordable housing development. The parish needs survey states that there is a requirement for 3 social rented properties in Callow Hill.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO127	H115 Oxbine	Oxbine, Callow Hill - 100% affordable	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO117	H116 Land off Wolverley Road	land at Wolverley Road Franche: greenfield site	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO103	H117 Land off Orchard Close	Land off Orchard Close, Bliss Gate: Would be suitable for some limited affordable housing development. According to the 2003 parish needs survey, there is a requirement for 4 affordable properties in Bliss Gate.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO126	H117 Land off Orchard Close	land off Orchard Close Bliss Gate should be developed for 100% affordable housing	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO609	H117 Land off Orchard Close	The site looks to have nice hedgerows, which should be maintained and enhanced	Comments noted.
Lacey Mrs J	SALIO57	H118 Land South of Spennells	Object to land South of Spennells being put forward as a potential housing site. Development of this land would contravene policy GB.1 of the Adopted Local Plan 2004. It would alter character of area, not be small-scale, affect wildlife and restrict access to countryside	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Adams Mr R	SALIO66	H118 Land	Object to development of land south of	Comments noted. The potential of this

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		South of Spennells	Spennells on number of grounds including alteration of character of area, loss of green belt land, loss of prime agricultural land and effect on wildlife	site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Bourne Mr R	SALIO67	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to any residential development on Site Reference H118 - Land to the south of Spennells. Outlines a number of reasons including the fact that this land is of high agricultural quality. Considers that such development should take place on brownfield sites.	These concerns are noted. The site has been put forward by the landowner for consideration through the SHLAA process. It should be noted that the principle of housing development on this site would not accord with the emerging Development Strategy as set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper. Guided by the emerging WMRSS this seeks to allocate new housing development mainly on brownfield sites within the urban areas.
Bassi Mr M	SALIO75	H118 Land South of Spennells	Object to development of land south of Spennells for following reasons:  traffic and noise pollution, loss of farmland, and impact on a semi-rural community	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Ward Mr P E	SALIO74	H118 Land South of Spennells	Object to proposed development at land south of Spennells on grounds of alteration of local character, urban sprawl,	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			highway dangers and effect on wildlife	Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Crow Mrs J	SALIO73	H118 Land South of Spennells	Object to Land South of Spennells being developed. it would alter the character of the area and increased traffic would endanger pedestrians	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Fisher Mr C	SALIO72	H118 Land South of Spennells	Strongly object to development of Green Belt land south of Spennells. Any development would alter character of area, create urban sprawl and lead to any even more dangerous junction with the A449	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Bradshaw Mr M	SALIO71	H118 Land South of Spennells	Object to proposal to develop land south of Spennells. The proposal would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significantly alter the character of the area, removing its semi-rural nature and identity</li> <li>2. Increase transport problems and hazards, extending difficulties to local, minor roads</li> </ul>	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			3. Impact upon local wildlife (such as the Skylark) and significantly change the local environment	
Screen Mr C	SALIO85	H118 Land South of Spennells	Object to building on Green Belt south of Spennells for these reasons:  loss of footpaths, loss of adjacent countryside to Spennells estate, loss of hedgerows, impact of development on skyline, loss of productive farmland, development would join up two communities, impact on road system, impact on local school, loss of local amenity	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Adams Mr Richard	SALIO86	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to proposals for housing development at site ref H118 - land to the South of Spennells. A housing development on this land would undoubtedly have a negative impact on the access and traffic use of Stanklyn Lane (which is a semi-rural community) and this would significantly alter the character of the area.	These concerns are noted. The site has been put forward by the landowner for consideration through the SHLAA process. It should be noted that the principle of housing development on this site would not accord with the emerging Development Strategy as set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper. Guided by the emerging WMRSS this seeks to allocate new housing development mainly on brownfield sites within the urban areas.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO111	H118 Land South of	<u>Land south of Spennells, Kidderminster:</u> Greenfield site.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Spennells		considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01).
Trustees of D R Woodward	SALIO221	H118 Land South of Spennells	Considers that Site H118 Land to the South of Spennells is considered suitable and sustainable for residential development.	Noted. However, the emerging Core Strategy advocates preference for brownfield sites within the main urban areas of Kidderminster and Stourport on Severn. This will assist the regeneration of the towns and is informed by Regional Policy.
Roberts Mrs V	SALIO248	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to development at south of Spennells as it would significantly alter the character of the area. Concerned about Green Belt development and the impact of traffic on the surrounding road network.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Cornish Mrs E	SALIO247	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to development of land south of Spennells. Concerned that development would significantly alter the character of the area and worried about the potential increase in traffic within the locality.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Boynton Mrs A	SALIO246	H118 Land	Objects to development south of	Comments noted. The potential of this

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		South of Spennells	Spennells because it would significantly alter the character of the area, there would be problems on the surrounding roads with the extra traffic generation (especially with regard to the Worcester Road junction off Stanklyn Lane) and that any development would affect the wildlife on site, particularly the Skylarks.	site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Boynton Mr J	SALIO245	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to development south of Spennells because it would significantly alter the character of the area, the area is covered by Green Belt, there would be problems on the surrounding roads with the extra traffic generation and the area is prime agricultural land and a haven for wildlife.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Thomas Mr R	SALIO244	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to development on land south of Spennells. Concerned it would significantly alter the character of the area.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Grove Mrs B	SALIO243	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to development of land south of Spennells for residential or industrial use. Concerned it would alter the character of the area, create noise pollution, create extra traffic and affect wildlife that currently exists. There are	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			plenty of other areas more suitable.	to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
List Mr R	SALIO242	H118 Land South of Spennells	Concerned about the impact of development of land south of Spennells especially with regard to the potential impact on the road network and the dangerous junctions at either end of Stanklyn Lane.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Searl Mrs S	SALIO257	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to the development of land South of Spennells. Concerns include the loss of Green Belt Land, loss of prime agricultural land, impact on the surrounding (rural) road network and that any development would significantly alter the character of the area.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Slade Mrs M	SALIO258	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to the development of the land south of Spennells. Concerns include the affect on the character of the area, the loss of Green Belt, the loss of agricultural land, the affect on wildlife (especially 'red listing' birds) and the affect on currently dangerous road junctions that are in close proximity to the site.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Edmunds Mr L J	SALIO261	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to the development of the land south of Spennells. Main concerns include the fact that Stanklyn Lane is sandwiched between two very busy roads	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			with dangerous junctions and that a new development would exacerbate the problems. Concerned about the affect on wildlife and the fact that there are many more suitable areas for development.	However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Slade Mr A	SALIO260	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to the development of land South of Spennells. Concerns include the loss of wildlife in the area, especially the birds, which are already depleting, concerned about the affect on Stanklyn Lane with an increase in traffic, the need to protect the Green Belt and prime agricultural land and the need to keep the areas identity, i.e. keep it semi-rural.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Natural England	SALIO594	H118 Land South of Spennells	The site appears to be large arable fields. Its close proximity to Spennells Valley LNR, Stanklyn and Captain's Pools and their associated woodland and the existing footpath connections to these should be promoted and enhanced as a part of green infrastructure.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wychavon District Council	SALIO382	H118 Land South of Spennells	A visual representation of the potential housing sites would be helpful within the site allocations paper, and also to help identify sites bordering Wychavon, although I appreciate this will be contained in the published SHLAA in April of this year.  Concerns for sites bordering Wychavon,	Comments Noted. A PDF map of the sites was included within the supporting documents but seek to improve this within further stages of document production. Seek to consult further with Wychavon should any development be proposed in an area adjoining or affecting their District.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>consideration should be taken with regards the potential increase in trip generations along Worcester road and the impact this has on the rural settlements, particularly potential increased traffic on rural within Summerfield and Torton.</p> <p>In terms of conservation and greenbelt, officers would also wish to like to be consulted further if development affects the setting and character of Hartlebury Common which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest. In addition, the impact the proposed development at the South of Spennells would have on the greenbelt within Summerfield and surrounding area.</p>	
British Sugar Plc	SALIO337	H118 Land South of Spennells	H118: Site is a large greenfield site that would represent a further extension to Kidderminster. Site is active agricultural land, boundaries are not strongly defined which could lead to pressure for further expansion.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Edwards Mrs G	SALIO351	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to the development of land south of Spennells. The site put forward by an 'interested party' is designated Green Belt and should remain so, any development here would extend Spennells estate into the semi-rural area of Stanklyn Lane. All brownfield land should be used prior to	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Green Belt land being used. This is also prime agricultural land and therefore should be protected. Green spaces are required for recreation and for wildlife. Concerned especially about the Skylarks which are on the 'Red List' of declining British Birds.	strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Price Mrs M	SALIO353	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to development of land south of Spennells. Concerned about the loss of character of Stanklyn Lane and the extra traffic and noise that would be generated. Also concerned about the wildlife and the loss of agricultural land.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Brown Mrs A	SALIO354	H118 Land South of Spennells	Objects to the development of land south of Spennells. Concerned about access to any development from Stanklyn Lane and the affect it would have in completely changing the character of the Lane. Also any development may exacerbate the current problems of the road junctions at either end of Stanklyn Lane. The Lane is regularly used for recreation purposes and this would be lost, along with wildlife, should development occur. This Green Belt land remains important in separating the rural and urban areas of the District and retaining important agricultural land.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Trustees of G R	SALIO222	H118 Land	The land as indicated to the South of	Noted. However, the emerging Core

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Woodward		South of Spennells (Part of)	Spennells is considered suitable and sustainable for residential development.	Strategy advocates preference for brownfield sites within the main urban areas of Kidderminster and Stourport on Severn. This will assist the regeneration of the towns and is informed by Regional Policy.
Octavian Development & Construction	SALIO443	H119 Land at Stone Hill, Stone	Would like land within Stone to be considered for affordable housing.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO619	H119 Land at Stone Hill, Stone	Near to Stanklyn Pool - could be promoted in the context of green infrastructure.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO379	H121 Land at Lawnswood Westhead Road, Cookley	We object to this site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Development would be contrary to settlement hierarchy</li> <li>• Site is currently within a Landscape Protection Area</li> <li>• Development could necessitate removal of a large number of trees</li> </ul>	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Price A R	SALIO458	H121 Land at Lawnswood Westhead	Submits representations in support of site H121 (Land at Lawnswood, Cookley) for residential development. It is considered	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Road, Cookley	that this site is well related to the heart of the village and the community facilities being within some 100 - 150 metres of the site itself. The site is in single land ownership and is available for development. The site is notably more sustainably and conveniently located within the village in relation to village services and facilities than the currently identified ADR. The site is well placed to meet some of the market as well as affordable housing requirements for the village of Cookley.	Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO617	H121 Land at Lawnswood Westhead Road, Cookley	The site appears to be deciduous woodland.	Comments noted.
Natural England	SALIO620	H122 Land at Brown Westhead Park	A woodland strip through the sites provides a north-south link between existing woodland areas - this should be maintained and enhanced. The site is a bit disconnected from the town and public transport options may be limited.	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO112	H123 Land at Wolverley Road Traffic Lights	Land at Wolverley Road traffic lights : greenfield site	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Natural England	SALIO595	H123 Land at Wolverley Road Traffic Lights	The site looks to be intensive agricultural land. Footpaths towards Stourvale Marsh SSSI should be maintained and enhanced in the context of green infrastructure.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO338	H123 Land at Wolverley Road Traffic Lights	H123: Site is distanced from the town centre and in a defined landscape protection area. Housing should be resisted. Boundaries of the site are not strongly defined, may lead to pressure to extend into open countryside.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO339	H124 R/o 41 Clarence Street	H124: Difficult to redevelop site for more than a single dwelling. May result in tandem.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO113	H125 Land at the Lea	land at The Lea: a greenfield site	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
British Sugar Plc	SALIO340	H125 Land at the Lea	H125: greenfield site detached from town centre, within landscape protection area. Site not considered to be suitable for residential development.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
				deliverability issues.
Bewdley Town Council	SALIO532	H127,140,141,144,145	Councillors were opposed to any developments in Greenfield/Greenbelt areas and to any areas subject to flooding.	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Issues such as land designations (i.e. Green Belt) will be taken into account when assessing sites.
Natural England	SALIO605	H127 Land off Stourport Road, Bewdley	The riverside path and national cycle route should be promoted as a part of green infrastructure.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO114	H128 Ceremaspeed	Ceramaspeed, Zortec Avenue: possible contamination issues may make housing development unviable	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Revelan Group	SALIO362	H128 Ceremaspeed	It is submitted that land west of Zortec Avenue, Kidderminster (site H128), should properly be allocated for residential development. The site is separated from the main body of the Stourport Road Employment Corridor by Zortec Avenue itself and sporting/recreation uses. As such, its primarily relationship with built development is with the southern end of the Birchen Coppice housing area. To the north, the housing area is separated from the Employment Corridor by open space	Noted. The site is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, the site in question is a relatively new employment unit, which was considered to be suitable and available to meet the District's employment needs, as indicated by the Employment Land Review.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			uses. The reallocation of the subject site for housing would extend this division of land uses. In land use and amenity terms, it is considered that this site should properly be allocated for residential development.	
British Sugar Plc	SALIO341	H128 Ceremaspeed	H128 Close to SREC, modern commercial accommodation, should be retained in employment use.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Interest in Lickhill Road North	SALIO255	H129 Lickhill Road north	Agent makes representations on behalf of a number of local landowners and developers regarding Bournemouth Nurseries off Lickhill Road, Stourport-on-Severn. The consultee objects to the future development of this site for residential use. The site is allocated Green Belt and there are no proposed plans to review the Green Belt boundary relating to Wyre Forest District. At this stage in the process no weight should be given to the allocation of greenfield sites within the Green Belt for future housing development.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Wood Mrs S	SALIO34	H130: Land at Moorhall Lane	Object to allocation of Moorhall Lane as potential housing site.	Site H130 is not the field referred to in the response. It is the wooded area adjacent to the nature reserve nearer the town centre.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Natural England	SALIO603	H130 Land at Moorhall Lane	Should deliver floodplain naturalisation.	Comment noted.
Environment Agency	SALIO572	H130 Land at Moorhall Lane	Much of site is in flood zone 3 - would fail sequential test. Difficult to secure safe dry access to site.	Comments Noted.
Martin Mr J H	SALIO442	H130 Land at Moorhall Lane	<p>Raises concern that land off Stagborough Way, Lickhill Lodge is on a Council 'wish list' for development. The following points are raised in relation to this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The material tipped was not washed ash, which some believe to be carcinogenic. It had no special compaction and is at least 12m deep</li> <li>• A stream which was not culverted is still there. This can be observed by the flooding which takes place every year even if the Severn does not flood</li> <li>• Building would cause a big impact on the flood plain below, and would put the Stourport Bungalow and</li> </ul>	This site has been put forward through the SHLAA process and is not currently being considered for residential development. However, should the RSS allocate a higher level of housing growth than currently forecast, all sites will have to be reconsidered.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>Caravan Site at greater risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The visual impact from Areley Kings side of the river would be high</li> <li>• Stagborough Way is pushed to carry the existing traffic</li> <li>• Any building would have a big impact on the newly created nature reserve, Moorhall Marsh.</li> <li>• The site is of great importance to local wildlife and a number of species have been seen there, some of which are protected.</li> </ul> <p>Believe land should not be built on for these reasons.</p>	
Natural England	SALIO610	H131 Bine Lane, Bliss Gate	This site is identified as possible lowland meadow, a BAP priority habitat. It looks to have nice hedgerow connections, which should be maintained and enhanced. It is also disconnected from the town and may have poor transport links.	Comments noted.
Natural England	SALIO618	H132 Land at Orchard House	The site looks to include scattered trees, which may be an orchard, a BAP priority habitat, or have other biodiversity interest	Comments noted.
Yardley Mr F J	SALIO455	H133 Land at Rear of Bellmans Cross	Consultee would like to promote site 133 at the rear of Bellmans Cross for future development. The site currently has planning permission for B2-B8 wholesale built would like to be considered for	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			alternative development. The site is the only one listed, at present, within Upper Arely parish. The owner considers that the site could provide affordable housing or alternatively live-work units or a combination of the two.	
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO100	H134 Muskateer PH	Muskateer PH, Avon Road: This would ideally be redeveloped as part of a larger scheme, which would include the adjoining Rifle Range Shops. Discussions have taken place about demolishing flats above shops and providing family housing. Would prefer a mix of tenures eg.rent to buy, shared ownership and low-cost open market as well as rent.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO124	H134 Muskateer PH	Muskateer PH : 70% affordable housing	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Agree that any scheme at this location should have a mix of tenures
Natural England	SALIO596	H134 Muskateer PH	Near to Devils Spittleful SSSI (open access land) and a National Cycle Route - green infrastructure connections.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO342	H134 Muskateer PH	Site H134: Small site constrained by other properties in terms of its potential layout and achieving appropriate spacing, we	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			would be concerned that the successful redevelopment of the site is unachievable	interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Natural England	SALIO626	H135 Bed City MCF Complex	Any development here should enhance the River Stour	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO120	H136 Land opposite East View	Land opposite East View Clows Top : greenfield site	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01).
Natural England	SALIO615	H136 Land opposite East View	Existing boundary trees should be maintained. The nearby Tanners Brook could be promoted and enhanced as green infrastructure.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO115	H139 Low Habberley Farm	Low Habberley Farm: greenfield site	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Natural England	SALIO597	H139 Low Habberley Farm	The site looks to be intensive agricultural land. Its proximity to Habberley Valley LNR, Honey Brook in the north and	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			existing footpath connections should be promoted and enhanced.	site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO343	H139 Low Habberley Farm	Comments on site H139: good grade active pasture land, poor accessibility to town centre, lies within landscape protection area. Considers site unsuitable for residential allocation.	Comments are noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01).
sir thomas white's charity	SALIO454	H139 Low Habberley Farm	<p>Whilst this site is currently in the Green Belt we believe the site does have the potential to meet many of the demands for residential use in the Kidderminster Area.</p> <p>The site is of sufficient size to enable a large scale development on the Northern boundary of the Town which would greatly benefit from the investment and the provision of better infrastructure.</p> <p>A mixed use for the site could be promoted if it was felt more appropriate for this location.</p> <p>There has been a number of other sites put forward but none on the scale of this site. This is a greenfield site without any site clearance costs and is available within</p>	Noted. Although this site will be considered as potential for development it is Greenfield and is designated Green Belt and therefore contradicts the emerging development strategy as set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			a short time scale.	
Natural England	SALIO606	H140 141 Grey Green Farm	Allotments may include biodiversity interest, which should be maintained and enhanced. Existing hedgerow trees should be retained. The railway line may provide a green infrastructure opportunity.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Grainger Mr C	SALIO350	H140 and H141 Crundalls Lane	My client Mr Grainger wishes these two areas of land to be included in future development of Bewdley, and sees it as an extension to the development in the locality	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Cox Mr T	SALIO8	H140 H141 Grey Green Farm	This beautiful area of land should never be allowed to be developed into residential housing. It is beautiful farmland which provides green open space next to high density council housing. It also contains footpaths both of importance to local walkers and visiting groups	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Environment Agency	SALIO571	H141 Crundalls Lane H144 Lodge Close H127 Stourport Road	Sites 141,144 & 127 associated with Riddings Brook - significant flooding problems on first 2 sites. Site 127 entirely within flood zone 2	Comments noted. Flooding issues to be taken into account when assessing suitability of site through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO118	H142 Land at rear of 92	Land rear of 92 Wilden Lane: greenfield site	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Wilden Lane		considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Natural England	SALIO607	H144 Land south of Lodge Close	There is a copse of woodland and associated watercourse which should be maintained and enhanced, with their green infrastructure potential promoted. Adjacent fields could be promoted as open space.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO608	H145 Land rear of Catchems End Fish Bar	There is a copse of woodland and associated watercourse which should be maintained and enhanced, with their green infrastructure potential promoted. Adjacent fields could be promoted as open space.	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO632	H148 CMS Car Showroom	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Comments noted.
Prigg Liz	SALIO40	H150 British Sugar Settling Ponds	Sugar Beet Settlement Ponds - proposed for development by site owners. Is Green Belt and next to SSSI - implications for restoring wildlife area - Environment Agency have commitment to do this. If site is proposed for housing, then consider there should be public debate on Green Belt boundaries.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred Development Strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO116	H150 British Sugar Settling	British Sugar Settling Ponds: Greenfield site - major work would be required before	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Ponds	housing development could occur	considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01)
British Sugar Plc	SALIO301	H150 British Sugar Settling Ponds	<p>Advocates the sustainability credentials of the site H150 British Sugar Settling Ponds and questions its value as Green Belt land. The settling ponds site is well contained by the SSSI and as such there would be little chance of pressure to release more land surrounding the site.</p> <p>The former settling ponds site is sustainable, accessible, deliverable and developable. These are considered to be the most important merits of a site being considered for allocation. Furthermore, the site could help deliver some significant social infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>The allocation and development of this site could quite realistically represent a new approach to housing and communities within the District, tackling the global challenge of climate change and supporting sustainable and healthy lifestyles. This site could create a benchmark for future developments locally</p>	This site is being considered through the SHLAA process. However it is noted that it falls within the Green Belt and its allocation for residential development would not therefore accord with the emerging Core Strategy.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			and regionally.	
Natural England	SALIO598	H150 British Sugar Settling Ponds	Must promote and enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI.	Comments Noted.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO346	H150 British Sugar Settling Ponds	<p>Promotes the former British Sugar settling ponds, off Wilden Lane for residential development arguing that the site is sustainable, accessible, available, suitable and achievable. The site is close to jobs and well linked to the town centre and the rail station. Linkages to the SREC could improve through the delivery of the proposed link road between the Stourport Road and Worcester Road.</p> <p>Site is considered to be brownfield, despite green Belt location. Value of site as Green Belt is low and housing here would not prejudice the original reasons for designating the Green Belt.</p> <p>Raises concern that many SHLAA sites are constrained by factors including loss of open space, loss of employment land, future residential amenity and economic viability. Small infill sites are unlikely to deliver affordable housing and social infrastructure or secure mixes of tenure, size and type of dwelling.</p>	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues. However the site is located on Green Belt land and as such would not accord with the emerging Core Strategy. (Core Policy DS01)

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>Refers to findings of PPG17 study which concluded that provision of open space, parks, sports facilities and play areas is below the recommended standard. Site allocations that would worsen, or fail to improve this should be resisted.</p> <p>Economic viability has worsened over past 12 months, sites with high abnormal costs are less likely to be deliverable.</p> <p>British Sugar settling ponds could provide in excess of 200 dwellings in the short-term, including upto 60 affordable units. The site could deliver ground-breaking eco-development within the District and could provide open space, including public access to the SSSI.</p>	
British Sugar Plc	SALIO344	H152 164 - 166 Sutton Park Road	This site comprises a pair of large residential plots. it appears that there are a number of mature trees on the site, but apart from this, there are no immediately obvious concerns to residential development.	Noted. This deliverability of this site is currently being considered by the SHLAA Panel, which includes local developer interests to assess constraints and deliverability issues.
Humberts	SALIO12	H163 Land off Briar Hill & H164: Land off Hemming Way	Would like two sites (ref: H163 Land off Briar Hill and H164:Land off Hemming Way) within Chaddesley Corbett to be considered for residential development.	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Natural England	SALIO614	H164 Land off Hemming Way	Aerial photographs indicate possible allotments, which may have biodiversity	Comments noted

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			interest.	
Natural England	SALIO599	H166 Land off Wolverley Road, Franche	Adjacent land should be promoted as open space	Comments Noted. Green Infrastructure will be an important consideration for any new developments. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
British Sugar Plc	SALIO345	H166 Land off Wolverley Road, Franche	Comments on site H166: good grade active pasture land, poor accessibility to town centre, lies within landscape protection area. Considers site unsuitable for residential allocation.	Comments are noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred development strategy (Core Policy DS01).
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO105	Various Sites, Chaddesley Corbett	<u>Various sites, Chaddesley Corbett:</u> The Parish Needs Survey has identified a requirement for a limited number of shared ownership in the village over the next 5 years. The smaller sites would probably suffice for the number of units required	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO128	Various Sites, Chaddesley Corbett	various sites in Chaddesley Corbett - 100% affordable housing	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Agree that such sites should only be used for affordable housing schemes
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	SALIO466	Various Sites, Chaddesley Corbett	Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council has recognised a widespread concern among residents to maintain the distinctiveness	Views on specific sites are noted. Local distinctiveness is a key consideration throughout the LDF. Affordable housing

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>and heritage of the rural community. The Parish Council has also recognised a local need to provide a small number of affordable housing solutions. The Parish Council has previously expressed its reluctance to see developments on site: Ref HO22, HO67, H120, H163 and H164.</p> <p>The Parish Council is concerned to identify within the Parish potential sites for some small scale development. These might include: land belonging to Brockencote Hall Hotel, land adjacent to the petrol station, land at the Chaddesley Corbett School, land adjacent to The Oaks Community Hall at Harvington, land at The Alms Houses Chaddesley Corbett. The land adjacent to the Hemmingway is now a Community Orchard, which has received substantial local donations and widespread support.</p> <p>The Parish Council is also concerned that due attention is paid to p110 of the document: <i>"Design Quality - Supplementary Planning Guidance"</i> in which it is stated that these villages are afforded a greater degree of protection from new development towards conserving their special character." And</p>	<p>is also a key consideration and within rural areas housing provision will be focussed on delivering affordable housing to meet local needs. The sites suggested will be considered.</p>

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			also that "Development opportunities will be limited to infill, conversions and small-scale exceptions...	
Friends of the Village Association	SALIO464	Various Sites, Chaddesley Corbett	We object to many of the suggested sites for various reasons, especially as they do not conform with the Parish Plan or the Parish Design Statement. The Sites in Chaddesley Corbett, Ref Nos: H022, H164, H163 and H067 are not acceptable for housing for a number of reasons, some of which have previously been expressed when residents have responded to planning applications in the past. Site H120 would have access problems.	Comments noted. The potential of these sites to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Dolley Mrs D	SALIO462	Various Sites, Chaddesley Corbett	<p>The sites highlighted in Chaddesley Corbett (22, 164, 67, 163, 143, 120) are located in green belt areas and therefore cannot be supported. Site 109 is in part brown field and small scale development could be considered.</p> <p>1. General point of principle. Would not support any development on green belt land (Sites 22, 164, 67, 163, 143, 120) when brownfield sites can be located. <b>Ref: Action Plan for the Parish of Chaddesley Corbett A7 'Explore the possibility of supporting small scale developments on</b></p>	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.



Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p><b>brown field sites...' A Design Statement for the Parish of Chaddesley Corbett 4.4 Building Design Principles 4.4.1 'The green belt should be preserved and any new development should as a priority and whenever possible make use of brown field sites'.</b></p> <p>2. Specific point in relation to development on brown field sites. Would support limited small scale developments on brown field sites and or the conversion of vacated existing buildings to provide low cost housing for parishioners. (109)</p> <p><b>Reference Action Plan highlighted in Point 1.</b></p>	
Sinclair Hall Mrs M	SALIO10	New Site - Option 6.1	I would like my site to be considered for residential development. Ideally for 2 properties (consisting of 1 house and 1 bungalow). Land at the rear of Green Dragon, adjoining Tenbury Gate, or Cleobury Road. (1 for my son in rented accommodation and 1 for me (bungalow) being in my 70's).	This site will be considered through the SHLAA process to inform the Site Allocations. The principle of allowing residential development on this site, does not comply with the overall development strategy outlined in the emerging Core Strategy. This advocates the location new housing on brownfield sites within the more sustainable urban areas. The development strategy would allow for affordable housing development

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				on small sites within or adjacent to rural settlements only.
Bradley Mr K	SALIO11	New Site - Option 6.1	Would like land off Comberton Road, Kidderminster, to be considered for residential development.	Noted. The site will be appraised through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment update later this year.
Jordan Mr A	SALIO21	New Site - Option 6.1	Would like land off the A456 Kidderminster/Bewdley Road to be considered as a housing development site.	Noted. The site will be appraised through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment update later this year.  However, development of greenfield Green Belt sites for housing is contrary to the emerging preferred Development Strategy (Core Policy DS01)
Hall Sara	SALIO31	New Site - Option 6.1	Would like a parcel of land on the northern edge of Sandy Lane Industrial Estate, Stourport, to be re-allocated for residential use. A residential dwelling has been on the site for over 120 years and they are interested in applying for planning permission to build another house on the plot of land, which under the current zoning they are unable to do.	Comments noted.
Shaylor Construction Ltd	SALIO206	New Site - Option 6.1	Sites identified for possible residential allocation - these should not be exhaustive especially in respect of other urban or town centre sites that become available through the changing dynamics of the local economy and could offer viable potential for residential based mixed use	Comments noted. Planning application received for conversion of Brinton's Offices to residential based mixed-used development. Agree that upper floors of town centre buildings can provide a useful supply of small low cost dwellings.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>schemes.</p> <p>Through this representation the Brinton's Office Site on Exchange Street, Kidderminster is promoted for a residential based mixed use development, as identified by the attached plan. The consideration of this site and other similar town centre locations should not be dismissed merely due to the presence of a Listed Building on the site and that rather the conversion of the Town's existing buildings at first floor and above to residential could help to provide a supply of small low cost dwellings.</p>	
Margaret Delabere Almshouse Charity	SALIO200	New Site - Option 6.1	New Site - The trustees of Margaret Delabere Almshouse Charity would like the whole site on which the current almshouses are built as Affordable Housing.	Site will be considered by Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment panel in late April as a potential rural affordable housing site.
Hingley & Callow	SALIO241	New Site - Option 6.1	Our client's land is in the centre of Blakedown and is considered suitable for residential development as all facilities are available, and is considered a sustainable location.	Comments noted. This potential of this site to deliver housing will be considered through the update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment later in the year.
Richard Cory & Others	SALIO216	New Site - Option 6.1	Our clients land (see plans attached) at Wilden Top is considered suitable for residential development.	Noted. This will be further considered through the SHLAA and Site Allocations process. The site would need to be carefully considered in terms of its sustainability credentials. It is also noted

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				that the Site falls within the Green Belt and therefore in principle would not accord with the overarching development strategy set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper. This seeks to allocate the majority of development on brownfield sites within the urban areas.
Tooby Family	SALIO217	New Site - Option 6.1	Our clients land is on the edge of the village and is considered suitable for residential development	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing will be considered through the update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment later in the year.
Cartwright Mr J	SALIO215	New Site - Option 6.1	Our clients off Wilden Lane (see enclosed plan) is suitable for residential development. The aims of the Green Belt would not be harmed by its release. In all other aspects the site is 'sustainable'.	Noted. This will be further considered through the SHLAA and Site Allocations process. The site would need to be carefully considered in terms of its sustainability credentials. It is also noted that the Site falls within the Green Belt and therefore in principle would not accord with the overarching development strategy set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Paper. This seeks to allocate the majority of development on brownfield sites within the urban areas.
Hackett Miss R	SALIO214	New Site - Option 6.1	Our client's land in Far Forest village is suitable for residential development Far Forest has facilities to be considered a 'sustainable' location.	Noted. This will be further considered through the SHLAA process to inform the Site Allocations. To accord with the emerging development strategy future housing developments within the rural settlements would need to be to meet

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				local needs only.
Broad House Farm Nurseries	SALIO465	New Site - Option 6.1	I write to put forward my clients' land for residential allocation in the current local plan review. For now I enclose only a simple OS extract from their land registry documentation, with the site edged red, as suggested. Naturally, my clients are prepared to provide further supporting information if necessary.	Comments are noted. The site will be considered through the development of the Site Allocations DPD.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO148	Higher Threshold Affordable Housing Sites - Option 6.2	Any policy developed would need to in accordance with emerging WMRSS policies CF7 and SR2 part A.	Noted
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO534	Higher Threshold Affordable Housing Sites - Option 6.2	In general sites that could accommodate higher percentages of Affordable Housing are likely to be those that are either much larger than others OR those that are replacing or neighbouring existing sites with a high percentage of Affordable Housing. Ghettos need avoiding though.	Comments noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO385	Higher Threshold Affordable Housing Sites - Option 6.2	We consider that the Bewdley Primary School site in Shaw Hedge Road could be suitable for affordable housing. We do not consider there are other sites that would be suitable.	Comments noted. Look to consider this further through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO224	Higher Threshold Affordable Housing Sites -	Consider the Bewdley Primary School Site, Shaw Hedge Road and the Health & Community Facility site in Load St, Bewdley to be suitable for some affordable	Noted and agreed.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Option 6.2	housing provision.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO264	Higher Threshold Affordable Housing Sites - Option 6.2	Birmingham has recently achieved 33% affordable housing. This figure has been incorporated in the Longbridge AAP, whose Examination in Public has now been now completed. Bromsgrove's Core strategy has a target of 40%. Similar figures should be achievable in Wyre Forest. (See our comment A on Core Strategy CP1a)	Noted. The final level of affordable housing will be set within the Core Strategy following a viability assessment of sites.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO149	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	Any policy developed would need to be in accordance with emerging WMRSS policy CF7 part C	Noted
Environment Agency	SALIO556	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	We would not support development with inadequate foul drainage facilities and where pollution could be caused by non mains drainage in line with circular 3/99 and PPS23.	Comments noted. Any future development will need to be in line with national guidance as indicated above.
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO449	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	At 6.3 of the Site Allocations Paper there is reference to affordable housing. Mobile homes and chalets are not affordable housing. invariably they are not used by local residents but as second homes or holiday homes for people who live outside the District.	Comments noted. Mobile homes and chalets are not seen as affordable housing.
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO450	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	In our parish Plan we referred to the need for more affordable housing in the parish, a view from which we have not derogated. No sites have been identified in Appendix	Comments noted. One site has been identified within the paper for potential development (Site 133: Land at Shatterford), this site will be assessed to

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			A of the Site Allocations Paper for Upper Arley. The surrounding land and much if the housing stock in the village of Upper Arley is owned by the Trustees of the R D Turner Charitable Trust.	see if it is suitable. Other sites may also have to be considered as well, in consultation with the Parish Council and the appropriate landowners, to ensure that the right site is selected for development.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO225	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	We are unable to identify any such sites within the rural areas.	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO265	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	Housing in villages should be limited to Local Needs. This may be "affordable" (social housing or shared ownership), or it may be smaller market housing to meet a demonstrable need. The option of building small schemes where an element of market housing helps to fund "affordable" housing should however not be ruled out.	Comments noted.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO150	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	Believe there is insufficient environmental information to allow us to comment on specific rural sites at this stage. Suggest that sites on fringes of rural settlements be subject to particular environmental scrutiny - likely to be features of ecological interest in such locations that will need to be taken into account in the allocations process.	Comments noted. Those sites considered through SHLAA to have potential for housing development will be assessed for their environmental impact
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO219	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	We consider that affordable housing provision can be provided on the Kimberlee Avenue ADR site at Cookley however we consider that this is most	These comments related to mixed tenure are noted. This will need to be considered in detail for the site allocations process. The development

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			appropriately provided as part of a mixed tenure scheme to meet the requirements of all sectors of the community.	strategy set out in the Core Strategy advocates affordable housing based on local needs within the District's rural settlements.
Price A R	SALIO459	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	For the reasons identified under submission relating to Option 6.1, Site H121 as previously identified (in part), as now promoted through these representations, could make a contribution towards the affordable housing requirements of Cookley as part of an overall scheme including market housing.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Purnell Mrs A	SALIO375	Affordable Housing in Rural Areas - Option 6.3	Promotes a site for 2-3 affordable houses at Callow Hill, Bewdley.	Noted. The site will be appraised through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment update later this year.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO151	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	Any policy developed would need to be in accordance with emerging WMRSS policy CF8 part Bi.	Noted
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO535	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	Those near the Town Centre OR local facilities OR perhaps Hospital and in respect of latter two alternatives here where served by public transport. An alternative view is to have them scattered about (although still served by public transport) as Older people often are more likely to move to such accommodation where it is near to their previous home.	Comments noted. Agree that access to services is a key consideration for accommodation for older people.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO386	Housing for Older People -	Bewdley Medical Centre redevelopment and Bewdley Primary School in Shaw	Comments noted. Look to consider this further through the Strategic Housing



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Option 6.4	Hedge Road may be suitable sites for residential housing for older people	Land Availability Assessment.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO226	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	The Bewdley Health & Community Facility development and the Bewdley Primary School in Shaw Hedge Road may be suitable	Noted. Consider possibilities of these sites to accommodate this type of development
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO131	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	<u>King Charles 1 School, Comberton Road:</u> Surrounded by residential use. Good central location, near to services and public transport (on a main bus route and near Kidderminster Train Station). Would like to see a mixed tenure scheme.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Bovale Limited	SALIO18	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	3.28 hectares of brownfield land off Bewdley Road/Steatite Way, Stourport on Severn - promoted for residential mixed use development comprising nursing home (Class C2) and housing (Class C3)	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
Shaylor Construction Ltd	SALIO208	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	In respect of the sites identified for possible affordable residential development or for homes for the elderly, these should be by no means exhaustive especially in respect of other urban or town centre sites that become available through the changing dynamics of the local economy and could offer viable potential for Extra Care residential based mixed use schemes.	Comments noted
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO220	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	We consider that housing for older people can be provided on the Kimberlee Avenue ADR site at Cookley as part of a	Noted. The emerging Core Strategy advocates allocating specific sites to meet the housing needs of older people,

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			comprehensive scheme providing a mix of tenures and types to meet the requirements of all sectors of the community.	based on accessible locations within the urban areas. Site Allocations to meet such need will need to be informed by the Older People's Housing Needs Strategy which is currently being undertaken at the County level.
Stanmore Properties Ltd	SALIO41	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	Failure to properly address the needs of the elderly conflicts with the guidance in PPS1 and PPS3, both of which seek to ensure the needs of the whole community are met. With an ageing population it is even more important that new accommodation be provided, including continuing and extra care facilities, but also accommodation for dementia sufferers.	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council have commissioned research into the housing needs of older people. This is due to be published Spring 2009.
Blakeway Mr RH	SALIO44	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	Failure to properly address the needs of the elderly conflicts with the guidance in PPS1 and PPS3, both of which seek to ensure the needs of the whole community are met. With an ageing population it is even more important that new accommodation be provided, including continuing and extra care facilities, but also accommodation for dementia sufferers.	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council have commissioned research into the housing needs of older people. This is due to be published Spring 2009.
Price A R	SALIO460	Housing for Older People - Option 6.4	For the reasons identified under submission relating to Option 6.1 , Site H121 as previously identified (in part), as now promoted through these	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			representations, could make a contribution to housing for older people as part of an overall scheme including market housing.	
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO365	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	We are pleased to see that you will be addressing the allocation of Gypsy and Traveller Sites. The document identifies the need for 30 additional pitches by 2013 and that this could be by extensions to existing sites or by the development of new private and social rented sites, it is good to see that a full list of criteria for identifying these sites has been included in this document	Noted. Support for approach is welcomed.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO152	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	Any policy developed would need to be in accordance with emerging WMRSS policy CF9.	Noted
Environment Agency	SALIO557	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	We would not support development with inadequate foul drainage facilities and where pollution could be caused by non mains drainage in line with circular 3/99 and PPS23.	Comments noted. Any future development will need to be in line with national guidance as indicated above.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO387	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	We do not consider any of the sites in Appendix A as suitable for Gypsy sites	Noted. However, there is a requirement to find suitable sites to accommodate gypsies and travellers within the LDF, therefore various options will have to be considered.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO388	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	We consider WFDC should concentrate further provision at Sandy Lane	Noted. Consider as an option for further provision.
Bewdley Civic	SALIO227	Gypsies and	We do not consider any of the sites	Noted. However, we have a requirement

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Society		Travellers - Option 6.5	identified in Appendix A to be suitable for Gypsy or Traveller sites	to identify sites within the LDF process and will need to identify sufficient pitches within the District to meet the proposed demand.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO266	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	As we have stated in our Core Strategy response, we do not consider it necessary for gypsies and other travellers to be required to rent sites, rather than being allowed to buy their own, but a mechanism needs to be found to overcome the chicken and egg problem involved in this.	Noted.
Oldington & Foley Park Pathfinder	SALIO699	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	<p>It is important that we ensure (and support) members of the GRT community to fully engage in this discussion to identify sites and seek to identify private sites where private applications would be considered.</p> <p>There is considerable advice recommending smaller clusters of pitches and therefore we would ask that recommendation for public managed sites capable of accommodating 15 - 25 pitches be reviewed</p> <p>There is considerable advice recommending smaller clusters of pitches and therefore we would ask that recommendation for public managed sites capable of accommodating 15 - 25 pitches</p>	Comments noted. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was undertaken in consultation with local gypsies and travellers to identify needs. Consider identifying smaller pitches where appropriate. All sites will be considered under the criteria set out in the Core Strategy.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
			be reviewed	
Friends Families and Travellers	SALIO32	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	Believes that more sites should be allocated than are needed, which is in line with the RTPi Good Practice Note No.4 Part C.	Comments noted.
Friends Families and Travellers	SALIO33	Gypsies and Travellers - Option 6.5	FFT and TLRP do not have the local knowledge to comment on particular locations. Consider that the local gypsy population should be consulted directly in accordance with Circular 1/2006.	Comments noted. A Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for the South Housing Market Area of the West Midlands region was published in 2008. Detailed consultation was undertaken by staff from the County Gypsy Liaison Service in accordance with the 2004 Housing Act, Planning Circular 1/2006 and the accompanying good practice guidance.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 7 – A Diverse Local Economy

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO267	A Diverse Local Economy - General	<p>Small non-conforming sites are often best redeveloped for housing. Larger sites should be retained.</p> <p>CPRE takes no view on individual sites generally, but welcomes the recycling of redundant employment land for employment uses. There should however be no need to develop any greenfield sites.</p> <p>We consider that the Titan works at Cookley should be retained for employment, if this can be done without substantial rebuilding. Due to the fact that the site has been in industrial use since the 17th century and accordingly, any redevelopment of this site has major archaeological implications. The Wilden Industrial estate is similarly an ancient industrial site - Its redevelopment also has major archaeological implications.</p>	Noted. The re-use and redevelopment of Brownfield land remains the focus for the development strategy. Regarding the Titan works at Cookley, this site will need to be discussed in detail as to its future use. The Employment Land Review of 2008 indicated that although the business remains an important local employer, if it were to close the site is severely constrained and not ideally suited for modern businesses needs. Any redevelopment could include some business use in order to maintain some employment within the village.
Kidderminster Property Investments	SALIO360	A Diverse Local Economy - General	The consideration of objectives in the LDF related to the Regional Economic Strategy seems weak and should be more refined	Noted. More emphasis on the RES will be taken account of in subsequent document production. Future employment provision will be in

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>with a broader emphasis than just viability.</p> <p>In terms of employment land requirements, it is good to see in paragraph 7.4 that the objectives of the RSS have been acknowledged which indicate that land should be designated outside of town centres. In this respect, the designation of such allows for the key central area sites within Kidderminster that are currently occupied by outdated industrial premises, to be regenerated (e.g. Churchfields for more suitable uses such as residential and mixed use development opportunities).</p>	<p>conformity with the RSS and situated predominantly outside of town centres. However, more central sites, such as Churchfields, also offer the opportunity to provide an element of 'employment' use (maybe B1a) through redevelopment in a sustainable location.</p>
Angell Mr G	SALIO23	A Diverse Local Economy - General	The British Sugar Site should take advantage of the proximity to the railway line through any redevelopment.	Noted and Agree. Any redevelopment of this site will need to look at possible sustainable transport measures, such as the proximity of the railway track.
Environment Agency	SALIO558	A Diverse Local Economy - Key Issue 2	Our comments above in relation to identification of contamination and its timely and effective remediation are relevant here. Up-front production of approved Desk Studies and Site Investigations should be required to ensure regeneration of brownfield sites does not adversely affect the phasing and delivery of the LDF	Noted. Look to progress this further in subsequent stages of the documents production.
Hovi Developments Ltd	SALIO65	A Diverse Local Economy - Key	Employment opportunities through the redevelopment of surplus land within	Noted. Undeveloped sites on existing trading estates provide the opportunity to

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Issue 2	<p>identified sites and the reuse of existing buildings within rural areas is welcomed.</p> <p>Employment within rural areas should be focused on the intensification and infill of existing major sites. The findings within the 2008 Employment Land Review are supported.</p>	<p>support the employment options for the rural economy. Containing development within existing boundaries will also minimise the effect on the surrounding areas. Support for the findings of the 2008 ELR are welcomed.</p>
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO47	A Diverse Local Economy - Key Issue 2	<p>This section fails to recognise the important role of tourism, given that the tourism industry accounts for approx 10% of all jobs in the Wyre Forest. The DCLG Good Practice Guide on Tourism outlines the importance of tourism to local, regional and national economies.</p> <p>In addition, Key Issues 2 supporting paragraph 7.2, defines employment use as 'purely B class uses', whilst we have no objection to a distinction being made between B class employment uses and other sources of employment, it is inappropriate, and contrary to policy, to ignore the importance other industries make towards the District's economy. As set out in draft PPS4, economic developments can be considered land uses that 'are major employment</p>	<p>Noted. Agree that Tourism is an important element of the Wyre Forest Economy. However, within this section we are specifically dealing with B use classes in accordance with RSS policies PA6, PA6A and PA6B and as detailed in the accompanying footnote to this section of the RSS which can be found on p.96 of the Phase Two Revision. With regard to PPS4, we are still awaiting the publication of the final version and therefore have not attributed great weight to the consultation draft of December 2007.</p> <p>However, agree that tourism is an important element of the Wyre Forest economy, but it is felt that this should be considered in a separate section to the other 'employment land' sites within the</p>



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>generators' (Paragraph 13), including tourism schemes.</p> <p>The emerging vision of PPS4 recognises that tourism plays a key role in the country's economy and the growth of the tourism industry should be encouraged. In order for the WMSLP to grow and develop to increase its tourism offer the current planning policies governing the development of the site need to evolve.</p>	District.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO156	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	In considering the response to this option, regard should be had to emerging WMRSS Policies PA6 and PA6A.	Noted.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO153	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	In line with our earlier comments regarding allocation of housing sites we would re-iterate our concern that there is not yet sufficient environmental information available to allow us to comment on the suitability of these sites. Again, we assume that this will be forthcoming so that the final allocations can be based on up-to-date information. In addition we would hope that all sites allocated for employment would include sufficient space for robust Green Infrastructure.	Noted. Further information on specific sites will be gathered prior to the selection of the preferred sites for development.
Hovi Developments Ltd	SALIO60	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	It is vital to have a diverse list of allocated sites to provide appropriate alternatives for businesses. Sites should be diverse in nature, size and location with alternatives	Noted and Agree. Look to safeguard the role of Rushock Trading Estate into the future.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			safeguarded so that they are not lost to alternative uses thus providing certainty to developers, existing and future occupiers alike. The sites listed within Appendix B, including Rushock Trading Estate (ELA 32, 33, 36, 56 and 71), are considered appropriate to meet the needs of the District as referred to above.	
English Heritage	SALIO427	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	As per our comments on the housing sites, all sites listed in Appendix B should be carefully assessed for potential implications for the historic environment. In our response to the Core Strategy Revised Issues and Options report we highlighted the Lea Castle Hospital site and the need for an appraisal of potential implications for the surviving historic parkland and its wider landscape setting.	Comments are noted. The historic environment is considered to be an important across the District and this will need to be carefully balanced with the need to accommodate the levels of housing growth set out within the RSS.
Environment Agency	SALIO568	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	Through Kidderminster, as I understand, largely the Employment sites on the right bank (sites of Stourport Road) are elevated in relation to the floodplain, especially the former sugar beet factory, any redevelopment the priority would be on the drainage.  Left bank, (sites off Worcester Road) frontages are generally high, dropping down to floodplain, preserve/enhance the river corridor floodplain where possible.	Noted. Consider comments in relation to sites identified during subsequent stages of document production.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO228	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	We comment on Bewdley sites only and consider the ones identified in Appendix B are appropriate for employment use.	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO389	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	The sites in Appendix B are appropriate for employment use. We consider there are no other sites that should be included.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO536	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	This seems to cover the relevant sites which are suitable for employment development	Noted.
Advantage West Midlands	SALIO692	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	The Agency notes that the list of sites being considered is not an exhaustive list, and may not all get developed, but those that go forward will have to be in conformity with the strategic principles set by the Core Strategy.	Noted. All sites will be in accordance with the strategic principles of the Core Strategy.
Advantage West Midlands	SALIO693	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	There are a number of current employment sites being proposed for housing development, or other alternative uses. The Agency whilst not wishing to raise specific strategic objections to these sites at this stage, would request that their assessment going forward is balanced against the need to provide a balanced portfolio of employment land within the District. In the assessment of the sites going forward, their importance to the local economy and the lack of other sites should be considered as a material consideration, as well as the potential for such sites to provide mixed use opportunities, including	Noted and agree. All current employment sites have been considered through the Employment Land Review Process. A number of these sites have been put forward to be considered through the LDF process to ascertain what use would be the most sustainable use into the future. It is important that a balanced portfolio of sites are provided and it may be that a mix of uses, incorporating new business space and residential units (Live/work), on previous industrial land would be the most suitable and sustainable way forward.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			local services, live-work (10% of the population already work from home) or starter units that would along with any housing provision help create sustainable communities.	
Advantage West Midlands	SALIO694	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	The Agency welcomes the retention of the majority of the existing employment sites within the Local plan to help meet LDF employment land requirements and in particular supports the continued promotion of the British Sugar Site. The designation of a defined Stourport Road Employment Corridor also adds certainty to the development plan process.	Noted. Agree that the British Sugar site should continue to be promoted for employment provision. Support for the SREC is welcomed.
Advantage West Midlands	SALIO695	Appropriateness of Sites - Option 7.1	In addition to the traditional employment sites there are a number of other employment opportunities likely to continue or to emerge over the plan period (i.e environmental technologies, tourism and leisure, screen image and sound and interiors) Whilst Kidderminster has strategically been the centre for employment and services, Stourport-on-Severn and Bewdley can provide a complementary offer due to their own natural assets where possible sites should be identified to accommodate future trends. Such uses can also be more easily accommodated within the rural economy.	Noted and agree. Stourport-on-Severn and Bewdley will continue to provide important roles as market towns and opportunities for businesses must continue to be supported. Diversification of the rural economy is also an area which is being considered through the LDF.
Natural England	SALIO633	ELA 11 Sandy	Any development should be sensitive to	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Lane Industrial Estate	Hartlebury and Hillditch Coppice SSSI and the River Severn, and enhance where possible.	
Natural England	SALIO636	ELA 21 Wilden Lane Industrial Estate	Any development here should enhance the River Stour.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO640	ELA 55 Lisle Avenue, Kidderminster	Any development here should enhance the River Stour and Canal	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO641	ELA 62 Bewdley Business Park	This site is very near to Wyre Forest SSSI and NNR. Any development must be sensitive to this. We recommend this is treated as an opportunity rather than a constraint, and this site is promoted for sustainable business ideally linked to the Forest.	Noted and Agree. The potential for sustainable businesses linked to the surrounding natural environment to be located here is supported.
Natural England	SALIO642	ELA 73 Crossley Retail Park	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Comments noted.
Natural England	SALIO648	ELA 74 Easter Park	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, development here has recently been undertaken and so any further development in the future is unlikely.
Natural England	SALIO649	ELA 76 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum	Noted. However, the sites listed within Hoo Farm are fairly small and are generally 'infills' on a large existing industrial estate. Master planning in this instance may not achieve many benefits.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			benefits to be achieved.	
Natural England	SALIO650	ELA 105 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, the sites listed within Hoo Farm are fairly small and are generally 'infills' on a large existing industrial estate. Master planning in this instance may not achieve many benefits.
Natural England	SALIO651	ELA 109 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, the sites listed within Hoo Farm are fairly small and are generally 'infills' on a large existing industrial estate. Master planning in this instance may not achieve many benefits.
Natural England	SALIO656	ELA 121 Folkes Forge, Stourport Road	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. Consider producing a master plan for the Stourport Road Employment Corridor.
Prigg Liz	SALIO37	ELA 124 British Sugar Phase 1	Would ask that we as residents are consulted if anything is considered on 'The Beet' which is likely to produce noise, emissions into the atmosphere or impinge on the skyline. An office park seems unlikely to do this, but I would really appreciate it if we are kept informed.	Noted. However, although there may be some office development on 'The Beet' the current policy allows for development of all B Type use classes. Therefore, it is anticipated that a mix of business/office/industry uses could be developed on the site.
Natural England	SALIO657	ELA 124 British Sugar Phase 1	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from	Noted and Agree. The British Sugar site offers the opportunity to consider redevelopment on a large scale, incorporating all of the issues that

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	surround the site, including those listed.
Natural England	SALIO658	ELA 127 Foley Business Park	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO637	ELA 130 Wilden Lane Industrial Estate	Any development here should enhance the River Stour.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO638	ELA 136 Wilden Lane Industrial Estate	Any development here should enhance the River Stour.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO652	ELA 139 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, the sites listed within Hoo Farm are fairly small and are generally 'infills' on a large existing industrial estate. Master planning in this instance may not achieve many benefits.
Natural England	SALIO659	ELA 140 Stourport Road (Firs)	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, given the small scale nature of this proposal benefits to surrounding natural features would be minimal.
Natural England	SALIO653	ELA 143 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from	Noted. However, the sites listed within Hoo Farm are fairly small and are generally 'infills' on a large existing industrial estate. Master planning in this

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	instance may not achieve many benefits.
Natural England	SALIO634	ELA 145 Sandy Lane Industrial Estate	Any development should be sensitive to Hartlebury and Hillditch Coppice SSSI and the River Severn, and enhance where possible.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO654	ELA 149 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, the sites listed within Hoo Farm are fairly small and are generally 'infills' on a large existing industrial estate. Master planning in this instance may not achieve many benefits.
Natural England	SALIO665	ELA 150 Residual Land at Finepoint	There is an area identified as possible lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this site is currently being developed out and has a valid planning application.
Natural England	SALIO666	EMP 1.1 Brintons	There is an area identified as possible lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this site is currently an existing industrial area which is expected to remain into the future and so biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements will be difficult to implement.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Natural England	SALIO667	EMP 1.2 Coppice Trading Estate	There is an area identified as possible lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this site is currently an existing industrial area which is expected to remain into the future and so biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements will be difficult to implement.
Natural England	SALIO660	EMP 1.3 Firs Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this is an existing industrial estate and therefore this would only really be a realistic option if total redevelopment of this site was considered, at present it is anticipated that the site will remain in its current form.
Natural England	SALIO661	EMP 1.4 Foley Business Park	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this is an existing industrial estate and therefore this would only really be a realistic option if total redevelopment of this site was considered, at present it is anticipated that the site will remain in its current form and therefore would not require master planning.
Natural England	SALIO662	EMP 1.5 Foley Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this is an existing industrial estate and therefore this would only really be a realistic option if total redevelopment of this site was considered, at present it is anticipated that the site will remain in its current form

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				and therefore would not require master planning.
Natural England	SALIO668	EMP 1.6 Klark Industrial Park	There is an area identified as possible lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this site is currently an existing industrial area which is expected to remain into the future and so biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements will be difficult to implement.
Natural England	SALIO669	EMP 1.9 Oldington Trading Estate	There is an area identified as possible lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this site is currently an existing industrial area which is expected to remain into the future and so biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements will be difficult to implement in the current form.
Natural England	SALIO670	EMP 1.10 Romwire	There is an area identified as possible lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. However, this site is currently an existing industrial area which is expected to remain into the future and so biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements will be difficult to implement.
Natural England	SALIO671	EMP 1.12	There is an area identified as possible	Noted. However, this site is currently an

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Ceramaspeed	lowland heathland on this site (BAP priority habitat). The site is also near Burlish Top LNR. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities should be enhanced. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	existing industrial area which is expected to remain into the future and so biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements will be difficult to implement.
Prigg Liz	SALIO38	EMP 2.1 Hoo Farm Industrial Estate	If any changes are planned at Hoo Farm which are likely to emit noise, light or impinge on the skyline we would ask that we are consulted.	Noted. There are no major changes planned for Hoo Farm. However, they may be individual planning applications which may affect the area in question into the future.
Natural England	SALIO672	EMP 2.2 Spennells Valley	The site is near Spennells Valley LNR and includes an important tributary of the Stour which connects important habitats. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities must be maintained and enhanced.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO673	EMP 2.3 Brockway	The site is near Spennells Valley LNR and includes an important tributary of the Stour which connects important habitats. Biodiversity interests and green infrastructure opportunities must be maintained and enhanced.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO674	EMP 2.4 Hoobrook South	Any development within this area must enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and Canal	Noted. However, any future development within this area is likely to be small scale and therefore may not

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
				provide much opportunity for enhancement of the features listed.
Natural England	SALIO676	EMP 3.1 Worcester Road	Any development in this area should enhance the River Stour and canal	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO675	EMP 3.2 Hoobrook North	Any development within this area must enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and Canal	Noted. However, any future development within this area is likely to be small scale and therefore may not provide much opportunity for enhancement of the features listed.
Natural England	SALIO643	EMP 5.1 Churchfields Business Park	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO644	EMP 5.2 Former Georgian Carpet Factories	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO645	EMP 5.3 Stoney Lane Industrial Estate	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO646	EMP 5.4 Puxton Mill	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Noted.
Environment Agency	SALIO567	EMP 5.4 Sites at Puxton	EMP 5.4 Sites at Puxton. - This location is immediately downstream of Puxton / Stourvale dam. Large parts of the site may not be appropriate for significant development, and would require detailed Flood Risk Assessments'.	Noted. Take account of comments when considering specific sites.
Natural England	SALIO635	EMP 8.1 Sandy Lane Industrial Estate	Any development should be sensitive to Hartlebury and Hillditch Coppice SSSI and the River Severn, and enhance where possible.	Noted.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
Environment Agency	SALIO569	EMP 9.1 Riverside Business Centre	River bifurcates through this area, possibly not a great deal of area suitable for re-development.  As stated above we would look to re-establish / enhance the river corridor and floodplain.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO639	EMP 10.1 Wilden Lane Industrial Estate	Any development here should enhance the River Stour.	Noted.
Morgan Advanced Ceramics Ltd	SALIO213	EMP 11.1 Bewdley Road, Stourport	The location of MAC is not a good one for employment uses. MAC's location there is historic and over the years substantial investment has been made there which has influenced the company to remain. However, new and incoming employment businesses would evaluate the site differently. Surrounding residential development would be a constraint upon many types of user, and the location is remote from the principal highway network adding to costs and diluting efficiency. Continuing shared use of the sole road access by industrial and residential traffic is not desirable, particularly when other more suitable locations are available to meet the RSS employment land requirements. Demolition and remediation costs will be significant and are only likely to be cost effective for higher value uses	These comments in relation to the site's suitability for continued use for employment purposes are noted. It is important that an objective and comprehensive assessment of employment sites is undertaken to inform the LDF process. The Employment Land Review is an important element of the evidence base. The SHLAA will consider those sites identified through the Employment Land Review process that could be suitable for alternative uses in the future.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>such as residential.</p> <p>In circumstances where the council has identified sufficient employment land - along the Stourport Road Employment Corridor - to meet its RSS targets, there is no need to continue to protect site EMP 11.1 for employment uses; it has serious drawbacks for that purpose, whereas the planning benefits are significantly weighted in favour of residential development.</p>	
Natural England	SALIO663	EMP 13.1 British Sugar Phase 2	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted and Agree. The British Sugar site offers the opportunity to consider redevelopment on a large scale, incorporating all of the issues that surround the site, including those listed.
Natural England	SALIO647	EMP 13.2 Lime Kiln Bridge	Any development here should enhance Stourvale Marsh SSSI	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO664	EMP 13.3 Land between Vale and Foley Industrial Estate	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	Noted. One of the options currently being considered for this site is to look to re-zone it as open space, as it is currently a wooded area. Therefore, development of this site could be restricted in the future.
Natural England	SALIO655	EMP 13.4 Land between Hoo Farm and Summerfield	Any development should enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, the River Stour and the Canal. The development of sites in this area would benefit from	Noted. This site is currently a green wedge between two employment sites and so Green Infrastructure issues as well as enhancement of existing features

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			master planning, allowing maximum benefits to be achieved.	would also be a consideration. A master plan of this site may be beneficial if it were ever to be developed.
Environment Agency	SALIO570	EMP 13.7 Mitton Mills	Mill Lane - it is believed that this site has significant flood issues, look to re-establish river corridor with any redevelopment	Noted. Look at achieving this if site is to be redeveloped.
Environment Agency	SALIO566	EMP 13.9 Titan Steel Wheels	EMP 13.9 - Titan Steel Wheels, Cookley, although large parts of this site are elevated and away from the river, during any redevelopment, we would look to re-establish/ preserve river corridor and floodplain especially as the area nearest the river is currently a car park.	Noted. Agree with suggestions. Site would need to be considered in a holistic manner if it were to become available for redevelopment.
Natural England	SALIO677	EMP 13.9 Titan Steel Wheels	The site is between the canal and the River Stour. The site may therefore be better suited to open space and wetland recreation. There is an existing area of wet woodland, a BAP priority habitat, on the opposite side of the River.	Noted. Although the idea of an open space and wetland recreation area appears to be a good one it is unlikely that the site, should it become vacant, will be allowed to go back to a natural state. It is more likely that the site would be redeveloped, incorporating some form of built development. However, any redevelopment here would need to take account of the natural features listed.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO157	Suitability of Sites - Option 7.2	In considering the response to this option, regard should be had to emerging WMRSS Policies PA6 and PA6A	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO537	Suitability of Sites - Option 7.2	This seems to cover the relevant sites which are suitable for employment development	Noted.
Bewdley Civic	SALIO229	Suitability of	No	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Society		Sites - Option 7.2		
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO158	Alternative Sites - Option 7.3	In considering the response to this option, regard should be had to the emerging WMRSS revision and in particular Chapter Prosperity for All Policies PA6 and PA6A.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO538	Alternative Sites - Option 7.3	This seems to cover the relevant sites which are suitable for employment development	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO390	Alternative Sites - Option 7.3	Yes. Lax Lane. The Current Craft Centre, Red Cross and WRVS sites	Noted. The Lax Lane site will be looked at in more detail as the next stages of the document are progressed.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO230	Alternative Sites - Option 7.3	No - except possible sympathetic expansion at the Lax Lane Craft Centre site	Noted. The Lax Lane site will be looked at in more detail as the next stages of the document are progressed.
Morbaine Ltd	SALIO446	Alternative Sites - Option 7.3	<p>We propose that a site at Puxton Lane, Kidderminster be allocated for Class B1(a) Office Use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of the available employment sites within Kidderminster are unused/derelict former industrial sites. Many of these sites are beyond a reasonable walking distance, divorced from the town centre and supporting facilities and are characterised by a low quality environment.</li> <li>The Employment Land Review</li> </ul>	Comments noted. The suitability of this site to accommodate office development will have to be considered further in subsequent stages of document production. All issues will need to be considered carefully given the location of the site and what is being proposed.



**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>highlights an adequate 'amount' of employment land available within Wyre Forest District. however the suitability, viability and 'market attractiveness' for much of this land to cater for high quality B1a office space within Kidderminster is very low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prospective development sites outlined in the site analysis section of the KCAAP display similar characteristics to the land and stock of sites identified within the Employment Land Review. The aspirations for the prospective KCAAP sites are for mixed-use schemes. The proposed Kidderminster Central Area is unlikely to provide the amount of sites suitable, available and viable for office space development to meet the WMRSS development targets.</li> <li>• The Stourport Road Employment Corridor is an established industrial location and is likely to remain the focus for B1c (light industry), B2 and B8 uses.</li> <li>• The allocation of sites for B1a based uses that are proximate to</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>the Kidderminster central area, available and viable should be considered.</p> <p><b>Puxton Lane Site</b> The site is 165m away from the proposed Kidderminster Central Area boundary, at an edge of centre location within easy walking distance from supporting facilities to be found within the central area i.e. cafes, restaurants, bars, and leisure facilities etc</p> <p>The site is easily accessible on foot and bicycle and is served by public transport. The site is in close proximity to a wide residential catchment area.</p> <p>The implementation of a traffic control signal would acceptably mitigate increased traffic along Puxton Lane as a result of the site's development. Traffic impacts at the Franche Road/Proud Cross Ringway roundabout will be within acceptable limits</p> <p>The site is considered of low ecological conservation value. Badger activity adjacent to the site could be acceptably mitigated at the design stage of any development. At this stage ecological conditions at the Puxton Lane site do not</p>	

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>preclude its development for office based uses.</p> <p>Flood protection and mitigation measures can be implemented at the site to ensure management of flood risk in accordance with the requirements of PPS25 and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Accordingly, Morbaine proposes the Puxton Lane site is allocated as an employment site (Class B1a) in the forthcoming Site Allocation Preferred Options paper of the emerging Wyre Forest Local Development Framework.</p>	
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO159	Mixed Use Sites - Option 7.4	Any policy developed on mixed uses should accord with published WMRSS policies UR3 and UR4 and emerging WMRSS policy CF4.	Noted.
Environment Agency	SALIO559	Mixed Use Sites - Option 7.4	In terms of flood risk, it should be noted that PPS 25 requires that the highest vulnerability in a mixed site should apply to the whole site thus flood risk should be a critical constraint in the sequential approach to allocating any mixed use sites.	Noted and agree.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO539	Mixed Use Sites - Option 7.4	Without being specific those sites that are in Town Centre or are adjacent to other uses (eg housing) would seem suitable for potential mixed use consideration.	Noted. Agree that sites in or around the town centre or adjacent to other uses could be considered for mixed use development

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO391	Mixed Use Sites - Option 7.4	Yes. Lax Lane. The current Craft Centre, Red Cross and WRVS sites	Noted. The Lax Lane site will be looked at in more detail as the next stages of the document are progressed.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO232	Mixed Use Sites - Option 7.4	Possibly the Lax Lane Craft centre site in Bewdley	Noted. The Lax Lane site will be looked at in more detail as the next stages of the document are progressed.
Bovale Limited	SALIO17	Mixed Use Sites - Option 7.4	Submits site comprising 3.56ha greenfield land off Stourport Road , Bewdley for promotion for mixed use development comprising Nursing Home (C2) and Hotel Accommodation (C1).	Noted. At present the Core Strategy doesn't anticipate looking at Green Belt sites for development. Therefore, the submitted site does not conform to the emerging Preferred Option and should not be considered at this stage.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO161	Stourport Road Employment Corridor - Option 7.5	This option raises no regional conformity issues.	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO392	Stourport Road Employment Corridor - Option 7.5	Yes	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO268	Stourport Road Employment Corridor - Option 7.5	We support the general thrust of the policy and in particular the identification of the former British Sugar Works as a strategic centre. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The corridor should not be allowed to extend further south, towards Stourport. This would encroach on the strategic gap between Kidderminster and Stourport, which</li> </ul>	Noted. Agree with the boundary of the SREC not extending further south - the land to the south of the SREC is important Green Belt land separating Kidderminster and Stourport-on- Severn. The Western boundary of the SREC will be considered further to potentially include the amendment as highlighted.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>needs to be enhanced, rather than eaten into. It is relatively fragile Green Belt and further degradation must be resisted at all costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The western boundary of the area should be the canal. This will mean that the sewage treatment works is included in the area. We are not suggesting that there should be any change in the use of that, but it would mean that any boundary adjustments between the sewage works and the industrial estates could be made without difficulty. For example, the existing Local Plan appears to show some unused White Land at the northern end of the sewage Works. Could the Sewage Authority release this as to augment the industrial area?</li> </ul>	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO154	Stourport Road Employment Corridor - Option 7.5	We are happy to support the proposed boundary but would point out that the site falls very close to features of significant ecological interest. Any development in this area will need to take full account of these features and should contribute to their protection and enhancement.	Noted and agree. Any future development will need to have regard to the protection and enhancement of the surrounding ecological features. There is an opportunity to protect and further enhance a number of these sites through redevelopment of key areas, such as the British Sugar Site.
Revelan Group	SALIO363	Stourport Road	It is submitted that the boundary of the	Noted. However, the site in question is a

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Employment Corridor - Option 7.5	Stourport Road Employment Corridor should be amended to exclude land to the west of Zortec Avenue (site H128). This site is separated from the main body of the Employment Corridor by Zortec Avenue and abuts the Birchen Coppice housing area. It is submitted that this land is appropriate for allocation for residential development.	relatively new employment unit, which is considered to be suitable and available to meet the District's employment needs. The site is also in close proximity to new employment developments within the surrounding area (most notably the Finepoint development, which is adjacent to the site in question). Furthermore, it is felt that the site is situated close to the Strategic Road Network and offers employment opportunities in a suitable area, which does not adversely impact on the surrounding areas. It also provides potential employment options for the residents in nearby wards (which are, in some cases, severely deprived) Overall, it is considered that the site should be retained for employment use and thus retained within the boundary of the S.R.E.C.
Hardwick Mr R	SALIO251	Stourport Road Employment Corridor - Option 7.5	I agree with the S.R.E.C as detailed but it must not be extended south	Noted and Agree. The land to the south of the SREC is important Green Belt land separating Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 8 – Local Distinctiveness and Regeneration

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment	SALIO456	Local Distinctiveness and Regeneration - Key Issue 3	<p>Raises some general points about including design policies within the Core Strategy. Design should be embedded as a priority from strategic frameworks to site specific scales. It should be treated as a cross cutting issue.</p> <p>Includes a list of key questions to assess the Core Strategy against to ensure a design ethos is embedded in the strategy.</p>	Noted and Agree. Any design ethos embedded in the Core Strategy will have to be adhered to in any subsequent DPD production.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO269	Local Distinctiveness and Regeneration - Key Issue 3	We do not accept the need for a perpetual retail space. This is a fallacy that has arisen as a result of the 15-year boom, which has recently come to an abrupt end. Nevertheless, this is a subject to be addressed under WMRSS revision not the LDF process. The wise policy in the present circumstances will be to seek to retain existing space, only permitting new space where a developer can demonstrate that there is no realistic alternative.	Noted. However, the District will need to plan for developments in accordance with the figures being outlined in the RSS, any other policy would be seen as being contrary to the policies at the regional level.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO162	Designation of Centres - Option 8.1	The designations given in the DPD with Kidderminster as a strategic centre is in accordance with emerging WMRSS policy PA11. The designation of Stourport and Bewdley as market towns would be in accordance with emerging WMRSS policy RR3 and the villages listed would accord	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			with emerging WMRSS policy CF2 part C. Please see also the regional conformity assessment for the Wyre Forest Core Strategy Preferred Option.	
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO393	Designation of Centres - Option 8.1	Yes, but we would like to know the difference between a market town - Stourport - and a market town (District Centre) - Bewdley	Noted. The distinction is made between these two market towns to reflect the difference in their relative sizes and to make a distinction in policy terms.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO233	Designation of Centres - Option 8.1	We agree but would wish to see Bewdley identified as a proper Market Town	Noted. Bewdley has been identified as a Market Town within the Core Strategy and this designation will continue within the other Documents.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO270	Designation of Centres - Option 8.1	We would suggest that Wolverley/Fairfield should be encouraged to develop into a Local Centre. This is the one Large Village in the district without a designated Local Centre.	Noted. Consider this further within subsequent stages of document production.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO163	Town Centres - Option 8.2	This option raises no regional conformity issues	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO394	Town Centres - Option 8.2	No. The retail area of Bewdley should include the Fire Station and medical centre to allow comprehensive redevelopment of the Load Street Car Park area for mixed use including retail, community and residential use.	Noted. Consider revising the boundary to include this development opportunity in subsequent stages of the plan.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO234	Town Centres - Option 8.2	Yes, except that we consider that the Bewdley Health & Community Facility site should be included for consideration.	Noted. Consider including this within the subsequent stages of document production.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO271	Town Centres - Option 8.2	Support the designations, but think that Bewdley should be described as a Market	Noted. Bewdley's role as a market town will be safeguarded and enhanced



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>Town without the suffix "District Centre. We agree that further development for housing or employment should be linked to Local Needs. However that should be done by adopting specific policies (as is being done), limiting the extent of its role as a Market Town, rather than by denigrating its status.</p> <p>Great care needs to be taken that additional floorspace is in fact an addition to, rather than in a substitution for existing space. If that does not happen the fringes of existing retail area go downhill and need regeneration or conversion to other uses.</p>	<p>through the LDF. . Protecting the retail core of Bewdley will be vital into the future, in order to ensure that services remain within the town.</p>
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO490	Future Convenience Floorspace - Option 8.3	<p>With regards to paragraph 8.13, it might be useful to expand upon what the two scenarios, in the White Young Green study were, into the forecasting of potential future floorspace requirements, as the results for the two scenarios are quite different.</p> <p>Is the option in paragraph 8.15 '<i>One option is that this could be provided through the redevelopment of Load Street car park and the Medical Centre, which could provide further retail opportunities</i>' actually an option? If it is it might better placed in the options box 8.3.</p>	<p>Noted. Expansion on the two retail scenarios could be included. However, the methodologies used to provide these assumptions are fairly complex and so reference to the retail study may be more useful in ensuring the document does not become too technical and is easy to understand. The Load Street car park redevelopment is one potential location for future retail opportunities, other suggestions are asked for within the document.</p>

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO164	Future Convenience Floorspace - Option 8.3	The above options would be in conformity with published WMRSS policies UR3 and RR3 and emerging WMRSS policy PA12B.	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO428	Future Convenience Floorspace - Option 8.3	In determining the provision for future convenience floor space the potential implications on the historic townscape character of both Bewdley and Stourport on Severn must be taken into account. For Stourport on Severn the effect of introducing larger-scale retail developments must also address potential impacts on the overall regeneration of the town centre	Noted and Agree. The two towns mentioned have an important historic townscape and any future developments will need to be sympathetic to these surroundings.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO540	Future Convenience Floorspace - Option 8.3	The 25,000 sq.m for shopping seems at the moment wildly optimistic and with the contraction of the retail economy being currently undergone it will be some years until we are likely to be back to current retail occupation	Noted. This figure has been derived from the RSS and it is important that the LDF documents reflect the requirements as set out at the Regional level.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO395	Future Convenience Floorspace - Option 8.3	There may be a requirement for more convenience floorspace than indicated. A possible site for this may be in the redevelopment of Load Street Car Park and the Medical Centre.	Noted. However, the requirement figures have come from a background retail needs study and are considered robust. An update is due to be carried out into this study however, and therefore the figures that arise from this will need to be considered in the next stage of the documents production.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO235	Future Convenience	As above, the Bewdley Health & Community facility should be considered	Noted. Consider including this within the subsequent stages of document

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Floorspace - Option 8.3		production.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO272	Future Convenience Floorspace - Option 8.3	The provision of additional floor space needs to be driven by the commercial requirements of operators. The role of the Council should at most be to identify areas where development would be permitted, but we doubt there will be a substantial need for expansion. We note that a current application has been made for an out-of-centre superstore at Stourport. We would suggest that this (if permitted) should be the most that Stourport needs. Accordingly, the Allocations SPD should not encourage the provision of new retail space outside Kidderminster Town Centre. It should merely designate a zone, within or immediately adjoining which retail development will be permissible.	Noted. The role of the Council is to identify appropriate areas for potential new retail development and this should be in keeping with the role and the status of the centre in question. Agree that no more convenience floorspace should be specifically planned for in Stourport if the Tesco Application is implemented.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO165	Stourport on Severn - Comparison Floorspace - Option 8.4	The above options would be in conformity with published WMRSS policy UR3 and RR3 and emerging WMRSS policy PA12B	Noted.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO166	Stourport on Severn Redevelopment Sites - Option 8.5	This option raises no regional conformity issues	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO429	Stourport on	As per option 8.3 we would be happy to	Noted. Support and advice on this

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
		Severn Redevelopment Sites - Option 8.5	discuss at our meeting any site specific issues relating to the proposals on Bridge Street and other redevelopment opportunities.	matter is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO273	Stourport on Severn Redevelopment Sites - Option 8.5	We express no view on the possible superstore at Stourport.  Otherwise, new non-retail uses should be found for out-of-centre retail sites. This should help to focus retailing on town centres, and thus to enhance their viability	Noted. Agree that the focus for new retail development should be on the existing town centres.
Taylor Mr D	SALIO28	Stourport on Severn Redevelopment Sites - Option 8.5	Objects to the Compulsory Purchase of Lloyds Garage, Bridge Street. Comments on STC.4 Basins Link proposals.	These objections are noted. The site at Bridge Street has a comprehensive development brief associated with the Adopted Local Plan. The purchase of these buildings is necessary to deliver a comprehensive regeneration scheme to the town.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO167	Bewdley - Comparison Floorspace - Option 8.6	This option raises no regional conformity issues. The potential comparison retail floorspace would not be of regional significance.	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO396	Bewdley - Comparison Floorspace - Option 8.6	Yes. A possible site for this may be in the redevelopment of Load Street Car Park and the Medical Centre.	Noted. Agree that a potential site for small scale development could be the Load Street Car Park and the Medical Centre.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO236	Bewdley - Comparison Floorspace - Option 8.6	Yes	Noted

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO274	Bewdley - Comparison Floorspace - Option 8.6	The figures for Bewdley in the table are so low that no explicit policy should be needed. All that is needed is to designate the present town centres as a retail area and for the Plan to permit new retail development "in or immediately adjoining" the town centres. As far as possible existing retail frontages should be retained as such.	Noted and agree.
Cox Mr T	SALIO9	Bewdley - Comparison Floorspace - Option 8.6	The redevelopment of Load street carpark is vital and must go ahead. It should include space for a 3rd pharmacy, some retail space (but not a supermarket), any car parking spaces should be replaced (Maybe through purchase of the land at the rear of the George Hotel). The market should be moved into the central area that will be created in what is now Load Street Car Park. Finally as to development of Dog Lane car park it is vital that coach parking spaces are retained and the only development that should occur is the new Fire station.	Noted. The redevelopment of Load Street car park is one of the options that is being considered for new retail space within Bewdley. The specifics of any development will have to be dealt with at the planning application stage.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO168	Office and Leisure Provision - Option 8.7	This option raises no regional conformity issues. Any policy developed should not conflict with the emerging WMRSS policies PA6B, PA11, PA13A and PA13B.	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO397	Office and Leisure Provision -	Yes. Lax Lane. The current Craft Centre, Red Cross and WRVS sites	Noted. The Lax Lane site will be looked at in more detail as the next stages of the document are progressed.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Option 8.7		
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO237	Office and Leisure Provision - Option 8.7	Possibly Lax Lane Craft Centre site for Office accommodation	Noted. The Lax Lane site will be looked at in more detail as the next stages of the document are progressed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO275	Office and Leisure Provision - Option 8.7	Small-scale office developments fit well into town centres, above or behind shops. "Evening economy" leisure developments also fit well in or around town centres. Other leisure developments are diverse in nature. These matters must be left, so that the enterprise of developers can bring forward schemes that can be judged on their individual merits. It is extremely difficult to lay down specific rules for specific sites in the abstract.	Noted and Agree. It will be important to include policies to identify suitable areas for these types of development within the town centres.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 9 – Managing Travel Demand and Promoting Sustainable Modes

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO496	Managing Travel Demand and Promoting Sustainable Modes - General	We think that bullet point 2 under Key Issue 4 should be amended to read as follows:  ' A need to safeguard and enhance the commercial or core bus network'?	Noted. Consider including in subsequent stages of the documents production.
Centro- WMPTA	SALIO94	Managing Travel Demand and Promoting Sustainable Modes - General	A high quality public transport network can assist in sustainable economic growth and regeneration, whilst also ensuring that the West Midlands transport sector contributes to the wider challenges including reducing climate-changing emissions. It is therefore welcomed that transport and in particular public transport is a key theme throughout all three documents and will help to promote accessible developments and sustainable regeneration.  Centro recognises that Kidderminster is a significant rail station within the West Midlands and supports its redevelopment through working closely with existing partners.  Support the recent modifications made to Kidderminster rail station including the Disability Discrimination Act compliant	Noted. Support for recent and future planned projects at Kidderminster Railway station is welcomed. Agree that the footpath system is an important element to consider when looking at public transport. Look to make reference to Centro's Draft ' <i>West Midlands Rail Vision: Network Development Strategy</i> ' proposals for connecting the Severn Valley Railway line to the national network.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>footbridge with lifts</p> <p>Support a new bus station in Kidderminster in principle, but would like to ensure it is effectively connected with both the rail station and the wider public transport network. The footpath system should be seen as an important element of the public transport system and designed to be direct, safe, easy and convenient to use as possible.</p> <p>All three LDF documents should make reference to centro's Draft '<i>West Midlands Rail Vision: Network Development Strategy</i>' proposals for connecting the Severn Valley Railway line to the national network. This proposal would allow through linkages to be made, by conventional services to Bewdley, using the Severn Valley Railway. Therefore, Centro is keen to protect the alignment of this route.</p>	
Centro- WMPTA	SALIO97	Managing Travel Demand and Promoting Sustainable Modes - General	Centro would welcome continued involvement in Wyre Forest District Local Development Framework in order to ensure that policies and proposals promote sustainable transport within the West Midlands and the wider area.	Noted. Continued involvement within policies and proposals would be welcomed.
Campaign to Protect	SALIO276	Managing	We welcome the general policies	Noted. Support is welcomed.



**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
Rural England		Travel Demand and Promoting Sustainable Modes - General		
Angell Mr G	SALIO25	Managing Travel Demand and Promoting Sustainable Modes - General	<p>Support "Demand management measures including travel plans": more so if they are able to be implemented retrospectively for large employers whose every vestige of expansion has been matched by matched by D.C capitulation to applications for knee-jerk parking increase.</p> <p>Do "measures" contemplate the withdrawal of Bromsgrove St/Prospect Hill on-street parking which impedes fluent bus operation?</p> <p>Workplace parking levy is omitted.</p>	Noted.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO169	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	Neither scheme is included in the list of sub-regional priorities outside the MUAs in the published WMRSS or emerging WMRSS in Policy T12, although both can be viewed as a schemes that would improve access to regeneration sites in line with policy T12.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO678	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	Transport infrastructure needs to be carefully considered, with priority given to delivering sustainable modes of transport.	Noted and agree.
English Heritage	SALIO430	Major Transport	Our general preference with respect to	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Infrastructure - Option 9.1	major new highway infrastructure projects is as far as possible to make the best use of the existing highway network before investing in new infrastructure. A thorough appraisal of potential direct and indirect effects on the historic environment would be required in the case of the proposed Stourport Relief Road and any forthcoming proposal for the A449 Hoobrook Link Road.	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO497	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	Should the Stourport Relief Road Scheme or the Hoobrook Link Road progress, then they must involve prior ecological assessment in order to allow appropriate mitigation and opportunities for Green Infrastructure.	Noted. As Highway Authority, Worcestershire County Council would need to be a key instigator in this.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO541	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	Link Road is vital if British sugar Site is to be developed and possibility of using SVR facility. Also possibility of using Canal/River for transport -especially freight.	Noted. All transport options will be considered when looking at the redevelopment of this site.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO398	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	The proposal for Kidderminster by pass south of the town linking the Bewdley Bypass with the A491/A456 junction near Hagley should be reinstated.  We also propose a new link road between Dowles Road and Wharton Park/Bewdley by-pass to reduce traffic in response to the AQMA concerns, and a link between the	Noted. However, this level of road building is not something that is proposed within the LDF. The implications and delivery of these schemes have not been identified and it is considered that it is unlikely that these schemes would be developed within the time period of the plan.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			B4194 and the Bypass to reduce traffic through the town.	
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	SALIO143	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	<p>Construction of the Stourport Relief Road will lead to further increases in the level of traffic in the locality. This will produce increased air pollution including greater carbon dioxide emissions. More resources should be allocated to improving the traffic flow in Stourport rather than constructing the relief road.</p> <p>The construction of a Stourport Road/A449 link road could cause serious damage to Wilden Marsh SSI. Other ways of improving the Stourport Road should be examined. The railway bridge could be widened which would improve traffic flows between the British sugar site and the traffic lights at Foley Park</p>	Noted. There is a need to consider all possible transport options, including the building of new roads. It will be important that a package of transport measures are included within the document.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO277	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	<p>Believe that a new access route into Stourport Road, bypassing the heavily congested urban section of that road north of the railway bridge should be given a high priority, to facilitate the regeneration of that area</p> <p>The Stourport relief road should also be considered a priority.</p>	Noted. Look to develop these options further in subsequent stages of the documents production.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO155	Major Transport Infrastructure -	All major infrastructure schemes must be based on up to date environmental	Noted. The final choices of sites and options will be tested against the

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Option 9.1	information and subject to Environmental Impact Assessment. The final options chosen should be those that are most sustainable and cause least environmental harm. We note that the Stourport relief road runs through a significant area of urban green space. This will require substantial compensation and must be thoroughly weighed against alternative options. The route of the SREC road will need careful consideration, particularly with respect to the nearby designated wildlife sites.	Sustainability Appraisal Framework to ensure that the options are appropriate. With regard to large schemes like the Stourport Relief Road and the SREC link road these need to be considered holistically to ensure that all issues are taken into account.
Kidderminster Property Investments	SALIO361	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	Careful consideration should be given to the viability of regeneration schemes and whether infrastructure changes will render certain schemes unviable. For example, the regeneration of all of the Churchfields sites will have an impact on the surrounding highway network and how the sites are ultimately accessed. To ensure the appropriate level of infrastructure is put in place, the highway network should be analysed further. Furthermore it is considered that highway infrastructure requirements will be better assessed when land uses/site allocations have progressed to a more definitive stage.	Noted and agree. All sites will have to be considered to ensure that they are viable for development. Looking at infrastructure issues will form a key element of this.
Angell Mr G	SALIO24	Major Transport Infrastructure -	Oppose both Stourport Relief Road and	Noted. However, it is considered that new infrastructure will be required to

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Option 9.1	A449-Hoobrook Link Road - A451.  Standing Advisory Committee on trunk Road Assessment Reports:-  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1994: More roads=more traffic</li> <li>• 1998: new roads are not synonymous with economic development.</li> </ul>	facilitate future development. It will be important that a package of measures is included within the DPD, including the potential for new roads.
Prigg Liz	SALIO39	Major Transport Infrastructure - Option 9.1	I understand a new link road is proposed from The Beet towards the Island at the end of Wilden Lane. If this Road joins Wilden Lane before the Island we would like to be consulted, also if it compromises the site of Specific Scientific Interest we would want a full debate about this.	Noted. Any future development proposals for this site and a link road would be subject to a period of public consultation.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO170	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with published WMRSS policies T3 and T5	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO679	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	Yes. However, this should not prohibit the delivery of opportunities which were not captured in the LDF. Cycle and walking routes should also be integrated into a defined green infrastructure network	Noted.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO498	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	With regards to the option under 9.2 yes, we think the LDF should delineate and safeguard the 'core bus network routes',	Noted. Consider suggestions when producing the proposals map.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>cycling and walking routes.</p> <p>With regards to the second option, we suggest locations of potential bus priority measures could be added to the proposals map.</p>	
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO399	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	<p>There needs to be more off road dedicated cycle routes or lanes which are physically separated from traffic. Urban off street footpaths need better surfacing and maintenance.</p> <p>There needs to be better integration between bus services and train services at Kidderminster Station. Currently it is very difficult to use public transport all the way from Bewdley to Birmingham for commuting purposes.</p>	Noted and agree. Public transport services are a key consideration for the plan. Redevelopment of Kidderminster Railway station is currently being considered. Part of this proposal includes improving integration between trains and buses.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	SALIO144	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	It is important to delineate bus priority, cycle and walking routes. However it is unlikely that fully implementing these routes will produce a significant shift to sustainable transport unless other measures are also employed. Regarding buses there needs to be significant change in how the service is provided (e.g.	Noted. Agree that a range of measures will need to be considered further to improve public transport options within the District. A number of comments made fall outside the remit of the LDF and will need to be directed to the County Council.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>reduced fares, thorough ticketing, integration with rail services, improved frequency etc.)</p> <p>To produce a real increase in the levels of cycling will require a range of measures. The most important is speed reduction. A default speed limit of 20 mph would transform the environment for cyclists and pedestrians making short journeys, such as to local shops, much safer. The proposals map could show that all residential areas as 20mph. Major roads will have a 30mph limit and there will have to be changes to the infrastructure if cyclists are to use these as part of the cycle network</p>	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO278	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	<p>Bus priority routes (in conjunction with Park and Ride car parks) can be a good idea, but this is only feasible if there is sufficient road capacity for this to work.</p> <p>Protected walking routes are desirable. However, because of the comparatively slow speed of walking, routes need to take as direct a line as is feasible.</p>	Noted and agree.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO160	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	We agree that the network of priority bus routes and major cycling and walking corridors should be included on the proposals map in the LDF. This would help	Noted. Support for this approach is welcomed.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			to give clarity to the overall sustainable transport policy and would highlight key gaps in existing infrastructure provision. Safeguarding strategic routes for new cycling and pedestrian infrastructure would help to direct future developer contributions and offer a transparent and easily understood view of the Council's aspirations for leveraging a modal shift in local transport provision.	
Angell Mr G	SALIO26	Sustainable Modes of Transport - Option 9.2	Agree new LDF proposals map should delineate and safeguard a network of bus priority routes, cycle and walking routes. (Publication of walking and cycling map; public transport guides for Bewdley and Stourport offer precedent)  Attached graph A vindicates progressive advance to inclusion of priority routes for buses - provision for all.	Noted. Seek to ensure proposals map includes a network of bus priority, cycle and walking routes.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO171	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with emerging WMRSS policy T7.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO680	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	We support a detailed consideration of car parking standards within a package of demand management measures including Travel Plans. Standards should be defined after consideration of public transport opportunities and with sustainable modes of transport given priority.	Noted. Support for this option is welcomed.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO542	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	Unsure as to the viability of having the town of Kidderminster served mainly by public transport. Private cars are still likely to be needed and whilst their use could be discouraged where possible, realities again need to be recognised. Concerned that a park-and-ride scheme would not be viable within Kidderminster. Also it should be recognised that Town Centre workers may need parking, especially those who have to go out during the working day (often many times), for whom public transport is not a realistic option.	Noted. It is important that a balance is struck so that all residents and businesses needs are taken into account.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO400	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	Car Parking Standards should take into account the limited amount of off and on street parking in Bewdley.  The current on street restrictions in the town centre of only 30mins 7am to 7pm are unhelpful. They should be amended to be 1 hour between 9am and 6pm to encourage meaningful use of the Town Centre for retail and other community purposes.	Noted. The current parking restrictions are not a planning issue - comments directed to Street Scene services
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO279	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	Car parking standards need to be realistic. The imposition of excessively high standards is a waste of land, a finite resource. The imposition of too low standards will fail in its objective of altering behaviour. Instead those cars for which	Noted and agree.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			there is no accommodation will be parked wherever there is space, which usually means on-street parking, often in a way that obstructs other road users.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO175	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	We are pleased to support the use of strict car parking standards as part of a wider demand management package. They will be an essential tool in limiting car use and therefore helping to contribute to sustainable development.	Noted. Encouraging sustainable development will be a key element of the LDF.
Angell Mr G	SALIO27	Car Parking Standards - Option 9.3	Should not the approach to the service of able-bodied car-parking provision essentially require awareness of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population/ ecological footprint/ transport/ car-parking ratios (graphs attached).</li> <li>• Worcestershire is part of Great Britain - recently 'promoted' from 3rd to 1st in European population densities, therefore do not car-parking standards need to surrender less of our scarce public space for this land-profligate use - and reflect correspondingly in the basis for changing tariffs?</li> <li>• Are there not grounds for initiatives to reduce the extent of sterilised land at Kidderminster Hospital , whose irresponsible explosion of</li> </ul>	Noted.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			car-parking provision in 1994 - allied to the subsequent additions - exacerbates the social problem of ever-increasing traffic?	

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 10 – Delivering Sustainable Development Standards

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Environment Agency	SALIO560	Delivering Sustainable Development Standards - General	Include new bullet point - need to maximise water efficiency	Noted. Include in next stage of document production
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO48	Delivering Sustainable Development Standards - General	Support the requirement for new development to be sustainable and meet high standards of energy efficiency. All future developments at the WMSLP will endeavour to be 'green' developments working towards preserving the natural environment. We are concerned, however, that the restrictive Green Belt policy that applies to the WMSLP at the present time will prevent the development of new green infrastructure.	Noted. Support for delivering sustainable development standards is welcomed. The issue of Major Developed Sites within the green belt will need to be carefully considered further in subsequent stages of document production.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO172	Renewable Energy Sites - Option 10.1	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with published WMRSS policy EN1.	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO431	Renewable Energy Sites - Option 10.1	Strongly advise that potential direct and indirect impacts on the historic environment are fully taken into account when considering development of renewable technologies. (Outlines a number of documents produced by English Heritage which would be of use)	Noted. Take account of highlighted policy statements when looking at sites for renewable energy and the impacts on the historic environment.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO401	Renewable Energy Sites -	We are currently in discussion with the District Council on potential sites for	Noted. The District Council would welcome further information on this at

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Option 10.1	sustainable woodfuel boilers	later consultation stages.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO280	Renewable Energy Sites - Option 10.1	The possibility of hydroelectric power generation from water flowing down the river Severn should be considered. The amounts of power available may not be enormous, but wind turbines individually also only generate modest amounts of power. For example the weir at Lincombe, just beyond the district boundary could be used.	Noted. Consider as an option. However, any potential scheme would need to be carefully assessed against any detrimental impacts on the surrounding landscapes and the affect on the River Severn Valley corridor.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO182	Renewable Energy Sites - Option 10.1	We do not know of any sites that might be suitable for renewable energy projects and we await the IT Power study with interest. While we support the use of renewable energy technologies in appropriate locations it is imperative that sites allocated for such uses are subject to environmental scrutiny and that any adverse impacts are weighed against the benefit of the renewable energy solution.	Noted and agree. Environmental scrutiny of any proposals will be an important consideration.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO173	Energy Efficiency - Option 10.2	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with published WMRSS policy EN2.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO681	Energy Efficiency - Option 10.2	Where a site has the potential to achieve a higher percentage of renewable energy this should clearly be sought. The highest achievable percentage of renewable energy should be sought on all sites.	Noted.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO502	Energy Efficiency -	Please make use of the Planning for Renewable Energy in Worcestershire	Noted. We have now received the final version of this study and we will use this

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
		Option 10.2	Technical Research, produced by the County Council to inform this section.	to inform this section in the next stage of document production.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO402	Energy Efficiency - Option 10.2	Yes. We feel this should apply to any new housing/business development sites as a matter of course	Noted.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	SALIO145	Energy Efficiency - Option 10.2	Our view is that it is important for all developments to have an ambitious target for on site renewable energy rather than some specific sites having a higher target.	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO281	Energy Efficiency - Option 10.2	It is highly desirable that new developments should be energy efficient, but there needs to be a balance between cost and benefit. It is no good building to standards so high that buildings are unaffordable	Noted and agree.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO185	Energy Efficiency - Option 10.2	We support the drive for a higher percentage of renewable energy generation on some sites but suitable sites will have to come forward following appropriate environmental appraisal in due course.	Noted and agree. Sites will need to be appraised to ascertain what could be achieved in different locations.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 11 – Addressing Flood Risk Through Future Development

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Environment Agency	SALIO561	Addressing Flood Risk Through Future Development - General	<p>Para 11.1 - Amend reference to "flood zones" to "Flood Zone 2 and 3 (medium and high probability of flood risk)".</p> <p>Para 11.2/11.4 - Need to include reference to non fluvial flooding i.e. foul flooding, pluvial flooding caused by heavy rain and surface water run off, flooding from man made structures such as reservoirs or canals and groundwater flooding.</p> <p>Flood risk from all sources is a critical constraint and should be considered early in the LDF process using the sequential approach for site allocations.</p> <p>Ensuring there is adequate foul sewerage capacity, identifying areas under pressure and upgrading systems where required, will reduce the risk of foul flooding. The Water Cycle Study may also have useful information on this and should be referred to.</p> <p>Para 11.5 - New development should not have an adverse impact on groundwater or surface waters, therefore SUDS appropriate to the location must be utilised</p>	<p>Noted. Wording to be changed for next stage of document production. Flood risk from all sources will be a consideration taken forward and informed by the SFRA 1 &amp; 2. The SFRA will also provide information regarding the appropriate types of SUDs to be used within different locations. Furthermore, when completed, the Water Cycle Study will also be used to inform the policy preparation of this section of the document.</p>

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			in order to prevent the mobilisation of contaminants.	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO503	Addressing Flood Risk Through Future Development - General	Please make use of the Planning for Water in Worcestershire Technical Research, produced by the County Council to inform this section.	Noted. This will form part of the LDF Evidence Base.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO282	Addressing Flood Risk Through Future Development - General	<p>Building in the floodplain should be ruled out as far as conceivably possible.</p> <p>Flooding is inevitable in properties already built in Bewdley but this needs to be managed by adopting appropriate regulations and imposing these by planning condition whenever there is an application for development (such as extensions) in floodable areas.</p> <p>In Kidderminster and Stourport, a flood channel with a sufficient cross-section needs to be left unobstructed to carry the Stour in spate.</p> <p>Rainwater harvesting should be built into new developments as a matter of course</p> <p>The paving of the ground surface needs to be conditional on water being directed into soakaways that will ensure that rainwater enters the groundwater rather than</p>	Noted and agree. With regard to building within the floodplain - this will be governed by advice in PPS25 and the Districts Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Rainwater harvesting and permeable surfaces are two options to consider, alongside other possible preventative measures.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			running off into rivers.	
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO369	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	We welcome the strategic approach you are taking to manage flood risk and to ensure that the impact of flooding on future land allocations is minimised. The document highlights the issue in rural areas with regards to sever localised flooding is presumably due to the lack of capacity of small scale watercourses to deal with the volumes of drainage water involved. It is hoped that the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment would address these issues.	Noted. The Level 2 SFRA will provide an important information source to help inform the development of policies within this section further.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO174	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	Any policy developed would need to be in generally conformity with emerging WMRSS Policy SR1, part C iii and SR2, part G and paragraphs 8.42 -8.44 in the published WMRSS	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO682	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	Yes, the approach is in line with national policy.	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO504	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	Support the approach to investigating flood risk sites within development areas, however re-state that some parcels of land are suited for multi-functional (re)development which incorporates sustainable transport, flood storage, value for biodiversity (e.g. wetlands) together with appropriate developments - as long as these developments identify and protect that site's existing value for	Noted and agree.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			biodiversity.	
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO403	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	Support.	Support is welcomed.
Severn Navigation Restoration Trust	SALIO349	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	Firstly, we agree generally with your approach, and secondly, we would like you to incorporate reference to (our) proposals to install variable weirs in the main river channel - principally to ensure maximum river drainage capacity in times of flood.	Noted. Support is welcomed. Consider proposals for the variable weirs within the main river channel. This would need to be subject to discussions with the EA and would also need to undergo rigorous Sustainability Appraisal.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO134	Flood Risk - Option 11.1	I generally agree with the above. Consideration should be given to <b>all</b> sources of flooding including <b>surface water</b> ground water and Sewer flooding not just Fluvial.  <b>Drainage infrastructure and plans should be made available by developers during the planning process. At present there is little or no diagrammatical data available for drainage on many of the large private developments in the district.</b>	Noted. Agree that all sources of flooding need to be taken into account. With regards to drainage infrastructure and plans this may be something that will need to be dealt with at the planning application stage and will need co-operation with Severn Trent.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO176	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	The proposed approach set out in the DPD would be in general conformity with emerging WMRSS Policy SR1, part C iii and SR2, part G, SR3 part H and paragraphs 8.42 -8.44 in the published WMRSS.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO683	Sustainable	Welcome the mandatory requirement of	Noted. Support is welcomed. Further

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Drainage - Option 11.2	SuDS. We recommend that where possible SuDS should be soft-engineered (such as naturalised balancing ponds, reed beds, swales or living roofs) so as to deliver biodiversity enhancement. Where possible, SuDS should be integrated with the town's waterways and wetlands, utilising their flood alleviation potential and enhancing them for biodiversity. This is particularly relevant to the wetland SSSI, many of which are drying out. The Council have a duty to contribute to the enhancement of SSSI where possible.	investigation into appropriate types of SUDS will be provided by the Level 2 SFRA but the approaches outlined seem a sensible and logical approach. The potential for the multi-functional use of SUDS is appreciated and will be developed further within this section of the document.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO505	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	We support this approach to sustainable drainage	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	SALIO356	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	Yes, agree.	Noted. Support is welcomed
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO404	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	Support	Support is welcomed
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO199	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	We are pleased to support the approach to SUDS and believe that such drainage solutions play a fundamental role in delivering sustainable development. We look forward to seeing further detail on the final SUDS policy in due course but we would urge the Council to take the widest view of SUDS elements in their	Noted and agree. There are a number of benefits to implementing SUDs, including the biodiversity role. The multi-functional role of SUDS will be examined further and considered as part of the policy development on this subject. This will be informed by the Level 2 SFRA which is currently being prepared.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>deliberations. In particular we would be keen to see green building technologies (green roofs, green walls, water recycling, rainwater harvesting etc) added to the usual infiltration and storage techniques as part of a comprehensive package of measures. In addition we would suggest that the Council take a broad view of the benefits of SUDS systems for biodiversity and the public and do not concentrate just on the flood prevention aspect of their role. One of the key advantages of SUDS is the multi-functional role they can have if properly developed and this must be captured in the LDF policy position.</p>	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO197	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	<p>We are pleased to support the approach to managing flood risk set out in paragraph 11.4.</p> <p>We would however suggest that policies concerned with managing flood risk take full account of the benefits provided by 'soft' engineering solutions, in particular with respect to the multi-functional uses that can come from above-ground flood storage and attenuation features such as open green space, ponds and swales. We would advocate a presumption for using such techniques and it is imperative that site allocations leave sufficient space to</p>	<p>Noted. Support is welcomed. With regard to the type of approaches used to managing flood risk, this will vary depending on location. However, as SUDs are expected to become mandatory the space to implement them will be a necessity of future development. Development within the flood plain will be in accordance with the advice set out by PPS25 and the emerging SFRA Level 2.</p>

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			include these features. In addition we would strongly advocate a presumption against development in the flood plain.	
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO135	Sustainable Drainage - Option 11.2	<p><b>It should be made clear either in WFDC planning policy or during the planning process who (D.C? Developers? Highways? Residents?) will be made responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of SUDS schemes once completed.</b></p> <p>Once completed local planning policy should consider and set out a standardised approach to development based upon and advised by the information in the SFRA with specific attention to level II.</p>	Noted and Agree. Responsibility for SUDs will be a key consideration in making sure that schemes work and continue to be maintained. The Level 2 SFRA will be used to inform any policy production within this document.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 12 – Rural Development and Countryside Protection

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Environment Agency	SALIO562	Rural Development and Countryside Protection - General	<p>We would not want to see further development in areas with no mains drainage where private systems could cause pollution to surface and/or groundwater.</p> <p>No comments/objections in relation to contamination to specific locations so long as there is adequate sewage works and sewerage system capacity as development might put pressure on the system leading to more frequent discharges of sewage to rivers. This needs to be fully investigated as the sewerage network may require investment/improvement.</p> <p>We would not like to see new storm overflows as a result of new developments and would not like to see increased spill frequency or spill volume from existing overflows on the sewerage system.</p> <p>Consultee also provides background information on the sewage works within the District.</p>	Noted. Drainage will form an important consideration for future developments. Background information will be of use for the LDF and the Water Cycle Study.
English Heritage	SALIO434	Rural Development	Any development of these sites should be informed by an appropriate assessment of	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		and Countryside Protection - General	the potential impacts on the historic environment. Please also note our comments under Option 7.1 with regard to the Lea Castle Hospital site.	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO507	Rural Development and Countryside Protection - General	Under paragraph 12.1, please amend the second sentence as follows .....which will consider <b>landscape sensitivity</b> , biodiversity, geodiversity.....	Noted
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO508	Rural Development and Countryside Protection - General	Please add the following to paragraph 12.5 <b>Work on landscape sensitivity undertaken by Worcestershire County Council and based on the County Landscape Character Assessment, now identifies those landscapes that are particularly sensitive to change.</b>	Noted. Look to include changes in subsequent stages of document production
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO509	Rural Development and Countryside Protection - General	Central to the issue of countryside protection, which runs through options 12.1 to 12.7, is the importance of a Green Infrastructure (GI) network; especially in identifying fragmented areas of importance for nature conservation and ensuring that insensitive development does not occur, or, where development cannot be avoided, that suitable mitigation and/or compensation schemes secure "biodiversity-rich" connectivity between those areas.  These areas should comprise both sites	Noted. The proposed Green Infrastructure study will be a key component in achieving this. A meeting has been scheduled with the County to progress this further.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			identified as part of the GI study (with particular reference to previously identified sites such as SWS, LNR, RVNR networks etc), important BAP habitats (e.g. development should not be encouraged which would detrimentally and irreversibly impact BAP habitats), and those parcels of land most vulnerable to impact as identified within the Worcestershire Habitat Inventory (WHI). Worcestershire County Ecologists would be pleased to provide further information and advice as pertaining to this issue.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO283	Rural Development and Countryside Protection - General	We support the objectives	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO139	Rural Development and Countryside Protection - General	One of the biggest threats to landscape character, green belt, biodiversity and agriculture is the increasing conversion of agricultural land around the urban fringes and green belt into intensive horse culture. Increasingly more and more areas are being fragmented and intensively grazed drastically reducing biodiversity, and especially when accompanied by temporary shelters and improvised jumps, radically changing the rural character of	Noted. Consider further policy development on this subject in subsequent stages of document production.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			the District.  We desperately need a policy in place to prevent our rural areas character being destroyed and replaced by stark plastic fencing and a cacophony of ramshackle stables and temporary shelters.	
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO370	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	With regards to rural development and countryside protection, you appear to be adopting a methodological approach to Landscape Protection via Landscape Character Area, and this is welcomed. However, you are advised to be cautious regarding the proliferation of designations. You will need to be clear about which designations are important and why. It is only through having this information that countryside protection can be applied rigorously and defended.	Noted. Support for Landscape Character Areas is welcomed. A clearer indication of designations will be sought through further evidence base work.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO177	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	Any policy developed on this matter will need to be in general conformity with published WMRSS policies QE4, QE5 and QE6.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO684	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	The District has a high quality and diverse landscape which should be preserved and enhanced. We recommend consideration of landscape within the Green Infrastructure Study. As part of the evidence base, this study should help to ensure development is appropriately	Noted. Seek to utilise the County Council's work (a meeting has been arranged to discuss this further with the County) to inform the Green Infrastructure Study. Support for the intended production of a Landscape Character SPD is welcomed.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			located so as not to degrade the landscape, any development is in keeping with the local landscape and that local landscapes are enhanced as and when possible. Worcestershire County Council's online Landscape Character Assessment should be used to inform the Green Infrastructure Study. We support the intended production of a Landscape SPD.	
English Heritage	SALIO432	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	Consider that the County Council's Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) must be taken into account as an integral part of District's approach to landscape character and the proposed SPD. We would be happy to discuss how best this could be achieved in conjunction with the County Council who are progressing work on the HLC (contact: Steve Crowther).	Noted and agree. Seek to liaise with English Heritage to discuss this further.
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO452	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	We agree and support the statement made at 12.6 of the Preferred Options Paper.	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	SALIO367	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	The impressive and extensive red sandstone exposures that occur east of the River Severn are one of the clearest example of the distinctiveness of the District. These exposures should be safeguarded within all site redevelopments and where appropriate, enhanced. Some exposures are already listed as Local Geological Sites (or more commonly	Noted. Look to include this in further stages of the documents production.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			known as RIGS), and there are more that are potential Local Sites.	
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO405	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	A specific designation is required to control development and enhance the landscape in areas which are currently protected	Noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO238	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	Landscape Protection Areas should be given greater protection from development	Noted. The Government advocates a new appraisal process based on landscape characterisation. Detailed guidance will be provided through a Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO284	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	Sharp escarpments, where the hard bunter pebblebeds (or Mercian mudstone) have been broken into and the new red sandstone below has been eroded, are characteristic of the district. These are such a major feature that they probably do not require any particular action for their preservation, but it may often be appropriate to use them as a boundary to developed areas. Is this what is meant by "sandstone estatelands"? If so, the word "escarpments" should be used. The Lapworth Museum of Birmingham University has 25-inch geological maps of the Abberley area prepared by Mr Wickham King. This resource should be used where appropriate. We are not sure whether they extend into this district.	Noted. The features of the District outlined above are important to the local distinctiveness of the area and therefore should be preserved. Further research will be required into whether or not the geological maps of the Abberley area extend into the District.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO137	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	I know this is not your area but where do the County feel Wet and Wooded Valleys fit in their landscape characters?	Noted. As the comment suggests, this is something that would require a response from the County Council.
Pound Green Group	SALIO420	Landscape Character - Option 12.1	In view of the phasing-out of the existing designations of "Landscape Protection Areas", we would ask for an assurance that this will not happen before the Historic Landscape Characterisation Assessments for the Parishes of Rock and Upper Arley are in place and that priority be given to these areas. Pound Green and Button Oak are, we believe, very important historical landscape terms and we hope that Kinlet Parish will be incorporated by liaison with its relevant planning team. We would also ask that the Landscape enhancement objectives of the "Grow The Wyre" Project which covers all three parishes be incorporated in the plan, particularly as the WFDC and the Forestry Commission are stakeholders.	Comments are noted. The Landscape Protection Area policy is currently saved through the Local Plan process, this will be phased out as the LDF documents are adopted. The Landscape Character SPD will provide more detailed planning policy on areas of high landscape sensitivity.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO178	Other Landscape Designations - Option 12.2	Any policy developed will need to be in general conformity with published WMRSS policies QE4, QE5 and QE6	Noted
Natural England	SALIO685	Other Landscape Designations - Option 12.2	PPS7 steers against local landscape designations. We recommend the consideration, promotion and enhancement of special landscapes through green infrastructure	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
English Heritage	SALIO433	Other Landscape Designations - Option 12.2	<p>We suggest a possible approach to these landscape features is to link them to a positive and integrated policy framework based on their enhancement for supporting a range of interests e.g. biodiversity, historic environment and uses e.g. leisure, recreation, tourism.</p> <p>The Wyre Forest should be included as well as in view of the major HLF project funding underway. Work emerging from the County Council's HLC may also help identify other aspects.</p>	Noted.
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	SALIO422	Other Landscape Designations - Option 12.2	<p>Suggest that a Thematic Paper(s) be produced on each of the Landscape designations, if the conservation and enhancement of the identified areas cannot be dealt with in the Core Strategy. This may even lead to a Landscape, or Nature Conservation SPD?</p>	Noted. A Landscape Character SPD is timetabled in the Council's LDS and work is due to start on this in 2011. Further information is outlined within the Core Strategy preferred Options Paper.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO406	Other Landscape Designations - Option 12.2	The Wyre Forest should be a specific landscape designation	Noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO239	Other Landscape Designations - Option 12.2	The Wyre Forest	Noted.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO179	Areas of Development	There is no equivalent WMRSS policy on this issue.	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Restraint - Option 12.3		
Natural England	SALIO686	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	Natural England recommends that the existing ADRs are considered along with other sites through the LDF process. We would not support the development of any ADRs in advance of this LDF. We have raised concerns around the sustainability of a number of the ADRs; this Site Allocations Paper has indicated a plentiful supply of more suitable sites and we would therefore be unlikely to support their development.	Noted.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO510	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	Areas of Development Restraint should not be considered for/used before Brownfield sites in sustainable locations	Noted and agree.
Bewdley Civic Society	SALIO240	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	They should remain safeguarded	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO285	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	The extent to which ADRs are now needed will depend on the capacity of the towns to absorb growth. Under Issue 1, we are suggesting that their use should not be necessary during the Plan Period, but this will need to be reviewed periodically.  We note that all ADRs (or all remaining ADRs) are in villages. These should be	Noted. The outcome of the SHLAA process is awaited and this will determine the extent to which the District's housing requirements can be met on brownfield sites within the urban areas.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>reserved to meet Local Needs arising in those villages, and should not be used merely because urban capacity in towns has been exhausted.</p> <p>If land capacity in towns is inadequate, further ADRs should be identified adjoining towns, in order that the Council always has a reserve of identified developable land for each town</p>	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO201	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	<p>We would suggest that ADRs be allocated and brought forward where they offer a more sustainable solution to development than other sites identified through the LDF process. This must be weighed against the existing development hierarchy and sequential approach as laid out elsewhere with respect to sustainable development policy. It is important that consideration of such sites is informed by the need for associated Green (and other) Infrastructure in order that a balanced order for land release can be maintained.</p>	<p>Noted. However, at present, pending the outcome of the SHLAA, it is considered that there are enough available brownfield sites within the District to meet the emerging need and therefore the current ADRs will not require release.</p>
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO140	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	<p>Before options for development are prepared it is worth noting that many of these sites have significant biodiversity value. It would be wise to document this, perhaps a biodiversity statement relating to each of these site highlighting biological issues and expected mitigation. This</p>	<p>Noted. Explore further the idea of providing biodiversity statements on these sites.</p>

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			would remove the temptation to sterilise the sites by the current owners to make future redevelopment easier. Particular concern is Hurcott ADR	
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO380	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	We support the release of land for development in the Area of Development Restraint at Cookley.	Noted. The site will be assessed through the District Councils SHLAA for its suitability for release as residential land.
Stanmore Properties Ltd	SALIO42	Areas of Development Restraint - Option 12.3	<p>There would be no justification for altering the boundaries of the ADRs at the current time. Whilst there may not immediately be required to meet current housing needs there will certainly come a time when there is no longer sufficient previously developed land to meet the needs of the District. At such a time the ADRs comprise the most suitable and sustainable land which could then meet the requirements.</p> <p>Responding to the first question posed in Option 12.3 the areas should therefore remain safeguarded from development.</p> <p>The second question asks whether some of the ADRs should be released for development to meet future housing need. In response to this we are concerned that although the Council has indicated that there is sufficient previously developed land available to meet the housing</p>	Noted. Consider keeping the ADRs as reserve sites for residential development, if insufficient provision is made on previously developed land subject to Sustainability Appraisal. With regard to the available brownfield land the SHLAA, which is currently being undertaken, will identify the sites that are considered available and developable to meet the emerging needs.



**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>requirements to 2026 there is no evidence of this. We feel that the Council should make it clear that if insufficient brownfield land is available and developed then some of the ADR's should then be developed to meet the outstanding need.</p> <p>We feel that this land should be brought forward for development if insufficient provision is being made on previously developed land. The site is the only parcel of ADR land which lies adjacent to the edge of Kidderminster, the most sustainable settlement in the District. There are no specific constraints to the development of the land and as such it would be the most appropriate to meet any outstanding needs.</p> <p>We would recommend, as outlined in our response to Core Policy DS01 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options, that ADR sites should be identified for development and brought forward for development if insufficient progress is made towards meeting the regional housing requirements. We propose the Hurcott ADR be identified to meet that need.</p>	
Price A R	SALIO461	Areas of Development	Supports principle of retaining ADRs.	Comments noted. The potential of this site to deliver housing is being

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Restraint - Option 12.3	The site promoted, if not allocated during this plan period is considered to perform better as an ADR than the existing Cookley ADR as it is better related to services and facilities within the village of Cookley. It is proposed that the current ADR site be deleted and returned to full Green Belt status and the site at Lawnswood be allocated as a wider ADR if not accepted for development at this time.	considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO180	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	Both sites, Lea Castle Hospital and Rushock Trading Estate, are currently identified (in the Wyre Forest Local Plan) as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt (in the terms of PPG2). Phase 3 of the WMRSS Revision will consider the need for a new policy on the positive use and function of the Green Belt. This will be informed by a study of the current pattern of land uses and how these relate to the functions of the Green Belt. Neither the published nor emerging WMRSS contain policies for the control of development in the green belt. In this light no conformity advice is offered on these questions.	Noted. Phase 3 of the WMRSS will be considered once available and used to inform this section.
Advantage West Midlands	SALIO696	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	The Lea Castle site could offer considerable opportunities for redevelopment during the Local Development Framework period and along with the Rushock Trading Estate should	Noted. Seek to retain these two sites as Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			remain as 'Major Developed Sites' in the Green Belt to ensure the appropriate flexibility in their future use.	
Natural England	SALIO687	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	Provided these sites are developed sensitively and meet sustainability criteria.	Noted and agree.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO543	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	The sites mentioned seem the only ones appropriate to be designated Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO286	Option 12.4	<p>We consider that both the sites should remain in the Green Belt. Each has been developed in the past in the midst of green fields for particular reasons. If those reasons have disappeared the preferred option should be that they should revert to agriculture. No change of use should be permitted.</p> <p>Rushock Industrial Estate (and certain others beyond the district boundary) derived from World War II Defence uses. Such employment uses are appropriate to the nature of the existing buildings, but no substantial expansion of the buildings should be permitted.</p>	Noted. The sites are considered as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt and so development is likely to be able to continue into the future; it is unlikely that these sites will revert to their former agricultural status. However, any development must be in accordance with the policies set out in PPG2. With regard to Rushock, this site provides a employment need within a rural area and is proposed to be protected for such use within the confines of the existing site boundary.
Worcestershire	SALIO203	Major	These sites should be brought forward	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Wildlife Trust		Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	where they represent the most sustainable option for development in line with other policy considerations.	
Hovi Developments Ltd	SALIO63	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	<p>Whilst located within the Green Belt, Rushock Trading Estate (ELA 32, 33, 36, 56 and 71) is an historic and established employment site which was previously a developed military site. Whilst much of the site has been developed for business purposes there are a number of areas which have yet to be or are now disused. Therefore the potential of the Estate, which includes areas of previously developed land should be maximised.</p> <p>The site assessments for Rushock Trading Estate, as contained within Stage 3 of the Employment Land Review, are generally considered to be an accurate reflection of the sites potential for continued extension, all be it within the accepted constraints of the existing estate boundary.</p>	Noted and agree. Retain Rushock Trading Estate as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, which is suitable for employment development, within the existing boundaries.
Horton Estates Ltd	SALIO259	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	Submits representations on behalf of Hortons Estate Limited to consider the allocation of Cursely Industrial Estate, Nr Shenstone as a 'Major Developed Site' within the Green Belt.	Noted. Consider designation further in subsequent stages of document production. Further background work will be required to understand the options for this site in more detail.
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO49	Major Developed Sites	The emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD identifies two Major Developed Sites	This will need to be carefully considered through the future stages of the Site

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		in the Green Belt - Option 12.4	(MDS) in the Green Belt, Lea Castle Hospital and the Rushock Trading Estate. The WMSLP should also be identified as a MDS. Given the scale and nature of the WMSLP, it is our opinion that the site should be considered a MDS. Chessington World of Adventures, Camelot Theme Park and Drayton Manor Park have all been identified as MDS in the relevant Local Plan/Local Development Framework applicable to those sites.	allocations and Policies DPD. However, there are a number of detailed factors to consider and the potential impacts on the Green Belt and sensitive landscape are key. All site allocations would also be subject to rigorous sustainability appraisal.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO181	Lea Castle - Option 12.5	This option follows on from the above option 12.4. See above.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO544	Lea Castle - Option 12.5	Using Lea Castle site for High Technology and possibly partially for healthcare provision would seem reasonable	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO287	Lea Castle - Option 12.5	No doubt, Lea Castle Hospital was built in the countryside, due to the fear of mental illness: presumably, it needed to be separated from where people lived. This was presumably the result of "very special circumstances". If these circumstances no longer apply, the land should revert to agriculture.	Noted. The future development of this site will need to be considered further, however, it is very unlikely that the site will return to its former agricultural use.
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	SALIO381	Lea Castle - Option 12.5	We would support the development of this site for a High Technology Business Park.	Noted.
Cox Mr T	SALIO1	Lea Castle - Option 12.5	This is a large site which could provide employment for a large number of people within the district. The high technology business park idea is perfect. I do not think	Noted. The High Technology Business Park is one potential idea for this site - this is the approach advocated by the current Adopted Local Plan. Any new

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			it is vital for any of it to be used for healthcare purposes.	development will need to be carefully considered.
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO371	Rural Employment Options - Option 12.6	The document appears to be very focussed on large employment sites in pursuing policies for employment in rural areas. If the document is promoting sustainable rural communities, there may have to be a recognition that a more dispersed pattern of employment opportunity is the most suitable to achieve this objective.	Noted and Agree. The document is seeking to safeguard large rural employment sites where possible, however further employment diversification and opportunities in the District's rural areas will also need to be considered, in order to achieve more sustainable development options.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO183	Rural Employment Options - Option 12.6	This option raises no regional conformity issues. The sites are in current employment use. The sites referred to include those in Options 12.4. See also comments on this Option.	Noted
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	SALIO468	Rural Employment Options - Option 12.6	Business development on brown field sites might include the redundant farm buildings at the top of Briar Hill and at the garage site Ref H143 however roads are unsuitable for volume or heavy traffic as with a distributive business user, but may be appropriate for some small scale commercial services or professional use. These sites could also be considered for part residential accommodation	Noted. Site viability and appropriateness for different types of development will need to be carefully considered prior to any site coming forward for development. Small scale development on suitable/appropriate sites, preferably brownfield, within rural areas would generally be supported.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO407	Rural Employment Options - Option 12.6	Existing employment sites should be allowed to remain. Encouragement should be given to agriculture and small scale rural employment opportunities that do not	Noted and agree.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			damage the landscape	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO288	Rural Employment Options - Option 12.6	The rest of the sites listed should continue to be used for employment, but their expansion should be heavily discouraged.	Noted.
Hovi Developments Ltd	SALIO64	Rural Employment Options - Option 12.6	<p>Rural sites, which currently exist, and play an important role in part of the employment provision of the District, should be developed so that they can be fully utilised and therefore their potential maximised.</p> <p>The potential of existing sites within the Green Belt, such as the sites listed for Rushock Trading Estate, should be maximised to relieve the pressure for green field take up within rural areas. Such sites should be safeguarded so that they are not lost to alternative uses, thereby also providing certainty to developers, existing and future occupiers alike.</p>	Noted. Seek to retain Rushock Trading Estate as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, which is suitable for employment development, within the existing boundaries.
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO372	Agriculture - Option 12.7	We welcome the recognition of the importance of agriculture in the district and the contribution it makes to the local economy of rural areas. Looking at the best and most versatile land in particular with regards to PPS7, nearly 40% of the agricultural land areas carries a 60% likelihood of falling into the best and most versatile land category. PPS7 policies	Noted and agree. The final document will be in line with national guidance, including PPS7.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			should still apply and the proposal to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from inappropriate development should be incorporated.	
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO184	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with published WMRSS policy PA15	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO688	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Yes. However, consideration should also be given to other sustainability criteria such as biodiversity value, open space and sustainable transport options.	Noted and agree.
English Heritage	SALIO435	Agriculture - Option 12.7	When considering farm diversification we recommend that proposals are fully informed by an understanding of the historic character and interest of the farmstead and its landscape setting. The County Council is undertaking a county-wide survey of historic farmsteads funded by English Heritage and Advantage West Midlands as part of a wider regional programme (contact: Adam Mindykowski, Worcestershire County Council). It is envisaged that the survey work will inform the development of guidance on the sustainable use and conversion of historic farmsteads. We recommend that this work forms part of the evidence base and we would be happy to discuss how it can be taken forward to inform detailed policy guidance as for example as a	Noted. Further discussions required on this subject matter to ensure that it is brought forward in an appropriate manner.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Supplementary Planning Document.	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO514	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Please note the issue of re-development of agricultural land is complex: vast areas of agricultural land do have minimal value for biodiversity; however farmland often comprises a mosaic of habitats. While we would not broadly object to the use some agricultural land for redevelopment, we would highlight the potential value for biodiversity some of these sites may provide and encourage careful assessment of this prior to permitting development.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO545	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Allowing for diversity in rural areas is vital to their survival whilst generally protecting them from inappropriate development.	Noted and agree
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO408	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Agriculture has an important role to play in the countryside. Protecting agricultural land from inappropriate development is the right approach.	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO289	Agriculture - Option 12.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good agricultural land should be protected.</li> <li>• Farm diversification development should normally be in or adjacent to farmyards, and preferably by reusing existing buildings</li> <li>• Farm shops should be permitted but only within existing buildings to which there is good road access.</li> <li>• Agricultural workers cottages</li> </ul>	Noted and agree.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			should be permitted, provided there is a proven need and with an agricultural tie condition. All too often in the past, this has been used as a wheeze for avoiding the restrictions on development in the Green Belt.	
Cox Mr T	SALIO3	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Protecting agricultural land from inappropriate development is quite right. It is vital that we maintain all farm land within the district and that none of it is developed	Noted. Support for this policy approach is welcomed.
Hardwick Mr R	SALIO252	Agriculture - Option 12.7	Yes - agricultural land must be protected	Noted.
Environment Agency	SALIO563	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	We would wish to see these developments restricted due the risk of contamination from rural sewage disposal and the flood risk from those sites located in the flood plain. Future chalet and caravan sites should be subject to an assessment of environmental infrastructure including an order of preference towards sites connected to foul effluent sewers in the first instance. Such proposals should be subject to sequential testing as set out in PPS25.	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO447	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	We agree with the first question only at Option 12.8 of the Site Allocations and Policies (SAP).	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			In July 2006 a survey showed that with a radius of 1.8 miles from the centre of Button Oak there were 7 caravan sites with mobile homes, containing 336 mobile homes as compared to 128 houses.	Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO409	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	Yes. No further chalet or caravan parks should be permitted. Extensions to existing parks should also not be permitted	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO290	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	These are a feature of parts of the district, and in many places are unobtrusive. Caravan sites in floodplains should as far as possible be removed. It may be appropriate for chalet developments on higher ground to remain, but intensification (including rebuilding in brick, etc.) should not be allowed. The expansion of these within the Green Belt should not be permitted, any more than other kinds of dwelling would be.	Noted.
Pound Green Group	SALIO419	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	A petition signed by a number of residents of Pound Green and Button Oak outline a number of reasons as to why no more caravan sites should be allowed to be built or current sites extended. The reasons include that they do not enhance tourism in the area and are not a tourist attraction.	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Cox Mr T	SALIO2	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	We have quite enough in the district and I do not believe we need any more.	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Hardwick Mr R	SALIO253	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	I agree - no further chalets should be allowed	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Haycock Mrs J	SALIO69	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	The Wyre Forest already has a large amount of mobile home sites. On the whole they are unsightly and do nothing to blend in with the environment. Retrospective planning consent is all too easily granted on farmland for small caravan developments, which in this area are a considerable eye sore on this beautiful environment. If affordable housing is required then surely brown site development is the answer.	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Hodgkiss Mr N	SALIO198	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	I agree that <u>no</u> further chalet and/or caravan sites or related development by expansion of numbers be allowed in the west of the district. I believe there is an	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>abundance of local sites already.</p> <p>Policies should be directed at controlling the rallies of touring caravans to limit their numbers so that the local rural Landscape Protection Areas can be safeguarded from over exploitation.</p>	clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Hodgkiss Mrs F	SALIO70	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	<p>I agree with the approach <u>not</u> to allow further chalet and/or caravan site development within the District.</p> <p>I believe that in particular the existing area west of the district, which is a Landscape Protection Area, should be clearly protected to maintain its unique character from further development and intrusion.</p>	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Lewis Mrs B	SALIO249	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	No more caravan site/chalet development is required in the Far Forest area. Even extending existing sites are not necessary as there are plenty of sites already. The areas natural beauty needs protecting so no further development should be allowed	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Oyama Mrs S	SALIO35	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	Given all that is contained in 12.19 and 12.20, I wish to support the most strict controls on existing sites and those, such as Majuba in Button Oak, that are under development, and a ban on all future development	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD. The District Council has

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
			Furthermore, I would urge the council to liaise closely with bordering authorities, such as Shropshire, to spread this firm line.	commented on a number of neighbouring authorities emerging plans, however, the policies and controls that other authorities enforce are largely out of the Wyre Forest District Council's control.
Potter Mrs N	SALIO250	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	No more chalet/caravan site developments within the district and no more extensions to existing parks	Noted. The Core Strategy seeks to restrict the further development of mobile home/caravan/chalet developments into the future and this will be reflected in the Site Allocations. This will be further clarified through the landscape character SPD.
Smith Mr James	SALIO76	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	Support	Noted.
Smith Mrs Alison	SALIO77	Chalet and Caravan Sites - Option 12.8	Support	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 13 – Providing a Green Infrastructure Network and Supporting Local Biodiversity

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Government Office for the West Midlands - Planning Team	SALIO368	Providing a Green Infrastructure Network and Supporting Local Biodiversity - General	With reference to design, it is good to see that it has been mentioned in a cross cutting way and where possible opportunities have been taken to integrate it with other areas. On page 41, with regard to Key Issue 8, you promote opportunities to incorporate biodiversity and geodiversity features within the design of developments, this approach is welcomed. Where possible you should seek the views of CABE or MADE and make full use of design guidance such as By Design.	Noted. Support for the outlined approach is welcomed. The views of CABE have been sought in this consultation.
Environment Agency	SALIO564	Providing a Green Infrastructure Network and Supporting Local Biodiversity - General	We support the use of Green Infrastructure	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO516	Providing a Green Infrastructure Network and Supporting Local Biodiversity -	It is difficult to make strategic comments on this section of the DPD without having sight of or input to the GI Plan, as mentioned in paragraph 13.13.	Noted. The GI Plan is still in its infancy and meetings have been arranged with the County Council to progress this further.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		General		
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO517	Providing a Green Infrastructure Network and Supporting Local Biodiversity - General	<p>The key issues needs to have wider consideration of GI than purely Biodiversity, geodiversity and open space provision. It is also influenced by other areas such as Landscape character.</p> <p>Key Issue 8 should address landscape as part of the issues and it should be amended to reflect this. We suggest the following:</p> <p>The need to maintain, enhance and or add to <b>landscape quality</b>, biodiversity .....</p> <p>The promotion of opportunities for the incorporation of beneficial <b>landscape</b>, biodiversity, .....</p>	Noted. Agree regarding the wider role of Green Infrastructure. Seek to include all elements within the study.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO141	Providing a Green Infrastructure Network and Supporting Local Biodiversity - General	Perhaps a re wording to include, "when appropriate expanding important areas of accessible, and biodiversity valuable, areas of green space" I know this is covered elsewhere but perhaps a mention of the word "wildlife corridors"	Noted. Seek to include in next stages of document production.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO186	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with the Quality of the Environment chapter of the published WMRSS	Noted.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Value - Option 13.1		
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO518	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value - Option 13.1	Closer reference should be made to the GI study and the Worcestershire Habitat Inventory to identify both functional biodiversity-rich sites, biodiversity rich sites which are especially vulnerable to impact and also those areas suitable for protection and enhancement which currently connect (or could connect) these biodiversity-rich sites.	Noted. Reference to both documents will be key in continuing the DPD's production.
Wychavon District Council	SALIO383	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value - Option 13.1	In terms of conservation and greenbelt, officers would also wish to like to be consulted further if development affects the setting and character of Hartlebury Common which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest	Noted. No development is proposed at present that would adversely affect Hartlebury Common.
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	SALIO453	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value - Option 13.1	Support the above approach. However, there are sites still missing from the designated list with regards to LGS/RIGS. A section of the Leapgate Railway Cutting has been recently proposed as a Local Geological Site/RIGS and there are other potential Local Sites. How these sites which may be designated within the lifetime of the Core Strategy are dealt with, is an issue that should be considered.  Soils are an aspect of geodiversity that have historically not been recognised in	Noted. Seek to identify features, as indicated above, within subsequent stages of document production. Seek to engage with consultee to progress this issue further.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			terms of pure nature conservation interest within Local Authority development plans. Of particular note are two soil types in the District - peat soils (of which further work is needed to identify areas where peat soils exist) and the Crannymoor soil series, the only example of a true podzol in the county. It's extent is extremely restricted with the best location being in the area between Kidderminster and Bewdley. It existence relies on the continued presence of natural heath or coniferous woodland. Identification and protection of these sites should be considered within the context of this Key Issue.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO291	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value - Option 13.1	Opportunities should be sought to open up further areas of the Wyre Forest to walkers and cyclists by providing car parks at further access points, for example Coppice Gate SO767754; west of Grove Farm SO772763; and at Far Forest. These should be small car parks and should probably not be signposted, so that they will only be found by the most dedicated users. This will need to be selective, so as not to harm the sites	Noted. Consider as an option in subsequent stages of document production
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO205	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological	Support the principle of protecting sites and their inclusion on the proposals map. However we do not consider that this	Noted. Consider approach as indicated above further in document production. The Green Infrastructure

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Conservation Value - Option 13.1	<p>approach is far-reaching enough to protect or enhance the biodiversity of the District in line with existing guidance. Creating and enhancing links between these sites will be vital in maintaining a robust Green Infrastructure network for the future and it is imperative that the local policy context recognises this and takes a strong line on the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in the wider countryside and built environment as well as within designated sites.</p> <p>Missing sites are harder to quantify but it is important to recognise that where comparable sites do come to light they must benefit from the same level of protection as those already designated. Similarly it is imperative that the policy framework recognises that a lack of designated sites does not necessarily equate to a lack of biodiversity interest. A precautionary approach must be taken and surveys to confirm the value of all sites must underpin all major allocations and subsequent applications.</p>	Study will play an important role in this.
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO138	Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation	Statutory designated sites (e.g. SSSIs) need buffering from development as well as protection of the site itself	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
		Value - Option 13.1		
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO187	Open Space - Option 13.2	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with the Quality of the Environment chapter of the published WMRSS and also take into account part E of emerging WMRSS Policy SR2.	Noted.
Environment Agency	SALIO565	Open Space - Option 13.2	We recommend reference here to the need to protect the quality of all natural resources of air, land and water including water resources. Sites should be protected for their role as a water resource as well as for biodiversity and landscape reasons.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO689	Open Space - Option 13.2	Existing open spaces should be protected and enhanced. This is particularly relevant where there are current deficits, such as in parts of Kidderminster. Your PPG17 audit and Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards should be used to identify deficits.  The companion guide to PPG17 recommends the use of ANGSt (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards) along with other tools and techniques for auditing local provision, setting provision standards and applying provision standards. The existing RSS recognises ANGSt and presents the standards in its appendices. Natural	Noted. Ensure that existing open spaces are protected and enhanced, whilst using the PPG17 study to identify deficits in provision. Comments regarding ANGSt and Green Space standards will be further developed in subsequent stages of document production.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>England are currently in the process of producing guidance on ANGSt. When available we will ensure you receive a copy.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the quality of sites. We recommend the application of Green Flag standards where possible as a means of assessing the quality of sites. We also recommend designation as Local Nature Reserves where appropriate, providing a level of protection.</p>	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO519	Open Space - Option 13.2	We broadly support this option. However, it should be recognised that it may be necessary in some circumstances to utilise existing open space to allow for gain in developments elsewhere. Furthermore WFDC has signed up to the Countryside Access and Recreation Strategy (CARS), please ensure the CARS objectives and policies are reflected, as well as ensuring the sites identified in the CARS document are all accounted for	Noted. Ensure that the CARS document is fully integrated into the Document.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO546	Open Space - Option 13.2	Yes	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO410	Open Space - Option 13.2	Support	Noted. Support is welcomed
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO292	Open Space - Option 13.2	This should be generally protected. Where there is a deficit this should be addressed	Noted and agree.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			by identifying areas to be available for this. Green space is to be welcomed.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO209	Open Space - Option 13.2	Agree that all of the open space sites should continue to be protected and designated. We would also point out that some un-designated open space is of high value for biodiversity and that even un-designated multi-functional open spaces contribute to a range of objectives and help to deliver against a variety of sustainable development objectives.	Noted.
Dolley Mrs D	SALIO463	Open Space - Option 13.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific point in relation to allotments. Would not support any development on existing allotment sites (Sites 22, 164). <b>Ref: Action Plan for Parish of Chaddesley Corbett C6 'Promote and enhance local allotments in order to maximise their usage and preserve the character of the village'</b> NB This action is developing well as a result of sustained efforts by the Parish Council</li> <li>2. Specific point in support of the retention of open spaces surrounding existing settlements. <b>Ref: A Design Statement for the Parish of Chaddesley Corbett 2.4 Landscape Design Principles</b></li> </ol>	Noted. It is not envisaged that any allotments within the village will be developed for alternative means. The document will have regard to the Parish Plan and the Design Statement through its production.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<b>2.4.1 'The pattern of open spaces surrounding settlements should be retained in any future developments' and also 3.3 Settlement Design Principles 3.3.1 'New developments should be small in scale and maintain the practice of retaining open spaces surrounding settlements.'</b>	
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO188	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	Any policy developed will need to be in accordance with the Quality of the Environment chapter of the published WMRSS.	Noted.
Natural England	SALIO690	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	The proposed Green Space Plan is likely to overlap with the Green Infrastructure Study. We recommend that the Green Space Plan be subsumed into the Green Infrastructure Study. Its consideration within green infrastructure would enable its more strategic delivery and help to secure multifunctional benefits. Key nodes and networks identified by the Green Infrastructure Study should then be protected and enhanced.	Noted. Seek to include everything within the Green Infrastructure Study.
English Heritage	SALIO436	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	As part of the Green Infrastructure Study we strongly recommend that the historic environment is considered as an integral part of the approach in the sense of its	Noted. Seek to include the historic environment within the Green Infrastructure Study.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			potential to contribute to the network (e.g. canal network, designed landscapes and parks, historic sites and the wider historic landscape) as well as contributing to functional aspects such as promoting recreation, leisure and local identity and distinctiveness. As currently presented we are concerned that the focus of the Study is confined to natural conservation and biodiversity rather than the multi-functional basis of green infrastructure planning.	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO520	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	<p>Broadly support this option. Distinction should be made however, between physical linkage and habitat creation/management in order to establish "biodiversity-rich" linkages to facilitate movement of wildlife from fragmented areas of importance for nature conservation. The green space plan and site allocations document should also consider other elements of GI including the canal corridors which can be used to form green corridors. We would encourage that any Green Space/Infrastructure plan should be prepared in consultation with an ecologist.</p> <p>The definition of GI should perhaps draw on that of the West Midlands Green Infrastructure Prospectus rather than</p>	Noted. The multi-functional role of GI will need to be picked up on more in further stages of document production. The Green Infrastructure Study will play a key role in this. Seek to arrange a meeting with officers at the County to discuss the historic environment further.



**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>PPS12 as this illustrates the wider functionality particularly for those not familiar with the concept and this is also the preferred stance of Natural England and The Forestry Commission.</p> <p>Whilst the document notes that "the natural environment is a key component of the local distinctiveness of the District" in paragraph 13.3, it should perhaps illustrate what these important features are in terms of the multifunctionality i.e. river corridors, canal networks, commons, the Wyre Forest etc.</p> <p>With regards to paragraph 13.13, it should be noted that there is an overlap in interest between the natural and historic environment in creating green spaces. Officers of the District and County Council Historic Environment and Archaeology Service should work together to explore the potential within the study area.</p>	
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO411	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	Support	Noted. Support is welcomed
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	SALIO210	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	Pleased to support the concept of a Green Infrastructure Study to underpin site allocations in the future and we agree that the Green Space Plan will be very	Noted. Support is welcomed. Seek to engage Worcestershire Wildlife Trust in the preparation of the Green Infrastructure Study.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>important to the retention and enhancement of the District's rich wildlife habitats and biodiversity through enhancing wildlife corridors. We also agree that it must be a key consideration in developing site specific policies during the next stages of the Site Allocations and Policies process.</p> <p>Further information will be required before it is possible to comment on what Green Infrastructure will be required or where it should be placed but there are a number of obvious existing corridors that must be maintained and enhanced (rivers, the canal etc.). This work must be informed by a District-wide study and we would welcome the chance to work on this with the LPA in due course.</p>	
Wyre Forest District Council	SALIO142	Green Space Plan - Option 13.3	Perhaps identifying principle green corridors and then plotting them in the plan to highlight needs	Noted. The Green Infrastructure Study should help in achieving this.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 14 – Promoting Community Wellbeing

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Worcestershire Primary Care Trust	SALIO700	Promoting Community Wellbeing - Key Issue 9	The PCT supports the statements under Key Issue 9. The aim of these actions would be to improve access and reduce health inequalities.	Noted. Support for statements is welcomed.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO189	Educational Provision - Option 14.1	This option raises no regional conformity issues.	Noted.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO470	Educational Provision - Option 14.1	<p>The County Council's recent Wyre Forest Educational Review reached, after extensive consultation, the conclusion that a Primary School should be retained within the village of Wilden. However the existing school has major problems.</p> <p>The County Council has carried out two extensive studies which looked at developing the existing site. The first looked to include a new school/community hall on the adjacent community hall site but the Village Hall Committee have stated that they do not wish to consider this proposal. The second looked to extend and remodel within the school site. However it is not possible to build a new school on the existing site while the existing school is retained and occupied and the constraints that the existing site places on any development mean that</p>	Noted. Further discussions will need to be held with the County Council to consider the issue of the Wilden School Site further.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			<p>substantial compromises would be required. The potential impact on the school is such that any project to address the existing inadequacies of the accommodation would need to be phased thus prolonging the impact and increasing the cost.</p> <p>The County Council has identified a site opposite to the existing school adjacent to the industrial estate, an area which is currently designated Green Belt. The preferred development area would be that identified dashed with the site A on the attached plan and the County Council would like to make representations for the area to be designated as a school site within the Local Development Framework</p>	
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO547	Educational Provision - Option 14.1	Existing educational facilities should be safeguarded from other uses (including generally playing fields). If there are suitable ways of enhancing Kidderminster College within the town centre then this should be encouraged but as it is on a limited site then the reality of using further site(s) such as the previous Sladen school site should be recognized	Noted and agree.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO412	Educational Provision - Option 14.1	Yes.	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO293	Educational Provision - Option 14.1	We support the continued protection of these.	Noted. Support is welcome
Blakeway Mr RH	SALIO45	Educational Provision - Option 14.1	<p>It is important that existing educational facilities are safeguarded from other uses except where a school is to be replaced on an alternative site. In such occasions there is no reason why the land could not then be redeveloped for other purposes.</p> <p>We are aware that at least one school in Kidderminster is to be relocated during the Plan period, but that at present no land has been identified to accommodate the new development.</p> <p>We have promoted land to the east of Kidderminster for residential development, to include a range of community facilities. Some of this land could reasonably be used to provide for the relocated school, and/or to expand existing schools which are located on its borders.</p>	Noted. Agree that existing educational facilities should be safeguarded where appropriate. Discussions will need to take place with the County Council should land be required for further educational use. However, any allocation will need to be sustainable and in line with the emerging Core Strategy.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO190	Community Facilities - Option 14.2	This option raises no regional conformity issues.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO548	Community Facilities - Option 14.2	Generally speaking existing community facilities should be safeguarded but recognition that localities and requirements change should be	Noted and agree.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			acknowledged	
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO413	Community Facilities - Option 14.2	Yes	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO294	Community Facilities - Option 14.2	We support the continued protection of these.	Noted. Support is welcomed.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO191	Healthcare Facilities Option 14.3	This option raises no regional conformity issues.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO549	Healthcare Facilities Option 14.3	Kidderminster Hospital site should be definitely safeguarded for health care use. The proposals in paragraph 14.13 seem reasonable but will depend on actual healthcare requirements upon which we do not feel experienced to comment. NB - Existing Clinic Site at Franche	Noted. Seek to safeguard Kidderminster Hospital Site from inappropriate development.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO414	Healthcare Facilities Option 14.3	Strongly Yes to questions 1 & 2.	Noted.
Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust	SALIO231	Healthcare Facilities Option 14.3	Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust supports safeguarding of Kidderminster Hospital site for healthcare uses PROVIDED SUFFICIENT DEMAND FOR SUCH FACILITIES EXISTS TO NECESSITATE THE SAFEGUARDING OF ALL THE SITE (option 14.3).  Re par 14.9 note that Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust (and not PCT)	Noted. This is useful information.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			is responsible for provision of acute as against primary healthcare facilities within District ie those provided at Kidderminster Hospital.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO295	Healthcare Facilities Option 14.3	New minor service facilities will best be located in or adjacent to local and district centres. Many such centres have declined over past decades and are now weak. Fresh life can be injected into these by ensuring that office-type medical facilities, such as dentists, physiotherapists, and chiropodists, are situated in or adjacent to small shopping areas. In this way, they can be mutually supportive to each other, enabling visitors to medical facilities also to go to the shops. We understand that National Guidance suggests that these are acceptable in residential areas. That may be appropriate for doctors' surgeries or for one-person practises conducted from home, but a major medical enterprise employing many staff and receiving frequent visitors is inappropriate among houses.	Noted and agree. Opportunities to develop centres where feasible and practical should be considered.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Section 15 – Historic Environment, Culture and Tourism

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO525	Historic Environment, Culture and Tourism - Key Issue 10	The section on the historic environment is very positive	Noted.
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO526	Historic Environment, Culture and Tourism - Key Issue 10	Key issue 10 bullet point 4, under key issues 10 should also include 'other archaeological sites and historic buildings recorded on the County Historic Environment Record and also include an additional bullet point to 'conserve, promote and enhance the character of the Wyre Forest as a major historic, economic and tourism asset'.	Noted. Look to include revision to text within the next stages of document production.
Council for British Archaeology West Midlands	SALIO88	Historic Environment, Culture and Tourism - Key Issue 10	The fourth bullet point needs to say Scheduled Ancient Monuments <b>and other archaeological remains</b>	Noted.
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO50	Historic Environment, Culture and Tourism - Key Issue 10	Key Issue 10 should place a greater emphasis on encouraging the development of the District's tourism industry. As set out in our response to 'The Spatial Portrait - The role of tourism', there is considerable policy support at a national and regional level for the growth of the	Noted. Agree that tourism is an important part of the District that requires consideration through the Site Allocations.



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			tourism industry. The Site Allocations DPD should identify the District's key tourism destinations, such as the WMSLP and the Severn Valley Railway, and positively plan for their growth and expansion.	
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO192	Conservation Areas - Option 15.1	This option raises no regional conformity issues.	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO437	Conservation Areas - Option 15.1	Experience from elsewhere in the region has demonstrated that the county based historic landscape characterisation projects can be useful in informing the review of existing and designation of new conservation areas, particularly in rural villages where the surviving historic character of the surrounding landscape can be closely related to the historic evolution and character and appearance of the present day village. The opportunity should hence be taken to apply the County Council's HLC in any programme of review and designation.	Noted. Pass comments onto Councils Conservation Officer who has responsibility for Conservation Areas within the District.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO550	Conservation Areas - Option 15.1	Blakebrook conservation area should be extended to include Workhouse. Added areas - Green Street and surroundings and Farfield	Noted. Pass comments on to Councils Conservation Officer for information.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO415	Conservation Areas - Option 15.1	No	Noted.
Campaign to Protect	SALIO296	Conservation	We commend the concept of Areas of	Noted. This approach is also advocated

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Rural England		Areas - Option 15.1	Distinctive Character as a lower and less formal classification than Conservation Areas, for good quality Victorian, Edwardian, and interwar housing.	by English Heritage.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO193	Local List - Option 15.2	This option raises no regional conformity issues, however any policy developed will need to be in accordance with published WMRSS policy QE5.	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO438	Local List - Option 15.2	We fully support the continued protection of local list buildings, and welcome the commitment to extend the local list to the remaining rural areas.	Noted. Support is welcomed.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO551	Local List - Option 15.2	Not only should Locally Listed buildings continue to be protected but reference should be made to the list being continuously reviewed - it should not be looked upon as a "closed" list.	Noted and agree.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO416	Local List - Option 15.2	Yes	Noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO297	Local List - Option 15.2	We support the continued protection of these	Noted.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO194	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	This option raises no regional conformity issues; however any policy developed will need to be in accordance with published WMRSS policies QE5 and QE6.	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO439	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	We welcome the recognition given in paragraphs 15.8 to 15.10 to the wider historic environment resource of the District, including non designated aspects. In our response to the Kidderminster AAP	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Issues and Options we endorse the undertaking of a more detailed heritage/townscape appraisal for Kidderminster which could inform the questions posed under this option.	
Worcestershire County Council	SALIO529	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	Option 15.3 is a very positive proposal. The completion of the historic landscape characterisation project by the County Council Historic Environment and Archaeology Service in 2010, which will feed into a historic environment assessment, should provide a sound evidence base for landscape scale designation	Noted. Seek to use the landscape characterisation project once completed.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO553	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	Also Broadwaters Mill and Park area and Stack Pool. Rock Works and Park Lane area and Horsefair and Clensmore areas have become neglected and should be identified for improvement.(see KCAAP)	Noted.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO417	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	No but there are individual properties within historic centres such as Bewdley that have been allowed to decay by their owners. Action should be taken by the relevant authorities to ensure the condition of these properties is improved. This would apply also to Ribbesford House.	Noted.
Council for British Archaeology West Midlands	SALIO89	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	The Historic Landscape Characterisation will help identify historic landscapes and local character meriting particular protection	Noted.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO298	Other Historic Designations - Option 15.3	We support the continued protection of these	Noted.
West Midlands Regional Assembly	SALIO195	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	Any policy developed should be in accordance with published Policy QE5.  Taking a contrary stance to the question of <i>"Do you agree that Kidderminster Town Centre should be the main focus for the provision of new hotel accommodation?"</i> would tend to undermine emerging WMRSS Policy PA11 B ii).	Noted. Seek to maintain Kidderminster Town Centre as the main focus for new hotel accommodation.
Natural England	SALIO691	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	We recommend greater inclusion of the natural environment within the consideration of culture and tourism. In particular, the role of Wyre Forest as an attraction should be recognised. We would also like to promote Wilden Marsh as a wetland centre, as per our response to your Core Strategy Preferred Options.	Noted.
English Heritage	SALIO440	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	Although the historic environment is an important part of the District's cultural offer and is associated with the District's tourism economy such as the Severn Valley Railway, and the historic centres of Bewdley and Stourport, we consider that facility based aspects of culture (e.g. theatres, sport) would be better placed under a sustainable communities theme (linking to the promoting community well-	Noted. Consider revising the document in subsequent stages to incorporate changes as suggested.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			being). Similarly aspects such as tourism in the context of new hotel provision and chalets would be better placed under the economy theme. As outlined in our response to the Core Strategy we have reservations regarding the somewhat divergent scope of this policy as currently proposed.	
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	SALIO467	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	There are very limited development opportunities for tourism. Harvington Hall, the historic Chaddesley Woods and the village of Chaddesley Corbett have very little car parking space and access is restricted and any new facility would appear to be detrimental to the character of the adjacent areas.	Noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	SALIO554	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	Agree to both points. Like to mention however that we should be conscious that some leisure activities can be fairly short-lived in the public's interest and setting too much store by certain unsustainable activities will not be beneficial in the long-term. Of course identifying which activities are not likely to be sustainable is not always easy	Noted and agree.
Bewdley Development Trust	SALIO418	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	Yes. Facilities such as the St Georges Hall and the Wheatsheaf Room in Bewdley should be protected and enhanced for community use. Whilst Kidderminster could be the focus of future hotel	Noted and agree. Important community facilities should be protected and enhanced. The focus for larger/strategic hotel development is planned for Kidderminster but agree that this should

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			development this should not preclude the establishment of smaller bed and breakfast or country house type businesses in Bewdley.	not prevent opportunities for smaller hotels/businesses to locate within Bewdley.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	SALIO299	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	Hotels tend to be used by people coming to them by car. Accordingly, location is less important than accessibility. Those, intended as holiday destinations, may be better on brownfield sites in the suburbs or (for small family run businesses only) even farm conversions .Since they are providing residential accommodation, we see no reason for segregating them from other types of residential land.	Noted.
Shaylor Construction Ltd	SALIO212	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	<p>Support is given to the identification of Kidderminster Town Centre as the location for new hotel accommodation to support the growing tourist sector.</p> <p>In respect of the sites to be considered for such a hotel development, sustainable locations within the Town Centre should be prioritised, especially those with links to the historic carpet heritage. Further Town Centre sites are likely to become available through the changing dynamics of the local economy and could offer viable potential for hotel/residential/leisure mixed use schemes.</p>	Noted. Agree that future developments of this type should be in appropriate, sustainable locations. Sites within the existing town centre are to be welcomed for this type of development, subject to other material considerations.

## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Promotion of the Brinton's Office on Exchange Street for such a use.	
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO58	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	We have submitted representations to the emerging Core Strategy proposing the inclusion of a new policy in this document to address the development requirements of the WMSLP. We have suggested that this policy is included within the Core Strategy, as oppose to the Site Allocations DPD, as the WMSLP is a strategic site (as defined by PPS12) and policies governing the development of strategic sites should be included within Core Strategies. It would be beneficial, however, if this policy was also acknowledged in the Site Allocations DPD.	Noted. It is considered that the WMSLP would not meet the criteria for a Strategic Site as outlined in the recommendations to the responses on the Core Strategy. The correct document to consider its status as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt would be the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.
West Midlands Safari Park	SALIO59	Culture and Tourism - Option 15.4	We do not agree with the statement that Kidderminster Town centre should be the main focus for hotel accommodation. There should be a specific reference in this policy to the delivery of a hotel and conference facility at the WMSLP.  We have proposed the inclusion of a policy within the emerging Core Strategy that allows for the development of a hotel and conference facility at the Safari Park. This policy should be cross referenced by the Site Allocations DPD.	Noted. As the Strategic Centre identified through the emerging WMRSS, the most appropriate place for new hotel development would be Kidderminster Town Centre as it is well served by public transport, including rail links.
West Midlands	SALIO348	Culture and	Sets out background information on the	Background information is noted.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

<b>Organisation/ Respondent</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response</b>
Safari Park		Tourism - Option 15.4	<p>WMSLP. Park is located on A456 and opened in 1973. It is now one of the District's main tourist attractions and one of the largest employers in Kidderminster.</p> <p>Park is relatively low density/low impact but the core of the site is high density. Natural topography and established planting limit the visual and environmental impact of the site.</p>	



## Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper

### Appendices

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
Organ Mr J	SALIO13	Appendix B - Employment Land Review Sites	Concerned by the loss of industry that would result from Titan Steel Wheels being allocated for alternative uses.	Noted. This site will need to be discussed in detail as to its future use. The Employment Land Review of 2008 indicated that although the business remains an important local employer, if it were to close the site is severely constrained and not ideally suited for modern businesses needs. Any redevelopment could include some business uses in order to maintain some employment within the village.
Upper Arley Parish Council	SALIO451	Appendix H - Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value	There is no reference in Appendix H of the Site Allocations Paper that an area of Pound Green Common is a SSSI. this would appear to be a simple omission.	Noted. Five parcels of land made up the Pound Green Special Wildlife Site, the green itself was one of them. However, this was de-designated by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust in the 2008 review.
Blissett Mr P	SALIO303	Appendix H - Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value	Whilst I acknowledge that the majority of Pound Green Common is covered by an SSSI, I cannot understand why the land to the south of the SSSI , referred to as THE GREEN is designated as a Special Wildlife Site.  Accordingly, the green should be protected either by registering the green	Noted. Officer within the Forward Planning Section is dealing with this and has had separate correspondence with Mr Blissett.

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment	Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response										
			as a Village Green, thus protecting the historical nature of the land, or allocating the land as an area of historical importance, as opposed to a 'special wildlife site', which it clearly is not.											
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	SALIO423	Appendix H - Sites of Biodiversity and Geological Conservation Value	<p>The RIGS descriptions need slightly amending:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="929 587 1435 1343"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="929 587 1151 743">Bark Hill (Bewdley)</td> <td data-bbox="1151 587 1435 743">Carboniferous age, Etruria Formation and Pennine Lower Coal Measures</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="929 743 1151 900">Bewdley Road Cutting West (Wribbenhall)</td> <td data-bbox="1151 743 1435 900">Permian age, Bridgnorth Sandstone Formation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="929 900 1151 1011">Bewdley Road Cutting East (Kidderminster)</td> <td data-bbox="1151 900 1435 1011">Triassic age, Kidderminster Formation</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="929 1011 1151 1198">Blackstone Rock</td> <td data-bbox="1151 1011 1435 1198">Carboniferous age, Bridgnorth Sandstone and Kidderminster Formations</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="929 1198 1151 1343">Eyemore Railway Cutting</td> <td data-bbox="1151 1198 1435 1343">Carboniferous age, Pennine Middle Coal Measures</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Bark Hill (Bewdley)	Carboniferous age, Etruria Formation and Pennine Lower Coal Measures	Bewdley Road Cutting West (Wribbenhall)	Permian age, Bridgnorth Sandstone Formation	Bewdley Road Cutting East (Kidderminster)	Triassic age, Kidderminster Formation	Blackstone Rock	Carboniferous age, Bridgnorth Sandstone and Kidderminster Formations	Eyemore Railway Cutting	Carboniferous age, Pennine Middle Coal Measures	Noted. Include changes to descriptions in further stages of document production. Seek to arrange meeting to discuss the Earth Heritage Trust surveying features within the Wyre Forest.
Bark Hill (Bewdley)	Carboniferous age, Etruria Formation and Pennine Lower Coal Measures													
Bewdley Road Cutting West (Wribbenhall)	Permian age, Bridgnorth Sandstone Formation													
Bewdley Road Cutting East (Kidderminster)	Triassic age, Kidderminster Formation													
Blackstone Rock	Carboniferous age, Bridgnorth Sandstone and Kidderminster Formations													
Eyemore Railway Cutting	Carboniferous age, Pennine Middle Coal Measures													

**Appendix 2: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Issues and Options Consultation Paper**

Organisation/ Respondent	ID	Document Reference	Summary of Comment		Director of Planning and Regulatory Services Response
			Hartlebury Common	Quaternary age, late-glacial and post-glacial wind blown sands	
			Hextons Farm Quarry	Carboniferous age, Salop Formation (formerly the Keele Formation) and Pennine Upper Coal Measures	
			Worcester Road Cutting (Hoobrook)	Triassic age, Wildmoor Sandstone Formation	
			Additionally, a section of the Leapgate Railway Cutting has been recently recommended for RIGS status.		
			The Earth Heritage Trust is willing to survey those areas identified in H.4 and recommend features for designation, at the request of WFDC.		

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Bradley J	<a href="#">SALPO20</a>	Omission	<p>Please note, our land 'Bradley's Paddocks' is included within H129.</p> <p>Comments re Negative Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of open views - the open views are only visible by actually entering the site.</li> <li>• Agricultural Grading - the land is predominantly Grade 3b with a considerable proportion as Grade 3a - not grade 2 as stated.</li> <li>• Any new development on undeveloped land will impact on Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn regeneration and of course noise and light pollution are increased but this subsequently means that the tight band of development around the towns will never expand and cater for the growing population. This subsequently means higher property prices and greater demands on social housing.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted. These comments relate to the Sustainability Appraisal and has also been considered under this considered under this document. Re-consider the loss of views, re-check the agricultural land classification map. With regards to the regeneration of Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn the priority is to bring forward brownfield sites within these areas as set out through the Core Strategy. It is acknowledged that most new development will have an impact on noise and light pollution and that mitigation measures will need to be put in place to address this.</p>
Lawson J	<a href="#">SALPO21</a>	General Comment	<p>Overall paperwork and documentation well presented and helpfully explained. We all ought to be more active in development and supporting transport action plans to make people come to Wyre Forest area.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed and noted.</p>
Mrs P Harries	<a href="#">SALPO33</a>	General Comment	<p>Fairground owner monopolising Stourport-on-Severn. Too many vehicles and unused trailers strewn around the riverside causing an eyesore and public hazard.</p>	<p>Comments are noted, however, this issue lies outside of the LDF remit.</p>
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO37</a>	General Comment	<p>Thanks authority for consulting Natural England and sets out the background to the organisation.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed and noted.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Expresses general support for the Site Allocations and associated Sustainability Appraisal. Acknowledges that there is clear evidence that the Sustainability Appraisal has been used to inform policies.</p>	
Coal Authority	<a href="#">SALPO55</a>	Omission	<p>Sets out background to the Coal Authority.</p> <p>Identifies that parts of Wyre Forest District contain coal reserves which should not be unduly sterilised by new development.</p> <p>Highlights the fact that there may be issues with land stability in some areas of the District as a result of the legacy of previous mining activity. This needs to be considered when allocating sites so as not to lead to future public safety hazards.</p> <p>Questions whether the DPD is consistent with national policy - whilst the proposed settlement hierarchy and development strategy is unlikely to have any significant impact in relation to sterilising coal reserves, it should be noted that the settlements of Clows Top, Rock and Arley are located within the surface coal resources area. Although the development in these areas is limited, it could have the potential to sterilise resources. As the Minerals Core Strategy for Worcestershire is not in place it is necessary to address this through the Wyre Forest District Core Strategy in order to ensure that resources are not sterilised in accordance with MPS1 and MPG3.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Additional text for inclusion in the Core Strategy was requested at Publication Stage. This was forwarded to the Planning Inspector for consideration but there was no reference to it in his binding report and so no amendment was made to the Core Strategy. Consider including the suggested text within the Publication version of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Previously in relation to the Core Strategy The Coal Authority requested the following additional text is for inclusion within the Reasoned Justification to address this issue:</p> <p><b><i>"Impact on Mineral Resources</i></b>  <i>There are limited surface coal resources within parts of Wyre Forest District. In particular, the rural settlements of Clows Top, Rock and Arley are located within the surface coal resource area. Where new development is proposed within these areas, consideration should be given to any impacts in relation to the sterilisation of the coal resource, along with whether the prior extraction of coal resources would be suitable and/or appropriate, as part of the development process."</i></p>	
Bovale Limited	<a href="#">SALPO215</a>	Omission	<p>3.56 Ha site owned by Bovale Limited is situated off Stourport Road, Bewdley. Previously made representations to Core Strategy explaining merits of site to accommodate budget hotel / elderly persons care facility. Site is bordered by A456 and B4195 (Stourport Road) and a public right of way. Site is generally flat but has steep bank to east acting as visual and acoustic barrier to A456. At its northern corner it abuts the Severn Valley Railway.</p> <p>Consider that a review of the settlement boundary to include both the leisure centre, High School and the proposed site would represent a natural extension to Bewdley.</p> <p>We would like to see site removed from Green Belt</p>	<p>Comments are noted. However, this site lies within the Green Belt and the Core Strategy provides a clear Development Strategy which directs development to brownfield sites and does not allow development in Green Belt locations. Therefore it is considered that this site is not suitable for allocation and that there are sufficient other sites available to meet the requirement, which are in sequentially preferable locations.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			and included in settlement boundary to accommodate future development needs for the town. It is in a sustainable location and would provide an area which is large enough to accommodate a comprehensive mix of uses. It is unconstrained in terms of traffic unlike other town centre sites.	
Asda Stores Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO175</a>	General Comment	We would highlight the need for consistency between the Site Allocations & Policies DPD, the Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan DPD and the Churchfields Masterplan SPD e.g. regarding the development of new light and general industrial uses within the Churchfields Business Park area.	Comments are noted. Review the three documents to check for any areas where the approach may be considered to be inconsistent.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO251</a>	Omission	Without risk of prejudicing the findings of the forthcoming Strategic Infrastructure Assessment and with the objective of supporting its delivery in the District, we propose that either the SALP or the KCAAP contains two new policies safeguarding the existing principal police and fire station sites in Kidderminster, both for their current uses and anticipated future expansion to meet the demands of planned development growth. Suggest the following:  <b><i>The Headquarters site as shown on the proposals map will be safeguarded for police and related uses. Proposals for the development of the site for police service and related uses will be encouraged and supported wherever possible.</i></b>	Noted. Kidderminster Fire Station falls within the KCAAP boundary. The facilities are currently identified on the Proposals Map as community facilities and this will be carried forward. The facilities will be protected under policy CP07.
WCC - Transport Policy & Strategy	<a href="#">SALPO87</a>	General Comment	WCC considers this to be a well written, supportive and comprehensive document.	Noted. Include a reference to the LTP3 policies within the Publication version.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			Please could the document make reference to the "LTP3 Development Control Policy", the "LTP3 Accessibility Policy" and the "WCC Requirements for Transport Assessments" on a site specific basis.	
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO118</a>	General Comment	We agree with the policy in general and if you achieve your end goal of regeneration it would provide jobs for the area.	The Parish Council's support is welcomed.
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">SALPO299</a>	Omission	<p>Bournewood Nurseries should be considered for residential uses. The site is brownfield because of its previous commercial occupancy and use as a garden centre. Identifies factors in favour of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Topography is good</li> <li>• It lies on a regular bus route with a good frequency.</li> <li>• It is in flood zone 1 (low probability)</li> <li>• Drainage, water, gas, electricity, and telephone services are available to serve the site.</li> <li>• Site can accommodate required density and level of affordable housing and could be considered for a 100% affordable housing scheme built by a Registered Social Landlord.</li> <li>• The site has a mature natural boundary.</li> </ul> <p>Identifies that there is a recognised shortage of brownfield sites within Stourport and that this site is available and should therefore be allocated for housing development.</p> <p>Acknowledges that the site is in the Green Belt and as such a case may have to be prepared for relaxing the</p>	The Bournewood Nurseries site lies in the Green Belt and is considered to be a greenfield site because of its previous usage. The Green Belt boundary has not been amended and therefore, the allocation of this site for residential development would be contrary to the policies set out within the Adopted Core Strategy.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			Green Belt policy/amending the boundary.	
National Grid	<a href="#">SALPO343</a>	General Comment	Sets out background information on National Grid.	Comments are noted.
National Grid	<a href="#">SALPO344</a>	General Comment	Sets out background information on National Grid's infrastructure within the District. Sets out the consultations which National Grid wish to be consulted on.	Comments are noted.
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO322</a>	Omission	Requests that provision for allotments in Wolverley is included within the LDF. Parish Council have been working with a local allotment society over the last 18 months to locate a suitable site but this has been to no avail.	Comments are noted. Officers will seek to discuss this further with the Parish Council to try and identify a suitable site.
Horton Estates Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO354</a>	Omission	<p data-bbox="837 719 1529 799">Suggests that Cursley Distribution Park be allocated for live-work units.</p> <p data-bbox="837 799 1529 1214">The site has been marketed at very competitive rent but no occupiers have been found. Believe that this reflects the building's age and inflexibility - neither of which meet modern requirements. The properties represent a substantial mass of PDL in the Green Belt where redevelopment to a more sensitive scale and form represents an opportunity to enhance the site's impact on the environment as well as securing a more self-contained/sustainable form of development for which there is not a 'strong presumption in favour of planning permission'.</p> <p data-bbox="837 1214 1529 1361">Refers to PPS4 and its requirement for local authorities to facilitate new working practices such as live-work. Argues that the emerging plan makes no provision for this and considers the site is an excellent</p>	Comments are noted. Officers will seek to meet with the owners and agents of the site to explore the possibilities that might be available within this location.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>way to redress this.</p> <p>Stresses the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is already in employment use although not generating any real and sustainable employment at the moment.</li> <li>• Site is exposed with substantial built form which suffers from a number of deficiencies.</li> <li>• Redevelopment to provide live-work units will enhance the appearance of the Greenbelt in this area.</li> <li>• Live-work units are by their nature a highly sustainable form of development.</li> <li>• The site is of sufficient size to accommodate a live-work scheme which will support local employment opportunities which do not presently exist because development is concentrated in the main centres.</li> </ul> <p>In light of the above I wish to propose that this site is identified for redevelopment to provide live/work units. I would also welcome an opportunity to discuss this further with you at an early opportunity.</p>	
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO8</a>	Paragraph 1.1	Support LDF vision and proposals	Support is welcomed
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO9</a>	Paragraph1.2	Paragraph 1.2 sets out the route for identifying specific sites for development as: the Adopted Core Strategy, The Site Allocations and Policies DPD and the KCAAP. This is not correct as the KCAAP does not identify any sites or projects outside of its boundary.	The Core Strategy sets the overarching vision for the District, the level of development required and the strategy for locating that development. Both the Site Allocations and Policies and the KCAAP will allocate sites for accommodating this development. However, the Kidderminster

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
				Central Area Action Plan will only allocate sites within the Kidderminster Central area.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO10</a>	Paragraph 1.3	The Core Strategy sets out the strategy and vision for the area however, it does not include infrastructure. The green corridors and pathways should be seen as a priority as they will provide many benefits. New development requires infrastructure to be in place first. A plan is required to identify the many areas of Green Infrastructure.	The Green Infrastructure Study identifies all areas of existing green infrastructure. The emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy sets out the contribution which new development will need to make to the green infrastructure network.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO11</a>	Paragraph 1.4	Line 2-3 - the KCAAP should also designate land for open space and community uses and these sites should be identified for consultation.	The KCAAP includes areas for open space. This is set out for consultation within the Preferred Options Paper
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO12</a>	Paragraph 1.4	<p>1/ Line 2-3 (KCAAP)- The designation of areas for Open Space and Community use</p> <p>2/ Comment - (KCAAP) Will this policy be addressed in the Management Policies, as these will apply to areas across the whole of the district. If so specific areas will need identifying to allow comment or amending.</p> <p>3/ What is the position regarding planning applications and permission for the allocated areas.</p>	<p>1) The KCAAP DPD has undergone a Preferred Options consultation alongside the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. The Preferred Options Paper has identified the areas for development.</p> <p>2) The KCAAP DPD sets out development management policies for the KCAAP area in addition to those which are set out in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD Preferred Options Paper.</p> <p>3) Development on all allocated sites will be required to go through a planning application process.</p>
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO247</a>	Paragraph 1.9	We would expect the final Infrastructure Delivery Plan to include environmental infrastructure, linked to the Water Cycle Strategy. The Sequential Test (Flooding)	Noted. Both documents form important parts of the evidence base to inform the site selection process.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			should also be informed by the Level 2 SFRA. Both documents once completed should inform the phasing and selection of sites for development.	
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO325</a>	Paragraph 1.10	Para. 1.10 -11 lists studies and technical reports but there is no specific reference to any historic environment evidence base. Some aspects may be covered by emerging urban design Advice and Green Infrastructure Strategy. to accord with PPS5 we recommend that subsequent documents clearly explain the historic environment and heritage assets as part of the evidence base eg. conservation area character appraisals and management plans, local lists and Historic Environment Record. For the rural areas, Historic Landscape Characterisation could be referred to.	Comments are noted. Include references to the existing historic environment evidence base document and the Historic Landscape Characterisation within the Publication document.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO28</a>	Paragraph 1.11	Core11 note the elements of the evidence base that are still emerging.	Noted. The emerging elements of the evidence base will be finalised for the Publication stage.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO218</a>	Paragraph 1.11	It is not clear how any emerging draft Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) has informed the preferred option paper. WMP intend to submit a detailed Strategic Infrastructure Assessment (SIA) with consultants. Suggest that SIA is added to list at para. 1.11	Comments are noted.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO27</a>	Paragraph 1.13	SPD is required to inform the procedure for planning applications for walkways and cycling pathways. within the Core Strategy and as per PPG17 para. 1.7	The District Council is not currently intending to prepare such an SPD, guidance is set out within the Adopted Core Strategy and the emerging Site Allocations and Policies and KCAAP DPDs.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO13</a>	Paragraph 1.14	Suggests that an SPD is required to inform planning applications for paths and walkways and cycling and also to set out the procedure for carrying out works related to green infrastructure sustainability.	The District Council is not currently intending to prepare such an SPD, guidance is set out within the Adopted Core Strategy (policy CP13) and the emerging Site Allocations and Policies (policy 22) and KCAAP (policy 18) DPDs.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO29</a>	Paragraph 1.18	Core11 notes the retaining of the 2004 proposals map	The Proposals Map will be updated at the Publication stage to include the new sites and the elements retained from the 2004 Adopted Proposals Map.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO219</a>	Paragraph 1.18	To avoid any confusion, it is recommended that the Site Allocations and Policies document at paragraph 1.19 should be more explicit and state that the red line plans that accompany each of the site allocation policies <i>will replace</i> the allocations identified on the Local Plan proposals map.	Comments are noted.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO24</a>	Paragraph 2.5	Paragraph 2.5 - Key Questions: There are no missing sites. However, a plan of walking and cycling routes, initially around the outskirts of the District, which would not interfere with the KCAAP needs to be evolved to allow the green infrastructure network to be developed. These sites or projects are inexpensive and will reveal some of the problems in various parts of the district while not delaying other projects. A draft plan will recognise the contribution of green infrastructure, and allow work to start on this strategy from the beginning at little cost.	Support is welcomed and noted.  The emerging Green Infrastructure Strategy sets out the aspirational green infrastructure network for the District and a delivery plan for this.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO25</a>	Paragraph 2.5	Borrington Park is a missed site which should be listed as a WFDC asset because the site provides a significant community recreational area for all ages. It	Comments are noted. Borrington Park will be included on the Proposals Map as Public Open Space and will be protected under

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>runs alongside a wetlands area and close to water meadows. It is of biodiversity value and runs parallel to the Green Belt giving it sustainability. It is part of a natural drainage area and is of interest to Natural England and Worcestershire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>Borrington Park is RSL owned which will assist in any consultations with the land owner.</p>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO220</a>	3 - A Sustainable Future - Development Strategy	Although, it is considered that the section detailing development since 2006 is helpful at this moment in time, it is considered that this part of the document will quickly become out of date and unnecessary. In light of this, it should be removed from the Submission Draft.	Noted. However, this information provides important evidence to inform the site selection process. It also helps people not as familiar with the planning process to understand what is required and why, as the plan period runs from 2006 - 2026. Consider reducing this section for the draft submission of the document but its inclusion is considered to be useful.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO30</a>	Paragraph 3.3	At line 1 <residential: 4000 dwellings (district wide) should also note open space requirements.	The findings of the PPG17 audit are summarised in the tables below paragraph 7.16 which show an overall deficit across all typologies by 2026.
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	<a href="#">SALPO126</a>	Paragraph 3.10	In the list of issues in the adopted Core Strategy, you quite correctly list "Safeguarding biodiversity". However, CP 14 is "Providing Opportunities for Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity" The list in this document should therefore read: "Safeguarding Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity"	Noted. Amend bullet point to read safeguarding local biodiversity and geodiversity.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO151</a>	Paragraph 3.10	Endorse Core Strategy objectives set out at para. 3.10. believe allocation of Clows Top Garage site would assist in meeting objectives	Support is noted and welcomed.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO156</a>	Paragraph 3.11	Strict application of the hierarchal approach could result in an opportunity to develop a brown field site in a rural area e.g. Clows Top garage (which could bring significant and important benefits to a rural community) being overlooked in favour of other brownfield sites that do not bring such immediate benefits.	Comment is noted. The development strategy of the Adopted Core Strategy also includes indicative figures for the allocation of housing developments across the District. Bewdley and the rural areas should accommodate in the region of 10% of total new housing growth within the District.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO304</a>	Paragraph 3.11	Generally support principles of Core Strategy and Site Allocations preferred options paper but concerned that if sequential approach outlined at para. 3.11 is taken at face value, if additional sites come forward in Kidderminster, then is possible that identified sites elsewhere may not be needed to meet housing requirement. This could impede regeneration elsewhere including Blakedown.	Comment is noted. The development strategy of the Adopted Core Strategy also includes indicative figures for the allocation of housing developments across the District. Bewdley and the rural areas should accommodate in the region of 10% of total new housing growth within the District.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO305</a>	4 - A Desirable Place to Live	It is pleasing to see the BWM Stourport Waterside development featured on P.14 in the section "A Desirable Place to Live".	Noted
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO174</a>	Paragraph 4.3	Generally support but would wish to see additional wording: "or in rural areas where the redevelopment of previously developed land will meet other Core Policies". This would allow flexibility to consider community benefits of development.	Comments are noted. However, the Adopted Core Strategy clearly specifies that the focus of development will be Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn. Consider adding in a sentence to reflect the policy for development in the rural areas.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO253</a>	Residential Land Allocations	We would query whether the phasing of sites for residential provision has been fully informed by the WCS and the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Your WCS identified sewerage and waste water treatment constraints at a number of sites, some of	Noted. However, the vast majority of sites selected in the preferred option are classified as green/yellow in the WCS. There are known issues with drainage within the Clows Top area and the



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>which are listed in the table in 4.8</p> <p>For example The Terrace, Clows Top site is phased to come forward within 2011-2016, earlier then other sites, yet this site is identified within the WCS as requiring a major upgrade for sewerage infrastructure and wastewater treatment i.e. red box in table 22A-D of WCS, referred to in para 5.71 of your Councils Core Strategy (CS) for phasing and implementation (DS05).</p>	<p>Council are considering looking at a larger redevelopment opportunity which would help to alleviate the issues within this area through providing a critical mass of development to make improvements viable. This would come through via the development management process but the site specific policy will be amended to highlight the drainage issues within this particular location.</p>
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO217</a>	Residential Land Allocations	<p>It should be noted from the outset that whilst St Francis Group supports the principle of development on the site, objection is raised to the proposed phasing strategy for the former British Sugar site advanced in the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options document. As evidenced in this document the phasing strategy is not justified, not consistent with national policy and not effective as defined by PPS12. The delivery of the former British Sugar site, which is a key site within the District as a whole, should not be held back to later in the plan period.</p>	<p>Noted. The phasing strategy is indicative and was included to inform the housing trajectory. It is not proposed that this would seek to stifle development should sites come forward before the date identified within the document. In terms of the British Sugar site, it is anticipated that the development of this would be 'phased' anyway and so would be developed out over a longer period of time.</p>
Homes & Communities Agency	<a href="#">SALPO274</a>	Residential Land Allocations	<p>The HCA broadly supports the residential land allocation proposals identified within the site allocations and policies consultation document</p>	<p>Comments are noted and support is welcomed.</p>
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO254</a>	Residential Land Allocations	<p>For any new development early liaison between the developer, local planning authorities and the water company is essential to ensure that the relevant engineering infrastructure is in place (as opposed to quantity of water available through the company's water abstractions) to allow water to be supplied to</p>	<p>Noted. Severn Trent Water are consulted on all our documents and were involved in the Water Cycle Strategy and are therefore well aware of our development proposals within the District. The comments received on the strategy were that water issues were</p>



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			new developments.	not a problem within Wyre Forest District and that the proposed development could be accommodated.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO307</a>	Residential Land Allocations	The allocation of the Blakedown Nurseries ADR for development during 2011-16 is welcomed.	Comments are noted however the phasing periods are indicative and were included in order to inform the housing trajectory.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO308</a>	Residential Land Allocations	Generally supports principle of targeting growth to main towns but concerned that existing employment sites are being considered for residential uses when further industrial land is needed.	Comments are noted. All employment sites being considered for residential land use have been considered as part of the Employment Land Review.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO176</a>	Paragraph 4.5	Whilst this addresses indicative locations referred to in Adopted Core Strategy at para. 5.8, it ignores indicative percentages of distribution. The inclusion of the Clows Top Garage site would allow the early delivery of new homes and enabling development to meet local need and bring a range of planning gain to the village and rural community in order to meet other Core Policy objectives.	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO158</a>	Paragraph 4.6	Support proposal to include flexibility in dwelling number allocations. Urban sites will be more susceptible to delays so number of allocations should be increased to ensure delivery targets are met.	Comments are noted.
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO4</a>	Paragraph 4.8	Proposed 37 dwellings.  The Parish Council's Housing Needs Survey identified a need for just 17 affordable housing units.  Development of 37 dwellings would have a detrimental impact on Blakedown, including	Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased traffic</li> <li>• access issues onto Belbroughton Road and increased volumes using Birmingham Road junction</li> <li>• affect on Forge Lane residents/access</li> <li>• loss of on street parking for Belbroughton Road residents</li> <li>• effect on Green Belt - intrusion into countryside, noise and light pollution</li> <li>• potential water run off into the Pools</li> <li>• effect on existing services (sewerage capacities, etc)</li> <li>• effect on Primary School intake</li> <li>• continued pressure on Haybridge School</li> <li>• disregard of Parish Plan</li> <li>• disregard of Housing Needs Survey</li> <li>• loss of ribbon development pattern</li> <li>• loss of amenity for neighbouring residents - intrusion into gardens</li> </ul>	<p>through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.</p>
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO221</a>	Paragraph 4.8	<p>In terms of the quantum of development, the figure of 300+ dwellings is supported. It is consistent with the Inspector's Report and Core Strategy, which refers to "including a significant area of residential". As demonstrated to the Council through a comprehensive Masterplanning exercise, the site is capable of delivering 320 dwellings. Subject to detailed design of the site and depending upon the appropriate density (to ensure the site is used efficiently yet reflects the local character of the surrounding area), it is possible that the total dwelling yield could increase or decrease.</p>	<p>Noted. It is agreed that the indicative quantum of development will be further refined through ongoing work on the masterplan.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO222</a>		<p>In terms of the timescales for delivery, the approach to phasing housing sites is considered to be superficial and unnecessary. Development should not be constrained by such a policy approach as it will result in delaying the regeneration of the site, the wider area and District as a whole, which would compromise the achievement of a number of objectives, including facilitating the delivery of the initial phase of the Hoobrook Link Road. There is no justification as to why a phasing approach is necessary, particularly given that the majority of sites are brownfield and therefore should not be prevented from coming forward.</p> <p>Such sites often difficult to develop and take longer to come forward. In light of this they should be encouraged to commence early in the plan period in order to ensure that they are completed within the plan period. If, however, they are phased later on they may not be delivered before 2026 and could result in a failure to achieve the Core Strategy housing requirement of 4,000 dwellings over the plan period up to 2026. It is therefore recommended that the Council reconsiders this policy approach.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this point it is considered that the former British Sugar site can come forward sooner than 2016. A planning application is currently in the process of being prepared. It is anticipated that the outline planning application for Phase 1 (of 2 Phases) will be submitted in the autumn of 2011</p>	<p>Noted. The phasing strategy is indicative and was included to inform the housing trajectory. It is not proposed that this would seek to stifle development should sites come forward before the date identified within the document. In terms of the British Sugar site, it is anticipated that the development of this would be 'phased' anyway and so would be developed out over a longer period of time.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Should the Council maintain a phasing policy approach (although it is recommended that it should be removed) the suggested phasing for the former British Sugar site should be revised to allow the site to come forward as soon as practically possible. It is considered that the development of this site will not prejudice other policy objectives. It will, conversely, assist to deliver policy objectives of the Core Strategy, including delivering regeneration, providing a range of high quality market and affordable housing, growing the District's economy and delivering much needed infrastructure, and should accordingly be encouraged.</p>	
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO223</a>	Paragraph 4.8	<p>An additional issue is that it is unclear what is meant by the reference "suggested phasing". It could be interpreted as meaning, planning permission should not be granted until 2016, or alternatively, planning permission can be granted earlier, however, dwellings should not be delivered until 2016. For the reasons given above, such an approach to housing delivery is perverse and should be removed.</p> <p>It is noted that the suggested phasing is set out in five year periods, which implies the information has been taken from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Timescales within the SHLAA are indicative based upon the information available when preparing the evidence base document. Should the Council wish to maintain references to indicative timescales for delivery within the Site Allocations and Policies document, they should be referred to as such "indicative timescales". Although, there would be a concern that this information could become out of date</p>	<p>Noted. The phasing strategy ("suggested phasing") is indicative and was included to inform the housing trajectory. It is not proposed that this would seek to stifle development should sites come forward before the date identified within the document. In terms of the British Sugar site, it is anticipated that the development of this would be 'phased' anyway and so would be developed out over a longer period of time.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			very quickly and therefore it is best left within the SHLAA which is regularly updated based upon the latest information at the time of preparation.	
WCC - Transport Policy & Strategy	<a href="#">SALPO86</a>	Paragraph 4.8	WCC awaits instruction to proceed on the assessment of these sites in terms of journey times and distance assessments to local services and facilities.	Comments are noted.
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO119</a>	Paragraph 4.8	<p>Proposed 37 dwellings.</p> <p>The Parish Council's Housing Needs Survey identified a need for just 17 affordable housing units.</p> <p>Development of 37 dwellings would have a detrimental impact on Blakedown, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased traffic</li> <li>• access issues onto Belbroughton Road and increased volumes using Birmingham Road junction</li> <li>• affect on Forge Lane residents/access</li> <li>• loss of on street parking for Belbroughton Road residents</li> <li>• effect on Green Belt - intrusion into countryside, noise and light pollution</li> <li>• potential water run off into the Pools</li> <li>• effect on existing services (sewerage capacities, etc)</li> <li>• effect on Primary School intake</li> <li>• continued pressure on Haybridge School</li> <li>• disregard of Parish Plan</li> <li>• disregard of Housing Needs Survey</li> <li>• loss of ribbon development pattern</li> <li>• loss of amenity for neighbouring residents -</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			intrusion into gardens	
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO149</a>	Paragraph 4.8	Total number of units allocated for Bewdley and rural areas falls far short of 10% proposed under Policy DS01. Is too much emphasis on large settlements and further allocations should be identified in rural settlements to ensure that policies such as DS04, CP04, CP05 and CP07 can be achieved. Viability issues on high density brownfield sites in large settlements could prevent other sites coming forward.	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO173</a>	Paragraph 4.8	Consider that more sites should be allocated in rural areas to more closely reflect 10% split under DS01 - specifically Clows Top Garage to meet local housing need with necessary enabling development. 12 units at The Terrace are unlikely to be built as provision of off-site sewer is cost prohibitive. However, if the 2 sites were combined as per site with lapsed consent, then a drainage solution could be found subject to some enabling development.	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO163</a>	Paragraph 4.8	Proposed 37 dwellings. The Parish Council's Housing Needs Survey identified a need for just 17 affordable housing units.  Development of 37 dwellings would have a detrimental impact on Blakedown, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased traffic</li> <li>• access issues onto Belbroughton Road and increased volumes using Birmingham Road junction</li> <li>• affect on Forge Lane residents/access</li> <li>• loss of on street parking for Belbroughton</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Road residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effect on Green Belt – intrusion into countryside, noise and light pollution</li> <li>• potential water run off into the Pools</li> <li>• effect on existing services (sewerage capacities, etc)</li> <li>• effect on Primary School intake</li> <li>• continued pressure on Haybridge School</li> <li>• disregard of Parish Plan</li> <li>• disregard of Housing Needs Survey</li> <li>• loss of ribbon development pattern</li> <li>• loss of amenity for neighbouring residents – intrusion into gardens</li> </ul>	
Northumberland House Surgery	<a href="#">SALPO3</a>	Residential Land Allocations	Requests that the phasing period for Northumberland House Surgery and Aylmer Lodge Surgery be brought forward as both surgeries are due to relocate to the new development at the Kidderminster Hospital site in November 2012 meaning the sites will be available for development in 2012-2013.	Comments are noted however the phasing periods are indicative and were included in order to inform the housing trajectory.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO309</a>	Paragraph 4.9	Para. 4.9 acknowledges that rural areas may need to accommodate affordable housing on an exceptional circumstances basis. However, the Blakedown site is shown as an allocation and is an ADR so is not considered to fall into this category	Comments are noted. The Blakedown site would not be an exceptions site.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO180</a>	Paragraph 4.11	Support proposal to seek allocations slightly above that required to meet figures set out in Core Strategy. However, level of development in rural areas seems much lower than would be expected. We believe that there are sustainable arguments to support the allocation of Clows Top Garage given the significant benefits that can be brought to the local community	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			and the fact that the redevelopment of this previously consented site would appear to be essential to unlock the development potential of the adjacent site at The Terrace which it is proposed to allocate.	
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO69</a>	Policy 1 - Sites for Residential Development	The use of the terms 'brownfield sites' and PDL in Policy 1 and the Jargon Guide is confusing. Suggest use only PDL as defined in PPS3 which would allow for future changes in government definition without need to change your policy/ text.	Comments are noted. Consider removing reference to brownfield sites throughout document and replace with previously developed land (PDL) as defined 'in latest Government guidance'. Also consider similar amendment to KCAAP DPD.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO226</a>	Policy 1 - Sites for Residential Development	<p>Whilst we are supportive of land use strategy described in Policy 1, we are concerned that the bullet points do not reference the need to ensure that sites are supported by appropriate infrastructure as referenced for Policy 2 and CP07 of the Core Strategy. Request that following wording is added:</p> <p>Within sites and areas that either already offer good quality access to infrastructure and services, or where this can be provided in accordance with Policy CP07 of the Adopted Core Strategy'.</p>	Comments are noted however this issue is covered by CP07.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO224</a>	Policy 1 - Sites for Residential Development	Policy 1 entitled "Sites for Residential Development" sets out locations within which residential development will only be allowed. It lists the locations from 1 to 5 which imply that there is a sequential approach to be followed, however, from reading the accompanying text this is not the case. If it were intended, such a mechanism is not justified nor would it be consistent with national policy. To avoid any confusion or ambiguity, it is recommended that the numbered points are replaced with bullets.	Comments are noted. The policy should not be read as a sequential approach and therefore the Council will look to amend formatting of the policy. The sequential approach to site selection was included in Policy DS01 of the Core Strategy.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO234</a>	Paragraph 4.13	<p>We are concerned that paragraph 4.13 appears to imply that by simply delivering mixed-use developments in town centres, with the objective of extending the range of hours of activity and increasing natural surveillance, will automatically make them a lot safer.</p> <p>Whilst increasing natural surveillance does help, we strongly emphasise that the solutions for delivering safer town centres involve implementing a comprehensive range of measures and delivering necessary supporting infrastructure. Refer to Policy EC4.2 of PPS4. Suggest Para.4.13 is amended as follows:</p> <p>'Promoting a mix of uses within the town centres increases the range of hours during which activity takes places within town centres, <b>which alongside active management measures and supporting infrastructure, will make</b> the District's town centres more vibrant <b>and safer places</b> . Mixed use developments can also create...'</p> <p>This will bring DPD more in line with Community Strategy also.</p>	Comments are noted. Re-word as suggested.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO70</a>	Policy 2 - Rural Housing	I can not find a replacement for Adopted Local Plan Policy H9iii (replacement dwelling). This omission needs to be rectified.	Noted. Include a section on replacement dwellings in rural areas under Policy 2. Replacement dwellings in the Green Belt are covered under Policy 20.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO227</a>	Policy 2 - Rural Housing	Support Policy 2 but suggest that reference to Policy CP07 is added in.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. However, it is not considered

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
				necessary to duplicate the Core Strategy.
Homes & Communities Agency	<a href="#">SALPO273</a>	Policy 2 - Rural Housing	Supports the inclusion of rural housing in the LDF process as this fits with the Local Investment Plan for Worcestershire.  Encourages wider flexibility in the housing and tenure mix in rural areas which might encompass specialist housing provision to meet the wider residential needs within the District.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. The Core Strategy restricts development within the rural areas to affordable housing.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO310</a>	Policy 2 - Rural Housing	Policy 2 again refers to Rural Exception Sites. BWM considers Blakedown to be part of the Identified Sites in the Allocation process rather than falling within the Exception policy.	Comments are noted. The Blakedown site would be allocated and therefore not an exceptions site.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO181</a>	Paragraph 4.24	We support the principle of identifying settlement boundaries but believe that the boundary for Clows Top should include the whole of Clows Top Garage including all of the previously developed land and associated areas subject of the established use as a transport yard and storage depot to encourage the development of this site.	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO182</a>	Paragraph 4.26	We believe that the settlement boundary of Clows Top should be extended to include the area of the whole site currently in use as a Garage and Transport Yard in order to encourage development in accordance with the range of policies contained within the LDF Adopted Core Strategy.  It should be noted that The South Worcestershire DPD is proposing a greenfield release in Clows Top to accommodate 25 units - this would not appear to	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			comply with government policy if a brownfield site is available.	
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO225</a>	Policy 3 - Financial Viability Policy	<p>Raises concern to the financial viability policy, arguing that policy CP04 of the Core Strategy states that a standard viability model would be prepared and what this policy presents is a standard viability methodology.</p> <p>Considers that the policy is onerous and raises specific objection to the element which requires the developer to pay the Council's costs arguing that these costs form part of the normal consideration of a planning application for which a fee is payable. Independent advice will already have been used to prepare the viability assessment and if the Council chooses not to accept this then the application fee is meant to cover this element.</p>	Comments are noted. The policy was developed in association with GVA Grimley who have prepared a report looking at recent policy and best practice in this area and have used this to develop the policy wording. the report states that "should an independent review of a viability assessment submitted at planning application stage be required by a Local Authority, the applicant (developer) will normally be required to pay for such a review, given that seeking to challenge Council policies in relation to affordable housing or other planning obligations.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO311</a>	Paragraph 4.29	In Para 4.29 there is reference to - "Affordable housing provision of 30% will be sought on sites of 6 units or more in Bewdley and rural areas ". It is assumed that this part of the policy will be applicable to the Blakedown site.	Yes. 30% affordable housing will be sought on the Blakedown site
Homes & Communities Agency	<a href="#">SALPO278</a>	Policy 5 - Specialist Housing	The Agency supports the proposals identified within the policy, and would welcome the inclusion of acceptable locations within the policy.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Acceptable locations are governed by the Development Strategy and are identified through site specific policies in Part B.
McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO323</a>	Policy 5 - Specialist Housing	Happy with the Council's acknowledgement of the District's aging population and its support for specialist accommodation for the elderly, specifically policy	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider making the first amendment suggested. Whilst specialist

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>CP05 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Recommends consistency and reiteration and reinforcement of the need for specialist accommodation for the elderly within the emerging LDF documents. Particularly supports policy 5 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD Preferred Options and paragraph 4.39 of the reasoned justification.</p> <p>Despite support, we would advise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council expresses that it will support applications for "residential homes and extra care units" which intimates that other forms of specialist housing for the elderly would not be supported. Suggest re-wording to: "The District Council will support applications for specialist housing accommodation for the elderly where it is demonstrated that..."</li> <li>• Sub-clause B states that housing for the elderly will be supported where it is demonstrated "they will have minimal impact on adjacent occupiers, local character and the local highway network". This intimates that housing for the elderly has a higher environmental impact than other types of development when in fact housing for the elderly is considered to be a "good neighbour development". Considers this clause unnecessary and should be deleted.</li> <li>• Sub-clause c states that housing for the elderly will be supported where it is demonstrated "they have adequate amenity</li> </ul>	<p>housing is seen as good neighbour development, the buildings and their operation can have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbours. With reference to parking and amenity space, specialist housing covers a range of types of housing and occupiers and therefore, this will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>space and sufficient parking provision for staff and visitors" which infers that higher levels of amenity space and parking space are required than for market housing which is not the case. Therefore, this clause is considered to be unnecessary. By its nature this type of development is usually located within walking distance of essential services, including public transport. Suggests one space per 3 units is sufficient given the nature of schemes. Whilst amenity greenspace is important the quantity required is less than market housing. The most important amenity spaces are the indoor spaces. Suggests that clause c is deleted and amenity space and parking issues are considered on a case-by-case basis. Should the Council maintain that these standards are still necessary, we would recommend setting a significantly lower level than market housing.</p>	
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO71</a>	Policy 6 - Accommodation for Dependants	Consider that proposed wording is too narrow. Annex extensions may be for either carers (often with family) or elderly dependants. Consider criteria too narrow and difficult to justify.	Comments are noted. These criteria are in place to allow the opportunity for extensions for dependant relatives but also to prevent new separate dwellings occurring where they would not normally be permitted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO144</a>	Policy 6 - Accommodation for Dependants	The policy should state that the use of a 'granny flat' as ancillary to a dwelling will normally be secured by a planning condition, to prevent 'creep' towards it becoming a separate dwelling	Comments are noted however, paragraph 4.41 is clear that accommodation should be provided by way of an annex and the policy includes safeguards to ensure that the accommodation could not become a separate dwelling.
Stourport on	<a href="#">SALPO169</a>	Para 4.42-4.46	It is hoped that this will amount to no more than a	Comments are noted. The potential sites for

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Severn Town Council			holding objection, providing consultation with the Town Council by the District Council's consultants in accordance with paragraph 4.46 of the above Development Plan Document.	gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople will be the subject of a separate consultation exercise later this year.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO148</a>	Policy 7 - Providing Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Travelling Showpeople have different needs to Gypsies and Travellers, such as secure winter storage for expensive equipment, and there should be a separate policy to cover their needs, perhaps by permitting the use of employment or residential land for this purpose.  Recognises possible tensions between travellers and the settled community.	Comments are noted. These issues will be considered when allocating sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. A separate consultation will be undertaken on potential sites later this year.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO255</a>	Providing Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	We note the document states that new sites still need to be identified, which will be detailed within the publication DPD. We would refer to criteria 5 of policy CP06 in your adopted CS for selecting new sites, which states that new sites should not be located within Flood Zone 2 & 3 and should be informed by your Level 1 and 2 SFRA.	Comments are noted. Selection of sites will need to have regard to all relevant planning issues.
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	<a href="#">SALPO67</a>	Paragraph 4.42	Welcome the approach of allocating sufficient sites to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	<a href="#">SALPO68</a>	Policy 7 - Providing Accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Support the approach of safeguarding sites where these are appropriately located. Welcome clarity of approach in setting out that additional sites will be identified in the Publication document.	Support is noted and welcomed.
West Mercia	<a href="#">SALPO242</a>	Paragraph 4.47 -	Welcome recognition that provision of community	Comments are noted and support is

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Police		4.49	<p>facilities are essential to quality of life of local residents but disappointed that there is no recognition that this also has positive impact on crime levels and community safety. Request that para. 4.48 is amended to read:</p> <p>The Sustainable Community Strategy <b>and the Community Safety Partnership Plan</b> support the provision of community facilities in order to promote community cohesion, <b>reduce crime and disorder</b> and enhance community well-being.</p>	welcomed. Re-word as suggested.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO152</a>	Paragraph 4.49	<p>My only problem with this is that it is not clear beyond doubt that there is NO additional policy on this and that Policy 8 does not relate to this paragraph. Slight redrafting might be desirable to clarify this - possibly as little as a change in the levels of heading.</p>	Comments are noted. Consider revising the formatting.
Sport England	<a href="#">SALPO83</a>	Policy 8 - Educational Sites	<p>Advises the following changes to the policy:</p> <p>Clause a) Do not form part of a playing field or sports pitch, or if they <i>meet one of the exceptions set in PPG17</i>.</p> <p>Clause c) Demonstrate that there is no longer a need for the land or buildings to meet educational requirements or wider community needs, <i>by advertising the buildings or land for a period of not less than 18 months in a scheme agreed by Wyre Forest DC;....</i></p>	Comments are noted. Consider that this is addressed in the policy as it stands. Suggested amendments to clause (c) could unnecessarily delay development and the provision of alternative off-site facilities.
Campaign to Protect Rural	<a href="#">SALPO157</a>	Policy 8 - Educational Sites	<p>Policy is muddled. Clause c relates to redundant sites, others to those in continued educational use. Need to</p>	Comments are noted. Consider this further in developing the Publication document.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
England			separate out clauses to cover the 2 types of proposals in 2 separate policies. A different set of clauses should cover allocation of redundant sites for other non-educational uses.	
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO245</a>	5 - A Good Place to do Business	<p>Surprised that paragraphs 5.1 - 5.15 do not make any substantive statements re infrastructure planning. Large employment developments can have significant impact on operation of emergency services.</p> <p>Planning for community safety and infrastructure provision must take place at the earliest possible opportunity. Would be helpful if following could be inserted into Policy 9:</p> <p>...The development of these sites will need to be in line with the specific assessment identified in Part B <b>and deliver those requirements identified by the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</b></p>	Comments are noted. Consider including a reference to infrastructure delivery as suggested.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO228</a>	Policy 9 - Employment Land Allocations	<p>The former British Sugar site is identified within Policy 9 as an employment allocation. This is supported. In terms of the quantum of employment land, it is considered that approximately 12 hectares gross of employment generating uses can be delivered on site.</p> <p>Whilst this policy is supported, it should note that further testing of the specific allocation on the site (i.e. taking into consideration site constraints and necessary infrastructure) may result in a different figure than 12 ha gross.</p>	Comments are noted. Support is welcomed. This is a key employment site for the District and therefore the delivery of employment generating uses within this location is paramount.
Revelan Group	<a href="#">SALPO341</a>	Policy 9 -	Identifies that policy 9 seeks to protect the former	Comments are noted. However, the site has



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Employment Land Allocations	<p>Romwire site for employment development although there is no reference within the policy as to what constitutes employment development.</p> <p>Refers to PPS4 and the fact that allocations should not automatically be carried forward from the Local Plan to the LDF unless there is "evidence of need" and "reasonable prospect of take-up" during the plan period.</p> <p>Identifies that the site has been marketed for a significant period and during this time, only three parties have expressed an interest, however, none of these have been realised. Countrywide are interested in operating from the site. The site should not be retained for B Class uses.</p>	<p>been identified within the Employment Land Review as being suitable for employment use. It is located within the main employment corridor for the District and also forms part of the Enterprise Zone bid.</p>
Homes & Communities Agency	<a href="#">SALPO282</a>	Policy 9 - Employment Land Allocations	<p>The HCA recognises the importance of the emerging Worcestershire Economic Development and Regeneration Strategy and that this will influence land allocations and the aspirations for the Local Enterprise Partnership. Recognises the on-going consultation in relation to the Lea Castle site and is keen to work with the Council to deliver this complex site.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and support is welcomed. The former Lea Castle Hospital site is considered in more detail in policy 56: Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt.</p>
Hovi Developments Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO107</a>	Paragraph 5.15	<p>Existing employment sites provide flexibility for businesses- diversity of size, type and location. Rural sites help to sustain rural economy. Rushock Trading Estate is an historic established site in the Green Belt which was a former military site. Still not fully developed out so has potential to provide further employment with minimal impact on local amenity. Such sites should be safeguarded for employment</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The site is safeguarded for employment uses.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			uses to provide certainty to occupiers. Their development should be encouraged.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO160</a>	Paragraph 5.21	Question whether 300m is too far a distance. Suggest 100m should be maximum. If there are cases where greater distance is appropriate, then this should be dealt with by specific wording. Perhaps problem is with use of term 'edge of centre'. Although Weavers Wharf is edge-of-centre, it is clearly part of town centre whereas Crossley and Green Street are not. Solution lies in detailed policies in KCAAP. This issue is unlikely to be relevant outside of Kidderminster.	Comments are noted. The 300m distance is part of the national definition of 'edge-of-centre' which is set out in PPS4.
Asda Stores Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO177</a>	Policy 10 - Town Centre Retail	The impact test for edge and out-of-centre developments set out in paragraphs (b) and (c) requires a demonstration "... that there will be no adverse impact on the existing centre...". This wording lacks clarity and does not accord with the policy tests set out in PPS4. It should be amended to read "...that there will be no significant adverse impact on the overall vitality and viability of the existing centre....".	Comments are noted. Consider re-wording as suggested.
Shaylor Developments	<a href="#">SALPO89</a>	Policy 10 - Town Centre Retail	Shaylor Development (Shaylor) would like to support the uses proposed by Policy 10 within the designated shopping frontages of centres, reflective of national guidance. The range of uses the Policy identifies as able to be supported within secondary frontages is reflective of the Council's policy approach to encouraging mixed use proposals and to accept non retail based uses into Town Centres as a means of attracting visitors and improving sustainability.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural	<a href="#">SALPO183</a>	Policy 10 - Town Centre Retail	Acceptable uses for secondary frontages (and primary frontage above the ground floor) should include	Comments are noted. Consider suggestions made in preparing the Publication version of

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
England			dentists' and other health professionals' surgeries or consulting rooms (though perhaps not doctors'). This should also be an additional 'town centre use' for secondary areas, additional to those identified in PPS4.	the Document.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO246</a>	Policy 10 - Town Centre Retail	Welcome and support policy 10 and para. 5.33. This will help to resolve following issues: need to reduce crime, need to reduce alcohol and drug misuse.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Shaylor Developments	<a href="#">SALPO90</a>	Paragraph 5.30	<p>Object to the inclusion of paragraph 5.30 in the supporting text which seeks the protection of retail units within designated frontages. Taking into account the advice of PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth advises at paragraph EC1.4 for councils to "<b>set flexible policies for their centres which are able to respond to changing economic circumstances</b>", RPS would contend that applying such a regimented approach to assessing the opportunities and impact of economic proposals within defined frontages will not encourage sustainable economic development. This is especially true for the secondary shopping frontages and any areas centres experiencing difficulties. Indeed PPS4 requires that "<b>policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations</b>" [defined frontages] but does not encourage over restriction of development opportunities. Indeed paragraph 5.30 is considered to directly contradict and restrict the proposals of paragraph 5.31 in relation to encouraging mixed use developments.</p> <p>Therefore RPS would advise that the current inclusion</p>	Noted. The Council consider that the inclusion of a policy to prevent fragmentation of the Primary Shopping Frontage conforms with national policy in so much that it "makes clear which uses will be permitted in such locations". The test refers specifically to the Primary Shopping Frontage which the Council wish to see retained primarily for A1 Retail use. The proposed policy shift for the secondary shopping frontages provides a much more flexible approach in areas of the town that are considered to be more peripheral to the primary retail function and provide the opportunity to consider more diverse uses. Within these areas clusters of similar service and office uses are already evident and appear to complement the Primary Shopping Frontage well. The policy to allow much greater flexibility within these areas, whilst allowing A1 retail uses to dominate within the Primary Shopping Frontage would appear to support the theme

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>of the criteria in paragraph 5.30 is unsound, not reflective of national guidance or the other AAP policies to support mixed use development. Instead these criteria should be amended to refer to the Council's priority to avoid the loss of A1 retail uses but that clusters of similar service, office or residential uses are compatible but dependant upon the localised factors. Such an amendment would support the theme of national guidance in PPS4 to generate areas of specific uses and services within centres, whilst also allowing the A1 retail use to dominate.</p>	<p>of national guidance in PPS4.</p> <p>This approach is not considered to be overly restrictive and is considered to be a sound approach to future retailing within the District.</p>
<p>Campaign to Protect Rural England</p>	<p><a href="#">SALPO184</a></p>	<p>Policy 11 - Protecting and Enhancing Local Retail Services</p>	<p>Policy 11 should also encourage the clustering of other non-residential uses in village centres, including doctors', dentists', and other health professionals' surgeries or consulting rooms. This perhaps applies less to doctors' surgeries than those of other health professionals.</p>	<p>Comments are noted however it is considered that this would be overly restrictive.</p>
<p>Sainsbury's</p>	<p><a href="#">SALPO213</a></p>	<p>Policy 11 - Protecting and Enhancing Local Retail Services</p>	<p>Para. 5.35 - local and neighbourhood centres should be identified on plans and listed in appendix. Suggest current sites are appraised and new ones defined - we would wish to comment on this once this work is done.</p> <p>Policy 11 - Support objective to support new local retail proposals in suitable locations. However, paragraph two should be reworded to make it clear that this support extends to retail and other uses (which should be defined) in local or neighbourhood centres (as defined).</p> <p>Policy 11 - Paragraph 3 needs to make it clear that the 'identified areas' refer to local and neighbourhood</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The local centres will be identified on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>For Policy 11, seek to include suggested changes which have been identified to make this policy clearer. However, it is proposed to retain clause (d) due to the importance of safeguarding the vitality and viability of existing centres.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			centres, and that a criteria-based approach will apply to proposals outside these areas.  Policy11 - Criteria a should be deleted - is contrary to PPS4. Criteria d should also be deleted - is only require for proposals over 2,500 sq m in PPS4.	
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO72</a>	Policy 12 - Specialist Retailing	Adopted Local Plan Policy E2 allows car showrooms and vehicle maintenance etc. to be on Class B land. The draft Policy 12 does not give this flexibility and it should.	Noted. However, such uses on employment sites are covered by Policy CP08 of the Adopted Core Strategy
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO326</a>	Market Towns	We welcome and support the recognition given to the historic environment as a key consideration for the market towns of Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO38</a>	Paragraph 5.57	<b>Sustainable Tourism</b> We welcome the recognition of the need to protect the natural and historic assets upon which tourism is based.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO39</a>	Policy 13 – Supporting Major Tourist Attractions	Natural England supports the protection afforded to Wyre Forest by the sentence "proposals will need to ensure that they respect the landscape, biodiversity and setting of this ancient woodland and proposals that cause adverse impact on the area will not be permitted". We also welcome the reference to the Grow with Wyre project (paragraph 5.70).  Regarding the West Midland's Safari Park, the park includes some areas of heathland which adjoin the Devil's Spittleful SSSI. We would welcome the enhancement of this area, and we recommend that opportunities to achieve are explored. Perhaps there	Support is welcomed and noted.  Consider making specific reference to the Devil's Spittleful SSSI within the policy or reasoned justification.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			is scope to introduce a heathland exhibit/educational corner.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO125</a>	Policy 13 – Supporting Major Tourist Attractions	<p>The Trust is pleased to support this policy and in particular comments in relation to the Wyre Forest regarding the fact that  <i>' Proposals will need to ensure that they respect the landscape, biodiversity and setting of this ancient woodland and proposals that cause adverse impact on the area will not be permitted' .</i></p> <p>We would however suggest a small amendment to the section pertaining to the Safari Park to reflect the fact that the Park has significant potential to contribute to heathland restoration and re-creation. Appropriate steps should be taken to facilitate this through any major planning application here.</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider including reference to the Safari Park's potential to contribute towards heathland restoration as suggested.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO229</a>	Policy 13 – Supporting Major Tourist Attractions	Policy 13 refers to the Severn Valley Railway. This policy is supported, in particular in light of the proposals that are currently being prepared regarding the former British Sugar site, which may include a railway halt for the Severn Valley Railway.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
West Midlands Safari Park	<a href="#">SALPO301</a>	Policy 13 – Supporting Major Tourist Attractions	<p>WMSP supports policy 13.</p> <p>Appropriate policies are needed to create a positive framework for the improvement of facilities at WMSP in order to boost the local economy.</p> <p>A Sustainable Masterplan / Planning Brief should be produced by owners in consultation with the Council and other stakeholders. Such a document could then</p>	Noted. Support for the policy approach is welcomed.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>form the basis on which planning applications will be considered to ensure that the site is developed in a comprehensive way.</p> <p>On this basis, and with the particular characteristics of WMSP considered, this general tourism policy for Wyre Forest District as a whole making specific mention of the WMSP as one of the most important tourist attractions within the region, is welcomed.</p>	
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO327</a>	Policy 13 – Supporting Major Tourist Attractions	The Wyre Forest - recommend adding reference to historic environment of the ancient woodland. Heritage was key component of HLF funded landscape project.	Comments are noted. Add in a reference to the historic environment of the Wyre Forest as suggested.
West Midlands Safari Park	<a href="#">SALPO302</a>	Paragraph 5.65	<p>WMSP is broadly supportive of the relevant text accompanying policy 13, but <b>objects</b> to it in its current form.</p> <p>Current text clearly recognises WMSP's contribution to local and regional economy, and is consistent with PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth which states that local planning authorities should ensure that their development plans support "existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting" (policy EC2.1(b)), and "sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit rural business, communities and visitors".</p> <p>Accompanying Ministerial Statement to 2011 Budget, 'Planning for Growth' (23 March 2011) announced that local planning authorities should ensure that they give appropriate weight to the need</p>	Noted. The reasoned justification will need to be amended to take into account any changes in national planning policy, where appropriate. However, it is considered that the current wording already provides a flexible and positive approach to consider future development proposals at the Safari Park by recognising its role as an important tourism destination whilst also identifying the important economic role it plays. Further reference can be made to the Amion Report but it is considered that the suggested additional wording, as currently drafted, is inappropriate to include within the Site Allocations document.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>to support economic recovery and that applications that secure sustainable growth are treated favourably provided they are consistent with PPS4.</p> <p>This has more recently (15 June 2011) been backed up by details of the Government’s proposed presumption in favour of sustainable development. “Local planning authorities should plan positively for new development, and approve all individual proposals wherever possible”</p> <p>An Economic Impact Study (February 2011) of proposals to develop a national attraction at the WMSMP concluded that there was the potential to generate significant net additional local jobs and economic activity.</p> <p>It is considered that the Ministerial statement and the conclusions of the Economic Impact Study provides justification for including the following wording in paragraph 5.65:</p> <p><i>"Due to higher expectations from consumers and competition from other forms of leisure spending, and higher running costs associated with wild animal attractions, WMSMP is operating in a difficult environment. Unless the Park can continue to introduce new attractions and complementary developments, the parks contribution to the local economy will be restricted."</i></p>	
WCC - Transport	<a href="#">SALPO84</a>	Promoting	Considers section is well written and compliant with	Support is noted and welcomed. Consider



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Policy & Strategy		Transport Choice and Improving Accessibility	the latest policies. It will deliver a number of favourable outcomes, including reduced car use and an improved environment. May be worth adding some text on electric vehicle charging points to encourage more widespread use.	adding in text on electric vehicle charging points in the Publication version.
Centro- WMPTA	<a href="#">SALPO345</a>	Promoting Transport Choice and Improving Accessibility	<p>Centro considers that it is important that the plan is consistent with national policy guidance as well as with the West Midlands Local Transport Plan (2011-2026).</p> <p>These plans fall within the West Midlands 'journey to work' area and it is therefore important that residents of any new development can have sustainable access to regional services and wider employment and education opportunities. Centro therefore recommends that cross boundary issues and travel should be given further consideration in these documents and are happy to assist and provide information where required.</p>	Noted. Consider additional wording in the Site Allocations and Policies to highlight the importance of the rail links to the West Midlands and the services it provides residents of Wyre Forest.
Centro- WMPTA	<a href="#">SALPO346</a>	Promoting Transport Choice and Improving Accessibility	<p>Generally, Centro considers that development and redevelopment proposals make the use of existing transport infrastructure and services, improve connectivity locally and in the wider area where appropriate and provide high levels of accessibility for all with an emphasis on sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p>Centro recommends that these documents should encourage developments to be focused in areas already served by public transport and be design to ensure access to it along with walk and cycling routes.</p>	Noted. The policies contained within the Site Allocations and Policies seek to promote the development of a good pedestrian and cycle network as well as public transport facilities and access to them.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Centro- WMPTA	<a href="#">SALPO347</a>	Promoting Transport Choice and Improving Accessibility	Welcomes the section and sustainable transport and particularly the importance of rail, bus routes, cycling and pedestrians. Policy 14 would benefit from greater emphasis on cross-boundary issues and travel opportunities to ensure that residents have access to regional services and facilities.	Comments are noted. Consider including text on cross-boundary transport issues within Publication document.
Centro- WMPTA	<a href="#">SALPO348</a>	Promoting Transport Choice and Improving Accessibility	Centro also stresses that a high quality integrated transport network can assist in sustainable economic growth, job creation and regeneration, while reducing carbon emissions.  It is essential to invest in quality integrated transport facilities and services from the outset to encourage use of more sustainable modes.	Comments are noted.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO313</a>	Paragraph 6.1	In terms of Promoting Transport Choice, a Residential Travel Plan will be produced to accompany any planning application which will encourage use by public transport, walking and cycling. The site's location is well suited to this concept in terms of existing public transport facilities within Blakedown.	Comments are noted
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO40</a>	Policy 14 - Sustainable Transport	Natural England broadly supports this policy. We would welcome reference to green infrastructure within the policy. Off-road walking and cycling networks can form an important element of local green infrastructure and, in addition, may be perceived as being safer and more attractive than roadside paths.	Support is noted and welcomed.  Include a cross reference to green infrastructure within the policy or the reasoned justification.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO127</a>	Policy 14 - Sustainable Transport	The Trust is pleased to support the intent of this policy and the commentary regarding the need to safeguard and enhance more sustainable means of transport. We would however like to see the policy strengthened	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Include a link to wider green infrastructure as suggested.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			with a link to wider Green Infrastructure, which appears to us to be a sensible way to ensure later integration of transport links into wider site design, landscaping etc.	
West Midlands Safari Park	<a href="#">SALPO303</a>	Policy 14 - Sustainable Transport	<p>WMSP is broadly supportive of policy 14, but <b>objects</b> to it as currently worded.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5 refers to the Severn Valley Railway as "...one of the major tourist attractions within the area..." The potential exists to open up the line for commercial rail services. RPS on behalf of WMSP considers that the potential exists to develop a halt along the line to link the two attractions and allow visitors to the Park to arrive by rail. Precise details would be developed through an agreed Planning Brief and Masterplan.</p> <p>With reference to the statement in paragraph 6.3, which points out the requirement that development should "...reduce the need to travel by private car", it is considered that the following sentence should be added at the end of Policy 14:  <i>"Proposals which seek to facilitate and encourage the use of modes of transport other than the private car, including rail, will be supported, subject to compliance with other policies of this DPD and other development plan policies".</i></p>	Noted and agree. The potential to incorporate rail facilities at the WMSP and potentially link the District's two largest tourist attractions is something that should be explored. Agree that the detail of any development would require further consideration taking into account other relevant planning policy considerations. Look to re-word the policy to incorporate comments.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO248</a>	Paragraph 6.8	Endorse paragraph 6.9 but suggest additional text: 'Cycle parking must conform to the requirements of the Worcestershire County Highways Design Guide <b>and Policy 25</b> '	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Re-word as suggested.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO250</a>	Paragraph 6.13	<p>Welcome and support para. 6.13. Also suggest wording is inserted to link with Policy 25 which requires new development to comply with Secured by Design: -</p> <p>'Natural surveillance is a key aspect of encouraging walking. Routes must be overlooked in order to help create a safe pedestrian environment. Therefore, pedestrian routes which are not overlooked <b>and contrary to Policy 25</b> will not be considered to create safe ....'</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider re-wording as suggested.
WCC - Transport Policy & Strategy	<a href="#">SALPO85</a>	Paragraph 6.15	<p>Welcomes the proposal to seek parking facilities east of the River Severn in Bewdley during the plan period. WCC is keen to work with WFDC on this as there is significant potential to reduce visitor traffic in the historic town centre. Identifies 3 possible sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Caravan park off Northwood Lane</li> <li>• Land adjacent to the roundabout/junction of the A456/B4190, possibly as a small park and ride using existing bus services.</li> <li>• Land adjacent to the B4195 (near Netherton Lane) - possibly a small park and ride using existing bus services.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider the suggested sites further during the development of the Publication document to see if any are suitable for allocation.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO41</a>	Policy 16 - Major Transport Infrastructure	Natural England has significant concerns regarding the proposed Hoobrook Link Road and the potential impacts it could have on Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI. We would look to have early involvement in discussions and in the decision-making process.	Concerns are noted. Natural England will be invited to take part in discussions from an early stage in the process.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO128</a>	Policy 16 - Major Transport	The Trust has serious concerns about the likely impact of the Hoobrook Link Road on the adjacent	Comments are noted. Involve the Trust in discussions regarding the Hoobrook Link

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Infrastructure	Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI and our Wilden Marsh Nature Reserve. Significant measures must be put in place to avoid or mitigate for harm caused by any new road here and we would be pleased to engage in discussions concerning routing, design and landscaping as early as possible in any development proposal.	Road from an early stage.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO230</a>	Policy 16 - Major Transport Infrastructure	<p>Policy 16 refers to the safeguarding of the Hoobrook and Stourport Relief Road. It sets out that development along or adjacent should not prejudice the delivery and where practical will be expected to contribute towards delivery. Since the Site Allocations and Policies document was published in May 2011 and with the benefit of land ownership information, further work has taken place identify a suitable route for the relief road to pass through the site. In light of this, the Masterplan for the former British Sugar site has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>The mechanism for seeking contributions towards the implementation of the major transport infrastructure is unclear. Given that the Council has not yet put in place procedures to apply Community Infrastructure Levy, there is at present ambiguity as to how contributions would be sought. Further clarity is required in respect of this issue.</p>	<p>Noted. The line of the Hoobrook Link Road is still open for discussion. The key message is that a suitable route for the relief road is identified through the site. The actual line of the road will need to be agreed based on the best available evidence.</p> <p>Further work is required in identifying the contributions that will be required. This will be discussed further with the agents and owners of the site.</p>
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO258</a>	Policy 16 - Major Transport Infrastructure	In terms of planning road links, these must be carefully located and engineered, with consideration of the hydrogeological setting and in ensuring no adverse impacts on flood risk. The surface water drainage adopted needs to be appropriate.	Noted. Any scheme design would need to be agreed through a planning application where details such as these would be picked up.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO231</a>	Paragraph 6.24	Firstly, in terms of freight, it is suggested within paragraph 6.24 that there is potential for rail freight connection to the Severn Valley heritage line which was once used for rail freight. It is important though to note that there is no evidence to justify that this proposal is practical or viable. This issue has been considered in discussion between St Francis Group and Severn Valley Railway. It was concluded that whilst a link to the former British Sugar site is possible, it is not practical for rail freight for a number of reasons.	Noted. This was included within the document to understand if potential existed to include freight movement along the line of the railway. If this is not a viable solution then it would not be enforced.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO232</a>	Paragraph 6.24	No sidings existing on site and therefore sidings of a significant scale would need to be constructed to accommodate modern rail freight. In addition, other infrastructure such as the existing viaduct, which is adequate for passenger travel, would need to be assessed and potentially upgraded at significant expense. When all matters considered together, it is concluded in agreement with Severn Valley Railway that a rail freight connection at the British Sugar site is not a feasible, practical or viable option.	Noted. This was included within the document to understand if potential existed to include freight movement along the line of the railway. If this is not a viable solution then it would not be enforced.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO330</a>	Delivering Sustainable Development Standards	Suggests that smaller scale measures should also be included as well as measures relating to energy efficiency and adaptation which for historic buildings require careful and appropriate consideration. Refers to guidance available at <a href="http://www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk">www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk</a> . Could be included here or within the heritage section.	Comments are noted. Policy CP01 of the Adopted Core Strategy includes information on smaller scale renewable energy and energy efficiency. Consider including specific detail for historic buildings within the Site Allocations and Policies as suggested.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO256</a>	Delivering Sustainable Development	Requests further clarity over how the locally tailored sustainability checklist will be delivered. Will this be an SPD or a DPD? Refers to Shropshire Council as	Comments are noted. The locally tailored Sustainability Checklist will be produced following the adoption of the Site Allocations

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Standards	an example of an SPD.	and Policies and Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan DPDs.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO257</a>	Delivering Sustainable Development Standards	Note that this section refers to renewable energy only. Acknowledge that there is a water efficiency target within CP01 of the Adopted Core Strategy. Policy CP01 also refers to the investigation of more stringent targets as part of this DPD and we would seek clarification as to whether this has been investigated.	Comments are noted. The Adopted Core Strategy sets out specific targets in relation to water consumption. In the current economic climate it is considered that setting more stringent targets would be over-onerous.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO42</a>	Policy 18 - Renewable Energy	<p>Natural England supports the general thrust of this policy. We would welcome more positive/encouraging wording and increased local distinctiveness, e.g. the potential for biomass from the Wyre Forest. We welcome the references to the county's Landscape Character Assessment and the need to consider impacts on biodiversity and geology (paragraph 6.31).</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.2 of the SA provides the aims of the SAP DPD, one of which is to "Identify sites which are suitable for renewable energy development and identify whether higher renewable energy targets could be set for individual development sites". This aim hasn't been achieved.</p>	<p>Support is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to amending the policy to make it more locally specific at Publication stage.</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 3.2.2 of the SA report, paragraph 6.27 of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD Preferred Options Paper sets out why it was not considered appropriate to allocate specific sites for renewable energy development. Additionally, it was not considered financially viable to identify particular sites to deliver higher levels of renewable energy provision.</p>
Sport England	<a href="#">SALPO82</a>	Policy 18 - Renewable Energy	Raises concern about the negative impact of wind turbines on sport, particularly sailing. Highlights research being carried out by the University of Warwick looking at the effect of wind turbines on playing pitches. Suggests that wind turbines are not	Comments are noted. This will be considered on a case-by-case basis through the Development Management process.



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			located adjacent to playing fields or sailing clubs unless it is demonstrated that there is no negative impact.	
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO328</a>	Policy 18 - Renewable Energy	In relation to Policy 18, the supporting text should also refer to the historic environment in determining applications in addition to potential impacts on biodiversity, geodiversity and landscape. This is relevant to accord with PPS5 and Policy HE1.	Comments are noted. Include additional information to address this issue within the Publication document.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO131</a>	Paragraph 6.31	We are pleased to support the strong commentary provided by this paragraph and in particular the weight given to the need to consider impacts on biodiversity as part of the decision-making process. A line to reflect this guidance could be inserted in Policy 18 for the avoidance of doubt, perhaps as a bullet point (iv) in the second section.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider including a reference to biodiversity and geodiversity in the policy is not necessary as this is a key part of the LDF and is covered by CP01.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO259</a>	Paragraph 6.32	<p>Whilst we would accept that a flood risk policy is not necessary for this document, this would be on the basis that a flood risk policy is included within the Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan (KCAAP), given the flood risk to the town centre and its relationship with the upstream Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS).</p> <p>Sequential testing needs to be completed to inform the evidence base for the site allocations (see comments above on the evidence base).</p>	Comments are noted. Look to enhance policy in KCAAP.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO262</a>	Paragraph 6.32	The River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) for the Severn River Basin District was published in December 2009. The RBMP is the central tool for setting out the objectives and actions required to	Comments are noted. It is considered that the policies contained within the Adopted Core Strategy (CP01, CP02 & CP15) and the proposed site allocations within this



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>achieve the WFD objectives. The plan states the environmental objectives for the river basin district, where different objectives to good ecological status have been selected (because of necessary timescales for improvement, availability of improvement techniques or it is disproportionately costly to go further), and summarises the actions needed to deliver the objectives.</p> <p>Planning authorities have a duty under the WFD to take account of the RBMPs and can help deliver WFD objectives. Planning policies and activities can ensure that new development does not create adverse pressures on the water environment that could compromise our ability to meet WFD objectives. Failure to comply with WFD requirements may lead to the European Commission bringing legal proceedings against the UK</p>	document will help to have a beneficial impact on the water environment within the District. It is considered that the policies contained within the LDF would not cause adverse impacts or fail to comply with WFD requirements.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO43</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	Natural England supports this policy. We would welcome the design of SUDS to contribute towards re-wetting drying out SSSI wetlands in the District, where opportunities arose.	Support is noted and welcomed.  Consider including a reference to the re-wetting of drying out wetlands within either the SUDS or Green Infrastructure policies or their reasoned justifications at Publication stage.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO134</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	The Trust is pleased to support this policy and in particular sub-section b).	Support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural	<a href="#">SALPO185</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of	typo - should 'effect' not 'affect'	Comments are noted. Amend as suggested.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
England		SUDS		
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO233</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	It is considered that the policy does not add to the existing policy requirement (CP02), particularly given that the SUDS Approving Body is yet to be established. In addition, the incorporation of SUDS techniques is referred to in Policy 26 in respect of landscaping and boundary treatment, therefore policy 19 is superfluous.	Noted. However, this policy references new legislation that has occurred since the adoption of the Core Strategy and its inclusion is supported by the EA and the Council's Watercourse officer. It is considered it adds greater detail to CP02 and will ensure SuDS are considered in line with The Flood and Water Management Act of 2010.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO329</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	Raises concern over the implementation if SUDS having potentially damaging implications for heritage assets particularly archaeological remains and possibly sensitive townscape areas. Suggests that point (b) refers to the importance of any schemes also integrating with the existing valued feature/assets of the site.	Comments are noted. Consider that this would be addressed through LDF policies on heritage and design.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO260</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	Part b - We would recommend that this part of the policy also refers to maintaining and improving water quality, with a reference within the reasoned justification to the Water Framework Directive (WFD). The wording could also be made stronger in requiring developers to incorporate SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) with a multi-functional use. For example, part b of policy 19 could be re-worded: <i>'SuDS must be sensitively designed and located to: mitigate for flood risk; promote improved biodiversity and water quality; and provide for enhanced...'</i> . In addition, paragraph 6.35 could be changed to <i>'developers must demonstrate how SuDS have been sensitively designed and located to provide a multi-</i>	Comments are noted. Consider re-wording as suggested.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<i>functional use, in addressing policy 19. Appropriate justification must be provided in circumstances when this is not considered achievable'. You may want to include an explanation of SuDS with multi-functional use or reference to direct developers to.</i>	
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO261</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	It should be noted that infiltration SuDS should only be adopted where the ground conditions are shown to be appropriate (i.e. adequate permeability and absence of ground contamination). In areas where they are not suitable above ground SuDS techniques/lined systems should be considered, which can provide a number of 'multi-functional' benefits including: managing flood risk; biodiversity enhancements; improvements to water quality, meeting WFD objectives (see below); and amenity space.	Comments are noted. The multi-functional use of SUDS is identified within the Core Strategy but could also be further referenced here.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO315</a>	Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS	It is intended to incorporate SUDS which will assist water supplies to adjoining pools system which have suffered from low water levels	SUDS are required in all new development under Policy CP02 of the Adopted Core Strategy
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO331</a>	7 - A Unique Place	In principle we welcome the recognition of the importance of green infrastructure, landscape character. Not with standing this we would welcome greater reference to the cross cutting nature of these policies e.g. the influence of landscape character on local distinctiveness.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider how the cross-cutting nature of green infrastructure and landscape character can be clarified within the Publication document.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO14</a>	Safeguarding the Green Belt	We object to the list as shown.  Add to the list the possible uses of Green Belt as shown in the Core Strategy.	The list referred to is a summary of the representations received relating to this topic during the Issues and Options consultation and as such can not be amended as suggested. The list provides information only and will not be included within the

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
				Publication document.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO36</a>	Safeguarding the Green Belt	Summary of issues and options responses to 'safeguarding the Green Belt' raises following: development does not recognise that green infrastructure development is different from building development. Suggest that green infrastructure developments are identified as a stand alone development type (GID). This would allow green infrastructure projects to proceed.	Comments are noted. Green infrastructure development is supported through Policy 22: Providing a Green Infrastructure Network. The list referred to is a summary of the representations received relating to this topic during the Issues and Options consultation and as such can not be amended as suggested. The list provides information only and will not be included within the Publication document.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO15</a>	Safeguarding the Green Belt	Add to list CP07; CP13; CP14	CP07 not considered to be specifically relevant to the Green Belt policy as it relates to developer contributions and development within the Green Belt will be limited to where very special circumstances can be demonstrated.  Include CP13 and CP14 within the Relevant Adopted Core Strategy policies box.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO16</a>	Paragraph 7.1	Part 7.1 noted in conjunction with Core Strategy issues and agree.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO17</a>	Paragraph 7.2	Policy 20 criteria b recognises that green Belt may be used for recreation	Comments are noted.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO18</a>	Policy 20 - Green Belt	Note importance of outdoor recreation	Comments are noted.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO73</a>	Policy 20 - Green Belt	'Original' dwelling needs defining. Will there be any flexibility? Will similar policy affect extensions outside Green Belt?	Consider including a definition of 'original dwelling' which would be the dwelling as it was first built, excluding any extensions and

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
				alterations which have taken place since. The policy applies only to extensions within the Green Belt. Extensions outside of the Green Belt should demonstrate that they meet the criteria set within Policy 25 - Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness and within the Design Quality SPG.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO135</a>	Policy 20 - Green Belt	The Trust is pleased to support this policy	Support is welcomed.
Hovi Developments Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO108</a>	Policy 20 - Green Belt	Paragraph 'e' is welcomed in order to protect and enhance existing Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt including Rushock Trading Estate.	Support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO186</a>	Policy 20 - Green Belt	The distinction between the first two paragraphs grammatically seems slight. Should the second paragraph not be item f of the first one?	Comments are noted. Amend as suggested.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO19</a>	Paragraph 7.7	Major Developed Sites may be vital to CP13 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network.	Comments are noted.
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO5</a>	Paragraph 7.12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of antisocial behaviour is at risk of being overstated.</li> <li>• It is acknowledged that the site will one day come forward for redevelopment.</li> <li>• Development should be sensitive to its surroundings and meet the needs of Blakedown's residents.</li> <li>• Belbroughton Road has a classic ribbon development pattern with defined buildings lines to the front and rear.</li> <li>• Any redevelopment should respect this to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents and</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, the remainder of the site will need to provide the enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>the adjoining Green Belt - while the site is derelict it is well screened by existing vegetation to the rear and sides.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statement regarding local housing need and the Housing Needs Survey (17 units required) conflicts with paragraph 4.8 which identifies 37 housing units on the site.</li> <li>• Please identify which other sites have been dismissed as unsuitable for such development.</li> </ul>	
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO120</a>	Paragraph 7.12	<p>The level of antisocial behaviour is at risk of being overstated.</p> <p>However it is acknowledged that the site will one day come forward for redevelopment.</p> <p>However this should be sensitive to its surroundings and meet the needs of Blakedown's residents.</p> <p>Belbroughton Road has a classic ribbon development pattern with defined buildings lines to the front and rear.</p> <p>Any redevelopment should respect this to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents and the adjoining Green Belt - while the site is derelict it is well screened by existing vegetation to the rear and sides.</p> <p>The statement regarding local housing need and the Housing Needs Survey (17 units required) conflicts with paragraph 4.8 which identifies 37 housing units</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>on the site.</p> <p>Please identify which other sites have been dismissed as unsuitable for such development.</p>	
Meadows G	<a href="#">SALPO140</a>	Paragraph 7.12	<p>Despite the 30MPH limit traffic currently speeds up and down Belbroughton Rd and requests for traffic calming/radar traps have been refused (on grounds of poor lighting/unsuitable radar trap siting). The proposed development will significantly increase the traffic problem. Will there be suitable plans to allow traffic calming and speed limit enforcement to be implemented?</p> <p>Can we be assured that the area outlined in red will be the strict limit of development and that there will not be any development creep into adjoining land?</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The area outlined in red is the Area of Development Restraint which is land taken out of the Green Belt to meet longer term housing need. Land beyond this is covered by the Green Belt designation and therefore will not come forward for development.</p>
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO165</a>	Paragraph 7.12	<p>The level of antisocial behaviour is overstated.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site will one day come forward for redevelopment.</p> <p>However this should be sensitive to its surroundings and meet the needs of Blakedown's residents.</p> <p>Belbroughton Road has a classic ribbon development pattern with defined buildings lines to the front and rear.</p> <p>Any redevelopment should respect this to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents and the adjoining</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Green Belt - while the site is derelict it is well screen by existing vegetation to the rear and sides.</p> <p>The statement regarding local housing need and the Housing Needs Survey (17 units required) conflicts with paragraph 4.8 which identifies 37 housing units on the site.</p> <p>Please identify which other sites have been dismissed as unsuitable for such development and why.</p>	
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO316</a>	Paragraph 7.12	Continued dereliction of Blakedown Nurseries still concerns local residents who seem to accept residential development as a suitable solution. Site is considered to be brownfield due to previous use and extent of buildings. Site is not covered by any statutory designations. Its allocation is therefore sound.	Comments are noted.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO48</a>	Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	Suggests re-ordering the policy to present strategic considerations first. Suggested wording is included within the representation.	Consider re-ordering the policy as suggested within the Publication document.
Sport England	<a href="#">SALPO80</a>	Paragraph 7.16	PPG 17 playing pitch assessment should be carried out in accordance with the Playing Pitch Model methodology (PPM). If this was the case the table would not show hectares for the Outdoor Sports Facilities but the typology instead. Therefore Sport England would suggest these figures are unsound for the Outdoor Sports Facilities and they should either be omitted or made robust by following the PPM.	Comments are noted. The Worcestershire County Playing Pitch Strategy provides a detailed analysis of playing pitches by typology. This informed the PPG17 audit.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO44</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green	Natural England very much supports the inclusion of this policy particularly the requirement for new	Support is noted and welcomed.



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Infrastructure Network	development to contribute towards the delivery and enhancement of the River Severn and River Stour Corridors and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal and the proposal to safeguard an area for the creation of the Stour Valley Country Park. We would welcome a firmer commitment to the delivery of the Country Park, e.g. through developer contributions.	Consider including more detail on the delivery of the Stour Valley Country Park within the Publication document.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO45</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	At the moment, there is no mention of the Wyre Forest in the policy itself. Although it is not as clear a 'strategic corridor' as the rivers, the Wyre Forest is still a strategic green infrastructure asset. It could perhaps be described as a 'strategic node' or 'strategic site'. For this reason we recommend a reference to the Wyre Forest along with the Rivers Severn and Stour and the canal, with a shared requirement for developers to contribute towards its delivery and enhancement. This would also reflect policy CP13 in the adopted Core Strategy.	Comments are noted. Consider including a reference to the Wyre Forest itself, and a shared requirement for developer contributions within the Publication document.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO46</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	There is no mention of acid grasslands or heathlands in either the policy or the supporting text. The importance of Wyre Forest District's acid vegetation communities needs to be recognised. Larger sites such as the Devil's Spittleful SSSI act as locally important green infrastructure nodes/sites. Taken together, the acid communities form a patchwork across the district. Steps should be taken to enhance the functionality of this patchwork by creating/enhancing links between sites. We recommend naming the heathlands and acid grasslands as a habitat which developers should contribute towards the delivery and enhancement of.	Comments are noted. Consider naming the heathlands and acid grasslands as a habitat which developers should contribute towards the delivery and enhancement of.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			This would also reflect policy CP13.	
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO47</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	The policy and supporting text do not recognise the historic environment as an element of green infrastructure. We suggest cross-references to policy 24.	Include a cross-reference to policy 24 to recognise the green infrastructure value of the historic environment.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO136</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	<p>Support the inclusion of the policy but recommend slight changes to reflect the significant biodiversity enhancement drivers that underpin GI. Key habitats include the Wyre Forest itself and the heathland and acid grassland, and there is a need to promote work to restore and enhance these features where opportunities exist. These features are equally important in a GI and landscape-scale conservation context as the valuable corridors already mentioned in the policy and should be accorded the same status.</p> <p>Harmful development should be directed away from existing sensitive links and areas where high potential exists to re-create biodiverse green links in the landscape. Where possible opportunities should be taken to use development contributions to achieve habitat creation and restoration that aims to recreate a living landscape with well linked habitats providing ecosystem services for local communities.</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider including further information in the Publication document.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO179</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	Welcomes the aspirations of the policy. Aware of the County's GI work which encompasses the historic environment and interested to know how this has been taken into account or compliment's the District's Green Infrastructure Strategy.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. The County's GI work has informed, and will continue to inform the preparation of the District Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy.
British Waterways	<a href="#">SALPO193</a>	Policy 22 -	BW welcomes these requirements but suggests bullet	Comments are noted and support is

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	point relating to canal is amended: "Development should seek to enhance the biodiversity quality of the canal corridor whilst recognising the multifunctional nature of the corridor." Roles include catalyst for regeneration, water supply, drainage/flood management, heritage, ecological resource, sustainable transport etc.	welcomed. Re-word to "Development should seek to enhance the biodiversity quality of the canal corridor whilst recognising the multifunctional nature of the corridor.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO264</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	We welcome the first bullet point in policy 22 relating to the River Severn and River Stour Corridors. We support the reference to improving the biodiversity value of the river corridors and to removing culverts. Reference should also be made to maintaining and improving the water quality of the rivers and to flood risk betterment where possible i.e. restoring in addition to maintaining the functional floodplain. For example improved easements adjacent to the river corridor.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider this is covered elsewhere in the Local Development Framework including policy CP02 of the Adopted Core Strategy.
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO332</a>	Policy 22 - Providing a Green Infrastructure Network	No mention of landscape character or linking this policy to the Green Belt designation. No larger context to position Green Infrastructure in the wider rural landscape. Over reliance on PPG17 information in relation to GI and overemphasis on safeguarding PPG17 assets. GI should be multi-functional.  Supports the inclusion of the Severn and Stour as key GI corridors, although greater emphasis could be placed on the multi-functionality including recreational access. We welcome opportunities to link the river corridors into the wider GI assets of the district and the county.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. The District Council is actively involved with the County's GI work and it will continue to inform the Local Development Framework. Consider revising the policy and reasoned justification in light of the comments received.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			The County has a sub-regional GI steering group which is developing a GI approach for the whole County. The sub-regional approach enables assets to be created, maintained and enhanced across geographical boundaries to maximise their benefits for all.	
Sport England	<a href="#">SALPO81</a>	Paragraph 7.24	The Six Acre Standard was a national standard. Response quotes paragraphs 1 and 2 of PPG17. Proposals are not considered robust as they do not follow national guidance.	Noted. Review national guidance and amend if necessary.
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO333</a>	Safeguarding and Enhancing the Natural Environment	Welcome the relationship to the sustainable community strategy, safeguarding both the unique landscape and rich biodiversity of the district.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	<a href="#">SALPO130</a>	Paragraph 7.26	Whilst the comments raised in this paragraph are to be welcomed and not objected to in any way, geodiversity is missing from this summary of the natural environment. A statement should be included to highlight geodiversity and its integral link with influencing and supporting the biodiversity of the District.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Include a reference to geodiversity and its linkages to biodiversity as suggested.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO49</a>	Policy 23 - Providing Opportunities for Safeguarding Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Supports the inclusion of the policy but advise that it should do more to support positive gains for biodiversity, both within and outside of designated sites. Refers to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, PPS9 and Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and suggests that the policy should include a clause stating that all developments should take steps to enhance biodiversity, including provision for developer	Consider strengthening the policy in the Publication version of the document.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			contributions.	
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	<a href="#">SALPO132</a>	Policy 23 - Providing Opportunities for Safeguarding Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity	<p>Strongly support and welcome the policy.</p> <p>Local Geological Sites can be shortened to LGS</p> <p>"the interests of nature and biodiversity conservation" can be amended to read "the interests of nature conservation" as nature includes biodiversity and geodiversity.</p>	<p>Support is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Amend Local Geological Sites to LGS after first use.</p> <p>Amend "the interests of nature and biodiversity conservation" to "the interests of nature conservation".</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO137</a>	Policy 23 - Providing Opportunities for Safeguarding Local Biodiversity and Geodiversity	<p>The Trust is pleased to support the intent of this policy but we would like to see it strengthened significantly, in particular the policy should be explicit about the need to deliver biodiversity enhancement in line with PPS9 and the Council's duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.</p> <p>Sub-section b) should also reflect the fact that where development need requires development to proceed and therefore cause harm mitigation and compensation will be required.</p> <p>We would recommend that you cross-reference this policy with Policy 19, Policy 22 and Policy 24 as there are many potential synergies between them.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider strengthening the policy as suggested. Consider amending sub-section b) to include mitigation and compensation measures. Cross-reference this policy to Policies 19, 22 and 24 as suggested.</p>
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO334</a>	Policy 23 - Providing Opportunities for Safeguarding Local Biodiversity and	<p>We support the inclusion of statutory and non-statutory (local sites) sites for nature conservation within the policy and the emphasis on their protection.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of a table for national,</p>	<p>Comments are noted and support is welcomed.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Geodiversity	regional and local designated sites	
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust	<a href="#">SALPO133</a>	Paragraph 7.30	<p>Areas of National Importance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kinver Edge has one earth heritage SSSI unit within the District - this is currently not listed.</li> </ul> <p>Local Geological Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are two Local Geological Sites missing from the list. Please contact the Geological Records Centre for updated information.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. Update information for the Publication version.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO187</a>	Paragraph 7.30	Paragraph 7.30 (table) contains a typo. It is Arley Wood (being in Upper Arley) not Areley Wood (not being in Areley Kings, Stourport). If Areley Kings really is meant, Areley Kings should be given as the name	Comments are noted. However, Areley Wood is the correct spelling as it lies to the west of Areley Kings.
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO321</a>	Paragraph 7.30	The Parish Council welcome the protection of the Bishops Meadow Nature Reserve and welcome any improvements to it.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO50</a>	Policy 24 - Heritage Assets	Natural England welcomes the recognition of landscape features in this policy. The historic environment is an important part of green infrastructure, and a green infrastructure led approach to development could aid in the conservation of historic environment features, e.g. allowing archaeology to remain in situ or strategically placing greenspace to preserve the setting of a listed building or SAM. We suggest policy cross-references.	Support is noted and welcomed. Include policy cross-references within the Publication version.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO138</a>	Policy 24 - heritage Assets	The Trust is pleased to support this policy and in particular references to hedgerows, ancient woodlands etc. in this context.	Support is noted and welcomed.
WM Morrison	<a href="#">SALPO296</a>	Policy 24 -	Objects to policy 24, three criteria set out are	Comments are noted. Consider how this

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Supermarkets Plc		Heritage Assets	unclear. It is not clear whether all criteria apply to all applications or whether some are for demolition only for example. We suggest that this is clarified by inserting the words and or after each clause.	can be clarified within the Publication document.
WM Morrison Supermarkets Plc	<a href="#">SALPO294</a>	Policy 24 - Heritage Assets	<p>Objects to policy 24 as the policy is unclear, and conflicts with the reasoned justification, particularly regarding the scope and detail required in a heritage statement.</p> <p>Although the policy and reasoned justification list a number of heritage assets, footnote 11 states that this list is not exhaustive and could include other features which arise over the plan period. Either footnote 11 should be removed or, if retained, additional information should be provided in the reasoned justification to clarify what is required in Heritage Statements for those features referred to within it.</p>	Comments are noted. Consider removing the footnote.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO275</a>	Policy 24 - Heritage Assets	<p>Pleased that the document includes a specific policy on the historic environment. Questions whether the commitment in the Core Strategy to produce a specific Historic Environment SPD should be carried through into the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.</p> <p>Includes the following suggestions for improving the policy further and strengthening its soundness in the context of PPS5:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcomes the inclusion of landscape character in the list of heritage assets but questions the extension to drainage ditches and nature conservation.</li> <li>2. Welcome the policy support for preparing a</li> </ol>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider making amendments suggested.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Heritage Statement.</p> <p>3. This paragraph - suggest that a new point could be added at the beginning of the list which puts emphasis on understanding the significance of the heritage asset and the contribution of the setting to this significance. Recommends that in point a greater emphasis is put on the significance of the heritage asset 'detrimental impact on <i>the significance on of a heritage asset or its setting</i> and' Under point b we suggest 'techniques' are also highlighted as well as materials and styles. Under point c suggest also refer to 'setting' at the end of the last sentence.</p> <p>4. Policy 24 fourth paragraph and paragraph 7.54: We recommend these are reviewed against the provisions of PPS5 and Policy HE9 and in particular the demonstration of substantial public benefits which would outweigh the potential harm to or loss of a heritage asset.</p> <p>5. Para 7.38 - welcomes the prominence given to heritage statements. Recommends re-wording to read "summarise the heritage interest of the heritage asset (archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic) and its significance'.</p> <p>6. Para 7.52 - recommends underlining early consultation with the County HER, as well as highlighting that not all archaeological remains are identified and sites may have archaeological potential.</p> <p>7. Recommends the supporting text includes an</p>	



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>additional sub-section on historic landscapes to include Registered parks and Gardens and other non designated historic landscapes as well as the role of the county wide historic landscape characterisation in providing information on the surviving historic farmsteads provided by the West Midlands Historic Landscapes and Farmsteads Project - particularly the county summary report and Farmstead Character Statements covering the area.</p> <p>8. Comments on policy 18 highlighted sustainability considerations relating to energy conservation measures and historic buildings. It may be appropriate to expand on the sustainability section here to address this.</p>	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO188</a>	Paragraph 7.52	Paragraph 7.52 should contain a cross-reference to the relevant PPS.	Comments are noted. Consider including a cross-reference to PPS5 as suggested.
Shaylor Developments	<a href="#">SALPO91</a>	Paragraph 7.53	On behalf of Shaylor Developments RPS Planning & Development would like to support the text in paragraph 7.53 as recognition by the Council that enabling development proposals will be considered on their merits as a means of securing the long-term use of a heritage asset.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO51</a>	Policy 25 - Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness	Natural England supports the inclusion and general thrust of this policy. We particularly welcome point M of this draft policy, around green infrastructure.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO52</a>	Policy 23 - Biodiversity and	We suggest an additional point regarding building in biodiversity benefits, in accordance with the Town and	Consider that this is already covered by policy CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Geodiversity	Country Planning Association's Biodiversity by Design, which is available online at <a href="http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/biodiversity-by-design.html">http://www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/biodiversity-by-design.html</a> . Features such as swift bricks and bat lofts can be easily integrated into the built environment as standard.	and Policy 23 of the Site Allocations and Policies.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO53</a>	Policy 23 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity	The draft policy does not mention climate change adaptation. We are now locked in to experiencing climate change, and new developments need to be designed with future climates in mind. Point f on climate change mitigation could be expanded to encompass adaptation.	Consider incorporating climate change mitigation within the Publication version.
Asda Stores Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO178</a>	Policy 25 - Design Quality and Local Distinctiveness	The policy as worded says that "All proposals for new development must demonstrate that they:..." comply with a long list of design criteria. Site specific constraints may mean that some development will not be capable of meeting all these requirements. The policy should therefore be reworded so as to say "All proposals for new development must demonstrate that where possible they...".	Comments are noted however this will not achieve the level of design quality which the policy seeks.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO139</a>	Policy 25 - Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness	The Trust is pleased to support the intent of this policy but we would recommend an additional bullet point, or perhaps an addition to the very welcome sub-section m), to cover the need for biodiversity enhancement in the built environment. Provision of bird and bat roosting / nesting opportunities can be easily accommodated in modern development and there should be a strong policy presumption that this will take place.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider that this is already covered by policy CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy and Policy 23 of the Site Allocations and Policies.
Campaign to	<a href="#">SALPO189</a>	Policy 25 - Quality	Policy 25 should require compliance with any adopted	Comments are noted. However compliance

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Protect Rural England		Design and Local Distinctiveness	Village Design Statement, Parish Plan or Neighbourhood Plan and there should be a cross-reference to ensure conformity.	must be with Statutory Planning documents.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO249</a>	Policy 25 - Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness	Support policy 25 and supporting text, especially para. 7.61 and 7.63. Suggest that CP 11 from the Core Strategy is cross-referenced and that the Monitoring and Implementation Framework includes a commitment to monitoring how many schemes in the District achieve 'Secured by Design' standards.	Comments are noted. The number of development meeting 'Secured by Design' standards is a Sustainability Appraisal indicator. Consider cross-referencing Policy CP11 of the Adopted Core Strategy.
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO335</a>	Policy 25 - Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness	<p>We would welcome the inclusion of references to landscape character and how this can influence local distinctiveness. LCA may be less relevant to urban design but rural development should look to integration within the rural setting.</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of biodiversity within this. Local distinctiveness may also include elements of biodiversity and ecology which should be retained within developments as appropriate e.g. veteran trees.</p> <p>Good design may also include elements of GI, such as street tree planting which can contribute to good quality design but include multi-functionality.</p>	Comments are noted. Consider including a reference to landscape character within the design policy or reasoned justification.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO54</a>	Policy 26 - Landscaping and Boundary Treatment	Welcomes the inclusion of the policy and the benefits it could bring for biodiversity and green infrastructure, recommends that policy makes this a requirement. Suggests consideration should be given to specifically requiring a financial contribution towards the long term management of landscaping.	Support is noted and welcomed. The long-term management of landscaping must be through alternative funding or management mechanisms.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">SALPO141</a>	Policy 26 -	We are pleased to support the thrust of this policy but	Comments are noted and support is

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Wildlife Trust		Landscaping and Boundary Treatment	we would recommend that it be strengthened to include a bullet point regarding the need to provide biodiversity enhancement in line with national policy and guidance, perhaps by reference to policy 23. This would accord with bullet point a) regarding SUDS.	welcomed. Consider including an additional point within the Publication version regarding the need to provide biodiversity enhancement, possibly by referring to Policy 23 in a similar way to that in which bullet point a) deals with SUDS.
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO336</a>	Policy 26 - Landscaping and Boundary Treatment	<p>Welcomes the inclusion of this policy, particularly SUDS. Reference could be made to the Flood and Water Management Act.</p> <p>Policy should include stronger reference for the need for the overall design to integrate with the surrounding landscape. Currently no requirement for Landscape Character Assessment to be considered.</p> <p>Welcomes the requirement of the planning of native species, however, these should be native to the given area. No mention of protection of existing trees or distinct landscape features.</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider revising the policy in light of the comments received. Further information on SUDS is set out within Policy 19 - Implementation of SUDS and it is not considered appropriate to repeat this here.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO56</a>	Policy 27 - Re-Use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	We welcome point 2 iii, which requires no adverse impact on the landscape and wildlife.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO74</a>	Policy 27 - Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	Footnote should be part of policy wording. Should be flexibility to allow extensions to converted barns.	Comments are noted however, paragraph 7.80 sets out the justification for the policy approach. Consider moving the footnote into the policy itself.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO142</a>	Policy 27 - Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	The Trust is pleased to support bullet point iii in section 2) Residential Development. We would also suggest that a similar bullet point be added under Section 1) Economic Development.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider including an additional bullet point under section one which is similar to bullet point iii of section 2.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO190</a>	Policy 27 - Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	<p>Policy is generally welcome, but need requirement that buildings for conversion should be of substantial construction so as to exclude for example covered yards, dutch barns, pigsties and chicken coops.</p> <p>Objective should be to retain traditional brick built farm buildings - stronger policy wording is needed</p>	Comments are noted however it is felt that this is covered under point (i).
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO349</a>	Policy 27 - Re-Use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	<p>Strongly recommends that policy 27 and supporting text gives greater attention to and uses the products produced through the West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and Landscapes Project. This would include greater emphasis on understanding the character and significance of a farmstead as a whole, its landscape setting and its sensitivity and potential to change.</p> <p>Additionally, English Heritage are keen to ensure a sufficiently positive and flexible approach for promoting the sustainable use and re-use of historic farmsteads, including the consideration of all appropriate uses (agriculture, economic and residential). Refers to the Summary Report of the West Midlands Project which demonstrates that the majority of farmsteads in non-farming use provide homes. Suggests that the economic significance of residential use can be overlooked with historic farmsteads providing the basis for a wide range of home-based enterprise. This is relevant for the District which falls into the area of 'highly accessible rural areas around the central conurbation'.</p> <p>Would be happy to discuss this in more detail.</p>	Comments are noted. The policy set out is in accordance with the Adopted Core Strategy which promotes economic uses for farmsteads in preference to residential. The economic use of farmsteads includes live-work units. Meet with English Heritage to consider how the West Midlands Historic Farmsteads and Landscapes Project can be incorporated into the policy and reasoned justification.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO265</a>	Policy 27 - Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	Consideration should be given to flood risk and whether the proposed development (building) can be made safe for a 1% plus climate change design flood event. This could be included within the criteria of policy 27. Consideration should be given to non-mains foul drainage matters for rural areas.	Comments are noted. If flood risk is an issue, this would be picked up through PPS25 and CP02.
WCC - Environmental Policy & Strategic Planning	<a href="#">SALPO337</a>	Policy 27 - Re-use and Adaptation of Rural Buildings	Residential Development - welcome the inclusion iii, 'that there will be no adverse impacts on the countryside, landscape and wildlife'. However this should also be included with economic development of rural buildings.  7.79-Text would benefit from being amended accordingly: ..... 'considered in light of the physical effects of the proposed conversion on the character of the building, <i>existing wildlife</i> and its appearance in the landscape'.	Comments are noted. Amend paragraph 7.79 as suggested.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO75</a>	Policy 28 - Chalets	Chalets by definition are dwellings, some with occupancy restriction, some without. Criteria 'c' to allow replacement chalets only for holiday use is not reasonable if the existing chalet has established residential use.	Consider revising this policy to allow for chalets which have an established residential use to be replaced by chalets for residential use.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO266</a>	Policy 28 - Chalets	We support the reference to flood risk in Part b of policy 28. However we would recommend that it is altered to refer to the floodplain (location) in addition to building design i.e. not liable to flooding or located within the floodplain.  Within part c of policy 28 we would wish to see a reference that, for sites located within the floodplain, consideration is given to relocating the caravan(s) to	Comments are noted. Consider altering the policy to include suggested changes.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			an area of lower flood risk (i.e. managed retreat).	
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO57</a>	Policy 29 - Equestrian Development (Horsiculture)	Equestrian developments have the potential to impact on biodiversity as well as landscape, and we would welcome the recognition of this within the policy or its supporting text.	Comments are noted. Consider including appropriate wording within the Publication version to recognise this.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO76</a>	Policy 29 - Equestrian Development (Horsiculture)	Policy wording is too complicated. Policy must differentiate between keeping of horses and erection of stables and between recreational and commercial uses.	Comments are noted. Consider this issue in more detail when developing the Publication document.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO77</a>	Paragraph 7.87	Paragraph is too dogmatic and should relate to the size of field etc. <u>and</u> the landscape setting.	Comments are noted. Consider this further when developing the Publication document.
Davies Mrs E	<a href="#">SALPO23</a>	9 - Introduction	Lack of identification of sites for "first" homes.	All developments of six dwellings or more within Bewdley and the rural areas, and 10 dwellings or more within Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn must provide affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy policy CP04. Developments will also be required to incorporate a mix of dwelling types and sizes in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP05.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO350</a>	9 - Introduction	In general the explanation and policy framework appears to identify the site specific heritage assets and considerations. Suggests clarifying whether or not the County's HER has been used to identify any archaeological remains associated with the sites.	Support is noted and welcomed. The HER has not been used to identify archaeological remains associated with the site. Consider using HER to inform the Publication document or clarifying that this has not been done.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO352</a>	9 - Introduction	Identifies that a number of sites within Stourport-on-Severn have sensitivities relating to heritage assets and although these are reflected in the policies and	Comments are noted. The County's HER has not been used to identify potential archaeological interest, consider either doing



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			text it would be useful to clarify whether the County's HER has been used to identify archaeological interest. Endorses the importance of early pre-application discussions on future proposals.	this for the Publication document or clarifying that this information has not been included.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO267</a>	9 - Introduction	We note that the DPD refers to infrastructure for some of the sites, but there is no reference to environmental infrastructure for any of the sites. This section should be further informed by the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan. In addition the Sequential Testing should be completed to inform the development of sites.	Comments are noted. The sites have been informed by the Water Cycle Strategy and will be further refined through the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO268</a>	9 - Introduction	<p>Having reviewed the Part B site allocations, the potential for land contamination issues to arise is relatively high throughout the area given its industrial heritage, which will ultimately influence the viability and phasing of the redevelopment. As it stands none of the policies in part A of the DPD specifically mention the need for land contamination investigation. We have previously referred to land contamination and its importance, given the areas industrial heritage and hydrogeological setting (see information below), in our response at the issues and options stage of this DPD (our letter dated 13 March 2009 refers).</p> <p>We acknowledge that land contamination issues have been considered within policy CP01 of the adopted CS. Therefore if you are not minded to include a policy within part A of this DPD, we would seek a reference to land contamination within the introduction to Part B with a link to policy CP01 of the CS. As part of this it should be noted that re-development proposals</p>	Comments are noted. It was the intention that contaminated land was dealt with under policy CP01 of the Core Strategy. However, a link to this policy in the introduction of Part B is considered to be a sensible suggestion, especially given the development strategy proposed for the District. Look to amend accordingly.



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			(planning applications) for all of the sites will need to be accompanied by a desk study report, as a minimum requirement	
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO269</a>	Stourport Road Employment Corridor	This area has a long history of industry. Therefore land contamination will be a significant issue that will influence the need for remediation and appropriate building (foundation) and drainage design at all the sites. The corridor is located on a principal aquifer of regional strategic importance and within the combined source protection zone for a number of public water supply boreholes. It is therefore essential that the above issues are appropriately addressed.	Comments are noted. These are issues that were picked up through the Core Strategy (CP01 and CP02) and will therefore be considered through any development proposals coming forward within this area. Stronger links to contamination issues are proposed to be included in the introduction to Part B.
Mace G	<a href="#">SALPO2</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	The British Sugar Site should be considered a priority and the silos should be demolished.	The British Sugar Site is prioritised within the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document and a masterplan for the site's development is currently being prepared in conjunction with the site's owners, work is also on-going to determine whether the silos could be reused or whether they will need to be demolished.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO58</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	We welcome point f, which requires proposals for this site to protect and enhance the Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI, as well as point e, which requires the provision of a comprehensive GI network. We would encourage the developer and the council to discuss constraints and opportunities regarding Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI early on in the masterplanning process.	Support is noted and welcomed. Ensure that Natural England is involved with the masterplanning process.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO143</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site -	The Trust is pleased to support bullet points e) and f) of this policy, which are vital if the potential	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Engage the Trust in discussions

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		(SAL.SK.2)	environmental impacts of development here are to be dealt with effectively. We would welcome the chance to engage in discussions regarding proposals on this site, particularly with respect to our nearby nature reserve, the River Stour SWS and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire canal SWS.	on this site from the earliest possible stage.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO192</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	<p>Policy is generally welcome but should give:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stronger encouragement to possible railway station on site with potential for park and ride to enable commuting through to Birmingham for local residents.</li> <li>• provide for pedestrian access across canal to Wilden Marshes</li> <li>• small area by sewage works could potentially be added to site</li> <li>• should seek to secure access to canal and marshes even from phase 1 of development</li> <li>• site should be developed in accordance with masterplan</li> <li>• plan on p.108 is merely indicative - this should be made clear</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Consider suggestions further during the development of the Publication document.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO243</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	The site plans and Development Concept Plan (Picture 10.1) are supported. St Francis Group is committed to delivering a mixed use scheme, which is generally in accordance with the Development Concept Plan; although the precise location and mix of uses may well still change following further detailed testing. It may be better to describe the plan as illustrative at this stage. As highlighted above, since the Site Allocations and Policies document was published further work has been completed identifying	Noted - updated concept and development plans can be included within subsequent versions of the document to reflect the latest changes to the masterplanning work being undertaken on the site. Any plan/scheme would remain illustrative to retain the flexibility to consider the best layout and development mix of the site, in line with the adopted policy.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>a suitable route for the Hoobrook Link Road. The Development Concept Plan should be updated to reflect the latest alignment.</p>	
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO244</a>	Policy 32 Former British Sugar Site (SAL.SK.2)	<p>In the main, it is considered that the proposed policy for the former British Sugar site is generally sound other than for a few issues which need to be resolved through ongoing discussions with the Council prior to the preparation of the Submission Draft Site Allocations and Policies document.</p> <p>It is considered that in general terms the Site Allocations and Policies document is sound, however, a number of amendments as highlighted within these representations need to be made in order to provide clarity and justification, improve effectiveness and deliverability, all of which will improve soundness.</p> <p>One of the main points to address is in respect of whether the proposed phasing approach to delivering housing is necessary. As highlighted in the representations above, it is considered to be superficial as there is no reasonable justification to delay the delivery of housing land, particularly when the majority of the sites are previously developed and will deliver on a number of objectives in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The overall view on soundness of the document is welcomed. Further amendments to reflect consultation comments will be made during the preparation of the submission draft document. With regard to the specific point on the proposed phasing approach, it is considered to be an indicative target and is not included to stifle development from coming forward.</p>
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO235</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	<p>The identification of the former British Sugar site as an allocation for mixed use development is supported. Policy 32, entitled the former British Sugar site, and accompanying text is generally welcomed, however, there are a number of points to highlight in order to</p>	<p>Comments are noted and support is welcomed.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			ensure the policy is effective and deliverable, which will ultimately improve soundness.	
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO236</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	<p>It is considered that the first part of the policy should be presented in a different way to avoid confusion in respect of the quantum of land uses that can be delivered on site. As currently worded it appears that there will be 12 ha of employment land, 320 dwellings and other commercial uses (including community and tourism facilities). Going back to the original proposals as set out within the Background Document (February 2010) submitted as evidence to the Core Strategy, the original proposal was for 50% of the site to be used for future employment, leisure and commercial uses and the remaining 50% of the site to be used to provide new dwellings and associated open space. It is considered that the policy should be redrafted in order to include the commercial uses with employment land, as originally set out in the Background Document. A revised policy is set out below.</p> <p><b>Proposals for the site will include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A mixed use development incorporating a significant number of residential units (C2/C3), (approximately 320) and employment generating uses (approximately 12 ha gross) that could include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <b>Employment land (Use classes B1, B2 and B8)</b></li> <li>(ii) <b>Ancillary commercial uses</b></li> <li>(iii) <b>Community Facilities (Use class D1)</b></li> <li>(iv) <b>Tourism (inc hotel) and non-town centre</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Comments are noted. Consider this further during the development of the Publication document and through the masterplanning process.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<i>leisure</i>	
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO237</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	In terms of the paragraph which includes a caveat “subject to sequential test”, it is suggested that the evidence is prepared by the Council, in association with St Francis Group, to demonstrate that such uses are sequentially appropriate on site, which will ultimately reduce opportunities for the DPD to be challenged.	Noted. Consider this further through discussions with site owner and agents.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO238</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	It is agreed that a “comprehensive Masterplan that embraces the latest urban design thinking” should be agreed. St Francis Group has demonstrated a commitment to this through previous meeting with the Council to discuss the development of the site.	Noted and Agree. Continued work on a masterplan for the site is welcomed.
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO239</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	<p>In respect of the remaining criteria, which proposals for the site must include, the following comments are offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is agreed that the line for the Hoobrook should be safeguarded and provide onsite and offsite measures to mitigate against any adverse transport impact, including access to the local road network;</li> <li>• as outlined previously, St Francis Group is in discussion with Severn Valley Railway in order to incorporate a link for passengers. It has been concluded that a freight link is inappropriate and therefore this reference should be removed from the policy;</li> <li>• it is agreed that the proposal should provide for cycle and footpath networks throughout the site to enable connections to be made to this site and to other adjacent areas;</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. It is acknowledged that rail freight may not be feasible at the site and should this be demonstrated to be the case, it will not be enforced. Seek to make the green infrastructure element of the policy more site specific. Seek to clarify what is meant by providing 'landmark development' and making full use of the site's strategic position on the edge of the Stour Valley in the Publication document. Discuss these points further as part of the development of the Publication document and through the masterplanning process.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate sports pitch provision is required either improving existing facilities or compensatory provision. The element of the policy is considered to repeat policy set out nationally in PPG 17 and is therefore unnecessary;</li> <li>• in terms of providing a comprehensive Green Infrastructure Network, which connects and complements important adjacent wildlife areas etc. It is considered that this simply repeats the content of earlier policies. It is not locally specific and therefore should be removed.</li> <li>• it is agreed that the development should safeguard adjacent conservation areas and SSSI;</li> <li>• in terms of maximising the connectivity of the site to nearby centres and attractions, it is considered that this repeats policy statements above in respect of railway, cycle and footpath connections.</li> <li>• in terms of investigating the potential for "land mark" development, it is unclear what this would entail. Further clarification is requested;</li> <li>• again, in relation to making full use of the site's strategic position on the edge of the Stour Valley, it is unclear what is meant by this. Further clarification is requested;</li> <li>• it is agreed that contamination issues should be fully considered and mitigated against; and</li> <li>• it is agreed that the proposal should have full regard to the HSE zone that affects the site and locate uses accordingly.</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
British Waterways	<a href="#">SALPO194</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	Given that Canal bounds former British Sugar site, greater emphasis should be given to it when identifying requirements that proposals should meet. CP15 should be added to list at para. 10.24. Policy 32 could be reworded to incorporate some of following: integrate land and water; open up access to, from and along canal; explore the added value and use of water space; and view canal, towing path and environs as part of the public realm, enhance the use, enjoyment and setting of the canal.	Comments are noted. Consider including further guidance on how the development will be required to address the Staffordshire & Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area. Add policy CP15 to the list of relevant Adopted Core Strategy policies.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO351</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	Considers that the potential for the retention of the two remaining silos could be more positively encouraged within para 10.23.	Comments are noted. Whilst the policy encourages the retention of the silos, they will only be retained if a viable use can be found for them.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO270</a>	Policy 32 - Former British Sugar Site - (SAL.SK.2)	<p>We note that policy 32 states that the proposals for the site must 'ensure that contamination issues are fully considered and mitigated against'. The document notes that contamination needs to be considered from the outset (paragraph 10.22) and appropriate investigation studies undertaken, which we support. This should inform and be followed by remediation and validation to an acceptable standard, in line with policy CP01 of the adopted CS.</p> <p>Welcome the inclusion of the existing pond as a SuDS feature, but would suggest that it is included as part of the SuDS drainage proposals i.e. a drainage strategy will need to be produced to confirm the exact volume of surface water attenuation required on site for a 1% plus climate change event. SuDS proposals will be</p>	<p>Comments are noted. With regard to the contamination issues on the site, the draft policy and the framework included in the Core Strategy provide a clear requirement to ensure that this is properly assessed and mitigated against.</p> <p>In terms of SUDS, the Core Strategy requires new development to incorporate appropriate features within their developments. Any proposals will need to be detailed and agreed through the development management process.</p> <p>The existence of the HSE zone is identified within the policy and provision made to make sure that appropriate uses are located</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>further informed by the site investigation.</p> <p>An existing industrial use located to the south on the Vale Industrial Estate, operates two processes permitted by us under the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2010) to carry on the use and manufacture of organic chemicals. It is also regulated by the Environment Agency and Health and Safety Executive as joint competent authority under the Control of Major-Accident Hazards Regulations (COMAH) 1999, as a lower tier site due to the nature and quantities of the chemical substances stored and used on site. This requires assessment of the on-site risks associated with the storage and use of the substances, and the preparation of an on-site emergency plan. However, the location and the nature of the substances stored would give rise to concerns on the impact of a major incident at the site to both the environment and human health on the proposed development site.</p>	<p>accordingly. The site owners are aware of this issue and are taking it into account through the master planning process.</p>
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO240</a>	Paragraph 10.14	<p>Paragraph 10.14 sets out that the site is primarily in the ownership of one company but that 2 ha to the south east is owned separately. It should be noted that the extract from the SHLAA and the Development Concept Plan include land within the ownership of St Francis Group. In light of this paragraph 10.14 is incorrect and should be updated accordingly.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Look to amend accordingly. Review paragraph wording and consider more fully the future development of this additional land.</p>
St Francis Group	<a href="#">SALPO241</a>	Paragraph 10.17	<p>A route has been identified and land is safeguarded within the site to provide for the Hoobrook Link Road. This safeguarded route, however, is likely to change from that set out on the Development Concept Plan. In</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The main considerations for the site are included within the policy framework but the actual details are still subject to discussions and</p>



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>terms of the Severn Valley Railway, St Francis Group is investigating potential for providing a halt for the movement of passengers on the line. In that respect discussions are progressing positively, however, it has been concluded that the location is unsuitable for freight (as alluded above).</p> <p>Links to the canal towpath and associated travel network, which lies to the east of the site, will be reviewed as part of the design process.</p>	ongoing negotiations.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO199</a>	Policy 33 - Oasis Arts & Crafts and Reilloc Chain - (SAL.SK.3)	This site is surrounded by housing. Proposals for development wholly or mainly for housing ought to be acceptable.	Comments are noted.
Reilloc Chain Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO290</a>	Policy 33 - Oasis Arts & Crafts and Reilloc Chain - (SAL.SK.3)	<p>Refers to the former Reilloc Chain premises, Stourport Road. Site is currently vacant and is being marketed however, the nature of the building means that it is not suitable for modern day manufacturing processes. Site has been previously identified within the SHLAA as being suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Refers to the ambulance station which could also be incorporated into any redevelopment if it were to become vacant.</p> <p>Welcomes the inclusion of policy 33 and confirms that the Reilloc Chain premises would be available to delivery development within the first 5 year phasing period.</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			Considers that a predominantly residential use would be in keeping with the surroundings and would therefore be most suitable although this could be underpinned by commercial employment generating development such as a small retail element. Site is on a high frequency bus corridor and has access to employment locations and local shops.	
Revelan Group	<a href="#">SALPO342</a>	Policy 34 - Former Romwire Site - (SAL.SK.4)	<p>Objects to the allocation of the former Romwire Site for B1, B2, and B8 uses and other sui generis employment uses such as car showrooms and vehicle maintenance, repair and servicing centres. Argues that a wider range of uses needs to be considered for the site as it has been marketed for a significant period with no take-up. Suggests the following range of uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B Class employment uses</li> <li>• Public &amp; Community uses</li> <li>• Main Town Centre uses subject to the conformity with the sequential and impacts tests of PPS4. Typically they will be bulky good retail developments.</li> <li>• Uses that provide employment opportunities.</li> <li>• Uses that generate wealth.</li> <li>• Uses that produce or generate an economic output or product.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. However, the site has been identified within the Employment Land Review as being suitable for employment use and is located within the main employment corridor for the District. It is considered inappropriate to include some of the suggested uses for this site within the policy framework, especially with reference to the main town centre uses.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO59</a>	Policy 35 - Worcester Road Employment Corridor - (SAL.SK.5)	We recommend that the policy requires proposals to enhance the Wilden Marsh and Meadows SSSI.	Comments are noted. Consider including a requirement for new development to enhance Wilden Marsh and Meadows within the policy.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">SALPO145</a>	Policy 35 -	We would recommend that this policy makes explicit	Comments are noted. Consider making a

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Wildlife Trust		Worcester Road Employment Corridor - (SAL.SK.5)	mention of the need for development here to contribute to the protection and enhancement of biodiverse local Green Infrastructure, notably the nearby SSSI and SWSs.	more explicit reference to the need for development to contribute to the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure as suggested.
British Waterways	<a href="#">SALPO195</a>	Policy 35 - Worcester Road Employment Corridor - (SAL.SK.5)	Welcome reference to canal and potential for enhancement as part of overall scheme. The 'added value' of the water space needs to be fully explored.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO271</a>	Policy 35 - Worcester Road Employment Corridor - (SAL.SK.5)	Raises concern that land contamination is likely to be an issue in this area and requests that this is acknowledged within the policy. Site is located on a principal aquifer of regional strategic importance and lies within the combines source protection zone for a number of public water supply boreholes. The northern part of the site falls within the inner and outer source protection zone of a public water supply borehole and it is therefore a very sensitive hydro setting. The groundwater is also relatively shallow in part of the area located with the river valley. It is therefore essential that the land contamination issues are appropriately addressed. It will also be necessary to ensure that the proposed land use (activities), drainage design, foundations etc. are appropriate to the site setting. The proposed land uses should meet the requirements of our GP3 (Groundwater Protection Policy and Practice) guidance. Refers to relevant background documents related to this issue.	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO200</a>	Policy 36 - Blakebrook School and County	Policy 36 should be prefaced by a statement that it will only become operational upon the school becoming redundant from its present educational use. This	Comments are noted. This is covered by paragraph 11.2.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		Buildings - (SAL.WK.1)	should probably be similar to the first paragraph of Core Strategy Policy CP07.	
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO60</a>	12 - Kidderminster - Smaller Sites	Broadwaters Community Centre – Footpath connections to the canal, Stourvale Marsh SSSI and Puxton Meadows SSSI should be enhanced. This potential positive benefit was not picked up in the SA.	Comments are noted. Consider including a requirement that footpath connections are enhanced as part of this development.
Core11	<a href="#">SALPO26</a>	Policy 38 - Smaller Kidderminster Sites	Policy 38 should include the identification of small areas for development in accordance with Adopted Core Strategy policies CP07, CP13 and CP14. These areas should be shown on a map.	The document refers to Adopted Core Strategy Policies CP07, CP13 and CP14 as being relevant to these sites and any development on these sites will need to meet the requirements of these policies.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO201</a>	Policy 38 - Smaller Kidderminster Sites	Requirement that sites are redundant should be precondition for development. Suggest cross-reference to CP07. However this is not relevant to the Chester Road site. At Rifle Range site, policy should require some retail provision. Suggest cross-reference to CP11 is desirable. Would separate policies not be simpler?	Comments are noted. The sites are not considered large or complex enough to warrant separate policies. Both the Aylmer Lodge and Northumberland Avenue sites make reference to the sites becoming surplus to requirements once the new facility at Kidderminster Hospital is operational. Paragraph 12.8 refers to the need to retain retail provision at the Rifle Range Shops site.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO276</a>	Policy 38 - Smaller Kidderminster Sites	<b>Chester Road South Service Station</b> This site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone. Given the former use and industrial history of the sites there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. This is not specifically mentioned in the	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			policies.	via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO202</a>	Paragraph 12.6	Community Housing Group should be treated the same as any other developer. Developer should be encouraged to expand site to include surrounding available land. Need to ensure that community centre is redundant under Policy CP07.	Comments are noted. Land to the rear of the site is to be retained as open space and not developed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO203</a>	Paragraph 12.8	The requirement for continued retail provision as part of a redevelopment should be an explicit part of the policy, not merely contained in explanatory text.	Comments are noted.
Mrs P Harries	<a href="#">SALPO32</a>	Policy 39 - Bridge Street Basins Link - (SAL.STC.1)	Bridge Street - Concern visitors' vehicles will be indiscriminately parked around waterfront view. The basins need parking allocated for visitors.	Comments are noted. This will be considered further as more detailed proposals emerge and is also considered in more detail within the Bridge Street Basins SPD.
British Waterways	<a href="#">SALPO196</a>	Policy 39 - Bridge Street Basins Link - (SAL.STC.1)	BW welcomes requirement to open up basin views and enhance the basins. It is important for views to be optimised. Basins are valuable part of local heritage.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO277</a>	Policy 39 - Bridge Street Basins Link - (SAL.STC.1)	This site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone. Given the former use and industrial history of the sites there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. This is not specifically mentioned in the policies.	Comments are noted. This site is subject to a site specific SPD, which contains policies on contaminated land (ENV.1), Flood Risk (ENV.2) and a number of design policies.
Campaign to	<a href="#">SALPO204</a>	Policy 40 - Phase	Once again a precondition that the sites are redundant	Comments are noted. The replacement

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Protect Rural England		1: Tan Lane - (SAL.STC.2.1)	in that the existing uses are (or will simultaneously be) provided for elsewhere is needed. This is to some extent covered by the final paragraph, but a cross-reference to Core Strategy Policy CP07 would be useful.	school is currently under construction.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO252</a>	Policy 40 - Phase 1: Tan Lane - (SAL.STC.2.1)	<p>We have been working closely with the County Council in relation to the Tan Lane and County Buildings site. There is agreement in principle that the library, health centre, police station coroners court need a new purpose-built facility. These discussions are still at a preliminary stage. The Fire Station will remain at its current site. Developer contributions will be required to finance the new facility and upgrade the fire station. We recommend that the policy is amended as follows:</p> <p>Phase 2: County Buildings - (SAL.STC.2.2)  <i>Proposals for this site should provide for a suitable mix of uses including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Residential</i></li> <li><i>ii. Community uses (D1, including police and fire services)</i></li> <li><i>iii. Commercial Uses (offices)</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>The future redevelopment of this site should make compensatory provision for existing community uses affected and for their expansion commensurate with development growth in Stourport-on-Severn.</i></b></p>	Comments are noted. The provision of adequate community facilities within Stourport-on-Severn will need to be a primary consideration for the redevelopment of this site.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO279</a>	Policy 40 - Phase 1: Tan Lane -	This site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone. Given the former use and industrial	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		(SAL.STC.2.1)	history of the sites there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. This is not specifically mentioned in the policies.	Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Mrs P Harries	<a href="#">SALPO35</a>	Policy 41 - Civic Centre - (SAL.STC.3)	What will happen to the Civic Centre?	The policy for the Civic Centre will be amended following consultation responses and the final version will be set out within the Publication document.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO205</a>	Policy 41 - Civic Centre - (SAL.STC.3)	Once again a precondition that the sites are redundant in that there existing uses are (or will simultaneously) be provided for elsewhere is needed. This is to some extent covered by the final paragraph, but a cross-reference to Core Strategy Policy CP07 would be useful.	Comments are noted. CP07 is listed as one of the relevant Adopted Core Strategy policies.
Mrs P Harries	<a href="#">SALPO34</a>	Policy 42 - Swan Hotel and Working Men's Club - (SAL.STC.4)	Concerned about the Swan Hotel collapsing and injuring passers-by. Who is paying for its renovation?	Comments are noted. Any renovation work carried out to the building would need to be funded by the owner or a developer.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO206</a>	Policy 42 - Swan Hotel and Working Men's Club - (SAL.STC.4)	The bowling green is a sporting facility. If lost, equivalent provision elsewhere will be needed.	Comments are noted. Consider including a reference to replacement sports facilities although this is covered by PPG17.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO61</a>	Policy 44 - Carpets	We welcome the proposed treatment of the River	Support is noted and welcomed.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
		of Worth - (SAL.EA.1)	Stour, which is a valuable green infrastructure corridor and designated as a Special Wildlife Site.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO146</a>	Policy 44 - Carpets of Worth - (SAL.EA.1)	The Trust welcomes the intent of this policy and particularly endorses sub-section v) of section one.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO280</a>	Policy 44 - Carpets of Worth - (SAL.EA.1)	<p>We would wish to see a reference to the naturalisation of the River Stour including cutting down the sheet piling and re-grading the bank to produce a more natural river corridor. Also a reference could be made to flood risk betterment within policy 44 and paragraph 14.3, which could be achieved through the re-profiling of the river bank and the lowering of ground levels in areas adjacent to the river. The potential for river restoration could also help to deliver WFD objectives. These matters and the inclusion of a 10m buffer strip have been discussed and proposed as part of the previous planning applications for this site.</p> <p>In relation to point vi. flood storage compensation must be provided for the new bridge crossing prior to the works commencing on site, to ensure there are no adverse impacts on flood risk as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone, with shallow groundwater. Given the industrial history of the site there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. This is not</p>	Comments are noted. The policy is considered to be generally consistent with the planning permissions currently in place for this area. Issues such as those highlighted have been dealt with through the Development Control process and agreed with the EA. Consider potential re-wording to reflect the issues identified and agreed through the Development Control process.



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			specifically mentioned in the policy and this should be included. However, contaminated land issues have been discussed and are currently being addressed through the planning process	
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO62</a>	Policy 45 - Cheapside - (SAL.EA.2)	We welcome the requirement to incorporate and enhance the Rivers Severn and Stour.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO147</a>	Policy 45 - Cheapside - (SAL.EA.2)	The Trust is pleased to support this policy and in particular references to the need to enhance the rivers Stour and Severn given in sub-section c).	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO281</a>	Policy 45 - Cheapside - (SAL.EA.2)	<p>We support the inclusion of point C and D of policy 45. In achieving these points, we would wish to see consideration to setting any new buildings further back from the river to provide a greater easement/buffer strip in enhancing the river corridor and providing flood risk betterment.</p> <p>The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone, with shallow groundwater. Given the industrial history of the site there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. We note that this has been specifically mentioned in Policy 45.</p>	<p>Comments are noted and support is welcomed.</p> <p>Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.</p>
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO63</a>	Policy 46 - Parsons Chain - (SAL.EA.3)	We welcome the requirement to incorporate SuDS and GI linking to Hartlebury Common and the River Stour.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">SALPO150</a>	Policy 46 - Parsons	The Trust welcomes this policy and in particular is	Comments are noted and support is

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Wildlife Trust		Chain - (SAL.EA.3)	pleased to endorse sub-sections e) and f).	welcomed.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO283</a>	Policy 46 - Parsons Chain - (SAL.EA.3)	The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone, with shallow groundwater. Given the industrial history of the site and previous use (garage at Worcester Road & Baldwin Road) there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. We note that this is specifically mentioned in Policy 46 but not in Policy 47 or 48.	Comments are noted. With regards to the potential contamination issues, these will be explored further, including greater links to Core Strategy Policy CP01. Although this is referenced under relevant Core Strategy Policies at the final section of the RJ.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO284</a>	Policy 47 - Worcester Road Car Garages - (SAL.EA.4)	The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone, with shallow groundwater. Given the industrial history of the site and previous use (garage at Worcester Road & Baldwin Road) there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. We note that this is specifically mentioned in Policy 46 but not in Policy 47 or 48.	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Humphries M	<a href="#">SALPO100</a>	Paragraph 14.27	Basic premise of proposed policy framework is flawed. Whilst site may be considered as a whole by drawing a notional boundary, the delivery of the site as a whole prior to development starting is not a credible option. There are at least 13 different owners involved and not all will aspire to redevelopment. Without tacit agreement of all parties involved, area cannot be seen as a comprehensive development site.	Whilst it is acknowledged that there are plots of land within the wider site which will not come forward for redevelopment, the area has been presented as one policy area in order to ensure that any development which comes forward on the four sites identified is part of a comprehensive masterplan rather than a piecemeal approach.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO64</a>	Policy 48 - Baldwin Road - (SAL.EA.5)	We support the GI requirements expressed in points b, c and d.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO153</a>	Policy 48- Baldwin Road - (SAL.EA.5)	The Trust is pleased to support the thrust of this policy and welcomes the inclusion of sub-sections b), c), and d).	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Humphries M	<a href="#">SALPO96</a>	Policy 48 - Baldwin Road - (SAL.EA.5)	<p>Will the proposed masterplan cover all the land within the red line? If so, this will include a number of properties which have yet to come forward as deliverable. It would be unrealistic to produce a masterplan which requires delivery of entire site to allow development to progress and thus discourage development of those areas which are available and deliverable.</p> <p>Policy 48 wording is incorrect. There is no Public Open Space - the BW owned land has limited public access and recent ecological surveys have shown strong badger presence. Access to the public would not be in the best interest.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. However, it is considered that a holistic approach is best although there may be pockets of land which may not be redeveloped.</p> <p>The reference to 'public open space' at criteria b is incorrect and should refer to 'urban open space'. Inclusion of this site in any overall scheme will need to take into account results from ecological surveys.</p>
British Waterways	<a href="#">SALPO197</a>	Policy 48 - Baldwin Road - (SAL.EA.5)	Welcomes requirement to provide green links to canal corridor and ensure development has no adverse impact on Canal Conservation Area	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO285</a>	Policy 48 - Baldwin Road - (SAL.EA.5)	The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone, with shallow groundwater. Given the industrial history of the site and previous use (garage at Worcester Road & Baldwin Road) there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. We note that this is	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			specifically mentioned in Policy 46 but not in Policy 47 or 48.	via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Key Homes (Midlands) Limited	<a href="#">SALPO340</a>	Policy 48 - Baldwin Road - (SAL.EA.5)	Key Homes (Midlands) Ltd are in support of the proposal to redevelop the greater area of Baldwin Road for residential development with some business use. Part of the land owned by Key Homes (Midlands) Ltd is currently cleared and is available and deliverable for residential development. The greater area of Baldwin Road is in a minimum of 13 separate land ownerships. The majority of these are on small areas of land that could serve to blight a comprehensive redevelopment. We do not agree with the proposal in para. 14.35 concerning the pro rata application of the social housing threshold across the greater site. This will be detrimental to the owners of smaller areas of land and will further stifle redevelopment. Currently there is no accessible area of public open space within the greater site. The Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area abuts the site but lies outside the notional greater site boundary. Due to the number of land ownerships the provision of open space within the greater site could place an unnecessary burden upon a single landowner further blighting the greater development of the area. A plan is attached demonstrating that the cleared area of land in the ownership of Key Homes (Midlands) Limited can be developed independently to provide 9 no residential units incorporating its own adopted access off Baldwin Road. This in turn would service subsequent	<p>Comments are noted. However, it is considered that a holistic approach is best although there may be pockets of land which may not be redeveloped.</p> <p>The reference to 'public open space' at criteria b is incorrect and should refer to 'urban open space'. Inclusion of this site in any overall scheme will need to take into account results from ecological surveys.</p> <p>Further consideration needs to be given to the application of affordable housing policy in this location and its impact on viability.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			development of additional adjacent smaller sites. Consideration has also been given to the future provision of a footpath /cycle way link to the north by an extension of this access road. A 'Guidance Plan' has been produced providing evidence that this area of land can be developed independently and incorporated into the greater development of Baldwin Road.	
Humphries M	<a href="#">SALPO97</a>	Paragraph 14.29	Proposal to consider development of individual parcels of land within wider site subject to them contributing to wider area is commendable. This would provide the pump priming required on this fragmented site. However, the mixed use element is questionable. Whilst existing mixed uses may be viable there is no justification for new commercial development at this location. If a mixed-use element is needed, would suggest it is located at Gilgal end of site to avoid conflict with residential uses.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. The policy states that the mix of uses should be predominantly residential. The masterplan approach will ensure that the mix of uses does not result in conflict between neighbouring uses.
Humphries M	<a href="#">SALPO98</a>	Paragraph 14.34	Allocation of 'wider site' for housing is commended but question whether statement that 'wider site' is deliverable and available. No evidence to support this. Masterplan will have to take into account possibility that several of the smaller parcels of land may not come forward for development, particularly the small commercial premises and existing residential properties.	Comments are noted. A masterplan approach will be required as a number of smaller sites are available and these should not be developed in isolation. It is acknowledged that there are some parcels of land i.e, existing residential units and existing businesses which may not come forward at all or may come forward later in the plan period.
Humphries M	<a href="#">SALPO99</a>	Paragraph 14.35	Application of affordable housing thresholds pro-rata to entire site will prove further disincentive to both developers and smaller stakeholders. Site likely to remain in fragmented ownership as insufficient	Comments are noted. However, it is considered that a holistic approach is best although there may be pockets of land which

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			financial incentive for major developer to acquire the smaller sites. 3 of the 4 sites listed at 14.28 could each be developed out and deliver affordable housing in accordance with adopted threshold. Any pro-rata application of threshold would result in reduced amount of affordable housing on these larger sites.	may not be redeveloped.  Further consideration needs to be given to the application of affordable housing policy in this location and its impact on viability.
Sport England	<a href="#">SALPO79</a>	Policy 49 - Morgan Technical Ceramics and former Midland Industrial Plastics Site (SAL.WS.1)	Sport England is concerned that part of the site is designated playing fields and will oppose any development that would lead to the loss of, or prejudice the use of, all or part of the playing field without meeting at least one of the specific criteria identified in the Sport England Playing Pitch Policy.	Comments are noted. The policy includes a clause which requires the existing playing pitch provision to be retained or compensatory provision to be provided. Consider including reference to the Sport England Playing Field policy within the policy.
Morgan Advanced Ceramics Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO102</a>	Policy 49 - Morgan Technical Ceramics and former Midland Industrial Plastics Site (SAL.WS.1)	Request rewording of criteria 'b' as follows: "Ensure that scheme design and development demonstrate that appropriate noise mitigation measures, including layout, building design, construction, phasing and mix of uses ensure compatibility of uses within this location."	Re-word as suggested.
Bovale Limited	<a href="#">SALPO212</a>	Policy 49 - Morgan Technical Ceramics and former Midland Industrial Plastics Site (SAL.WS.1)	Supports policy 49 insofar as it advocates redevelopment of the former Midland Industrial Plastics site for residential development and elderly care facility development, however, raises concern over the conjoining of the site with the adjacent Morgan Advanced Ceramics site into a single site with a single policy. Bovale, the site owners, have previously tried to enter into negotiations with Morgan Advanced Ceramics about a holistic development across the two sites, however, the planning history shows that the two sites have been treated separately	Comments are noted, however, it is considered that in order to achieve the best quality design and development from the sites, these sites should be addressed as a single development site with an overarching policy.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>and the sites currently 'read' as two separate parcels of land.</p> <p>Raises concerns about difficulty complying with the final sentence of the policy because of an existing planning permission on the Morgan Advanced Ceramics site.</p> <p>Supports paragraphs 15.4, 15.5 and 15.7 which offer a fair reflection as to the site's history through the development plan process and its suitability for development.</p> <p>Acknowledge that office development could be used as a noise buffer between the Morgan Advanced Ceramic factory and residential development however, it is considered that this should not be a mandatory requirement as market demands may render the site unviable and undeliverable.</p> <p><b>Proposed Changes</b> Would like to see the Morgan Advanced Ceramics site and the Midland Industrial Plastics site divided into two separate sites with their own policies.</p>	
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO286</a>	Policy 49 - Morgan Technical Ceramics and former Midland Industrial Plastics Site (SAL.WS.1)	The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone. Given the industrial history of the site there is the high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. We note that this is specifically mentioned in Policy	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			49.	considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Morgan Advanced Ceramics Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO101</a>	Paragraph 15.6	The measures by which MAC's operations must be protected from potential complaints from future residents of adjoining housing development must be made clear to any potential developers at design stage. Measures include additional sound insulation to walls and windows and no balconies or opening windows to rooms at risk of noise nuisance. Any 'barrier block' of non-noise sensitive uses proposed must be substantially completed prior to occupation of any noise sensitive development. Scheme layout must also avoid 'noise corridors' being created.	Comments are noted. Clauses 'a' and 'b' of the policy will ensure that the future operation of the MAC site is not prejudiced by development on the wider site.
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO65</a>	Policy 50 - Lucy Baldwin Unit - (SAL.WS.2)	We support the requirements to provide GI links and access.	Support is noted and welcomed.
Owners of Lucy Baldwin Unit	<a href="#">SALPO214</a>	Policy 50 - Lucy Baldwin Unit - (SAL.WS.2)	Object to retention of locally listed buildings on site as this would make comprehensive redevelopment difficult as they are scattered around site and often linked by modern extensions. Originally designed as a hospital, the current condition, design, layout and physical nature of these buildings do not lend themselves to conversion and incorporation into a quality residential development. Do not consider buildings to merit local listing. Wish to see comprehensive redevelopment which will allow links to adjacent Memorial Park.	Comments are noted. A number of buildings on the site have been Locally Listed and as such, the policy position is to retain these buildings.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO287</a>	Policy 51 - Smaller Stourport-on-Severn Sites	<p><b>Robbins Depot</b> The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone. Given the previous use of the site there is high potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate.</p>	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
West Mercia Police	<a href="#">SALPO272</a>	Policy 52 - Load Street Redevelopment Area - (SAL.B.1)	<p>Do not dispute the economic and social benefits of expanding evening/night-time economy in Bewdley. However, there is direct relationship between the evening economy and number of incidents we deal with. This recognised both locally (Community Strategy and Community Safety Partnership) and nationally with violence and anti-social behaviour disproportionately concentrated amongst licensed premises and those associated with evening/night-time economy. We request that Policy 52(f) is strengthened to recognise this as follows:</p> <p><i>provide a wider range of evening economy activities to attract a broader range of people, <b>whilst ensuring that there is no adverse impact in terms of community safety or crime and disorder.</b></i></p> <p>This will be consistent with policy 10.</p>	Comments are noted. Amending policy wording as suggested.
West Mercia	<a href="#">SALPO263</a>	Policy 52 - Load	HWFRS have been in discussions with the Primary	Comments are noted, however community

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Police		Street Redevelopment Area - (SAL.B.1)	<p>Care Trust (PCT) regarding the redevelopment of its site and the future of the existing Bewdley Fire Station. Due to negotiations being at an early stage it not possible to confirm in these representations whether HWFRS will remain at its existing station, with improvements, or move to a new one off-site. However, it is confirmed that developer contributions may be required from the PCT. In light of this, WMP and HWFRS request that the current statement in paragraph 17.4 regarding the provision of community facilities be given policy status: -</p> <p><i>Policy 52</i>  <i>Load Street Redevelopment Area - (SAL.B.1)</i>  <i>Within the Load Street Redevelopment area a mixed use redevelopment will be sought, incorporating:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Community uses (D1, <b>including HWFRS</b> )</i></li> <li><i>ii. Residential (C3)</i></li> <li><i>iii. Small scale A1 retail to meet local needs</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Redevelopment of the site will need to provide community facilities, including the fire station, either on-site or through compensatory provision.</b>  <i>Proposals for this site should...</i></p>	facilities are safeguarded through policy CP07.
English Heritage	<a href="#">SALPO353</a>	Bewdley - Smaller Sites	<p>Whilst the heritage sensitivities have been picked up in the specific policies and text, relevant information from the HER should also be incorporated. Encouragement for the repair and reuse of the Former Workhouse is welcomed.</p>	Comments are noted. Support is welcomed. Consider including the HER information within the Publication document or clarifying that this information has not been included.
Watkins R A	<a href="#">SALPO78</a>	Policy 53 - Smaller Bewdley Sites	<p>The available space at Lax Lane (SAL.B.2), after demolition of the WRVS building, should be for <u>allocated residents only parking</u> . This would allow</p>	Comments are noted. This will be considered further when detailed plans come forward for the site.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<u>some</u> of the on-street parking in Lax Lane to be removed and this would improve safety and townscape.	
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO288</a>	Policy 53 - Smaller Bewdley Sites	The site is located on a principal aquifer and total protection zone. Given the location of the site within the historical centre of Bewdley and the former use, there is the potential for land contamination issues. Therefore we would want to ensure that such issues are adequately addressed and the building/drainage construction/design is appropriate. A desk study would therefore be required in the first instance. It is noted that it is hoped that the building is to be retained therefore any site investigation requirements would have to be designed with this in mind.	Comments are noted. It is proposed to make stronger references to Policy CP01 of the Core Strategy within the Site Allocations Document to ensure that land contamination is fully considered in any development proposals. With regards to issues such as drainage design and construction etc, it is considered that these would be picked up via the Development Control process. However, the Council will consider whether to make further reference to practice guidance where appropriate.
Davies Mrs E	<a href="#">SALPO22</a>	Paragraph 7.17	Delighted to see former workhouse as a given priority. Much needed.	Support is and noted and welcomed.
Banner Homes Midlands Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO93</a>	Paragraph 18.1	Consider housing policy for rural areas is unduly restrictive especially in relation to Clows Top. Would like to see Clows Top Garage site redeveloped for housing in preference to greenfield site being promoted in South Worcestershire Development Plan. This would help delivery of sewer improvements to village and allow for affordable housing delivery on adjacent site at The Terrace.	Comments are noted. Policy is in accordance with the Development Strategy set out within the Adopted Core Strategy (2010).
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO191</a>	Paragraph 18.1	We believe that in certain key rural settlements such as Clows Top there are also regeneration opportunities which will help sustain local facilities such as local stores and bus routes, as well as facilitating enhanced infrastructure provision for the	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-boundary issues and housing need.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			wider community.	
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO6</a>	Paragraph 18.2	<p>Agree that provision of housing be limited in order to safeguard the landscape character and not detract from urban regeneration. Proposal for 37 houses at Blakedown does not achieve this.</p> <p>Local need is mainly for downsizing and in many cases this does not require affordable. Any affordable housing should be for local needs meaning those residing in the Parish or with strong links.</p> <p>Questions the validity of the Housing Needs Survey and why there is more need now than when Swan Close was developed. Survey does not distinguish between need and desire, it is not means tested and is therefore fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Increase in the housing stock will impact on village services, particularly the primary school.</p> <p>Development should not provide strong visual linkages to the adjacent open space as this would be intrusion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>Any development should have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased traffic</li> <li>• access issues onto Belbroughton Road and increased volumes using Birmingham Road junction</li> <li>• affect on Forge Lane residents/access</li> <li>• loss of on street parking for Belbroughton</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable. The affordable housing will be for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to area. This will be a condition of planning approval.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Road residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effect on Green Belt - intrusion into countryside, noise and light pollution</li> <li>• potential water runoff into the Pools</li> <li>• effect on existing services (sewerage capacities, etc)</li> <li>• effect on Primary School intake</li> <li>• continued pressure on Haybridge School</li> <li>• disregard of Parish Plan</li> <li>• disregard of Housing Needs Survey</li> <li>• loss of ribbon development pattern</li> <li>• loss of amenity for neighbouring residents - intrusion into gardens</li> </ul>	
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO121</a>	Paragraph 18.2	<p>Agree that provision of housing be limited in order to safeguard the landscape character and not detract from urban regeneration. Proposal for 37 houses at Blakedown does not achieve this.</p> <p>Local need is mainly for downsizing and in many cases this does not require affordable. Any affordable housing should be for local needs meaning those residing in the Parish or with strong links.</p> <p>Questions the validity of the Housing Needs Survey and why there is more need now than when Swan Close was developed. Survey does not distinguish between need and desire, it is not means tested and is therefore fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Increase in the housing stock will impact on village</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable. The affordable housing will be for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to the area. This will be a condition of planning approval.</p>

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>services, particularly the primary school.</p> <p>Development should not provide strong visual linkages to the adjacent open space as this would be intrusion into the Green Belt.</p>	
Natural England	<a href="#">SALPO66</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	We welcome the recognition of the need to restrict surface water run-off into the Forge Pool. This is especially important due to the presence of Hurcott & Podmore Pools SSSI a short distance downstream via the Churchill and Blakedown Valleys Special Wildlife Site. For this reason we recommend making it a requirement in the policy.	Support is noted and welcomed. Consider including within the policy a requirement to restrict surface water run-off into Forge Pool.
Trustees of J R Bent Deceased & Mrs M L Bent	<a href="#">SALPO216</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	The former Blakedown Nurseries site was a horticultural business with offices, packing sheds, glasshouses and polythene tunnels. Closed in 1998. Since then site has suffered from vandalism. Site is blot on landscape and devalues area. Village is well served by facilities and we the owners support a proposal by Barratts to develop the site for housing.	Comments are noted.
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO103</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	<p>Parish Council welcomes development which accords with the Churchill and Blakedown Parish Plan and that housing development should meet local needs in accordance with the Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Parish Council is against residential/commercial development sites in rural areas such as those in Hagley being put forward by Bromsgrove District Council which will have a detrimental impact on Churchill and Blakedown. The Parish Council would object to any similar development in this part of Wyre</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			Forest District.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO154</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	The Trust is pleased to note the inclusion of sub-section c) but would recommend that it be strengthened to a requirement to provide buffering and enhancement to the SWS in line with wider policy aspirations and Government guidance.	Comments are noted. Consider amending policy to require buffering and enhancement to the SWS.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO207</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	<p><b>Need</b> Experience in Bromsgrove District has shown that the methodology used in housing needs surveys is poor and does not adequately identify local needs arising within the community. Policy 54 needs to be subject to a precondition of the applicant demonstrating that a local need for affordable housing exists. If the scheme also includes market housing, the need for this also needs to be robustly justified (see RSS policy RR1 and CF2 and its definition of "Local Needs"). Consider that housing needs survey demonstrates need for just 4 affordable houses, a need exists for market housing in form of bungalows for elderly and it may be desirable to provide some general market housing to help fund affordable.</p> <p><b>Housing Allocations</b> Housing criteria do not seem to be robust enough to ensure local connection (see Bromsgrove criteria for allocation of affordable housing developed in rural areas).</p> <p><b>Site</b> As a former nursery this is an agricultural site and not a typical brownfield site. Development along</p>	Comments are noted. Any affordable housing coming forward at the site will be for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to the area. This will be a condition of planning approval. Market housing cannot be restricted in the same way.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Belbroughton Road consists of houses with long rear gardens. Much of Blakedown is enclosed common. Opportunity should be sought to integrate open space provision within the development with adjacent community land.</p> <p><b>Strategy</b> There are few housing sites identified in villages. Important that site development is phased over the whole plan period so there is not pressure for another site in the village later on in the plan period. Suggest agree masterplan for whole site and divide into 3 distinct phases. Refer to Policy RR1c of the RSS - local needs is defined as excluding demand from those moving into the area.</p>	
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO166</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	<p>Agree that provision of housing be limited in order to safeguard the landscape character and not detract from urban regeneration.</p> <p>The proposal for 37 houses on Blakedown Nurseries does not safeguard the landscape character.</p> <p>Local affordable need is predominantly for downsizing by the more elderly residents.</p> <p>This does not necessarily require affordable in many instances.</p> <p>Any affordable housing should be "local" i.e. for those residing within the Parish and with strong connections</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The site would need to deliver the level of affordable housing identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. This site has been identified as the most suitable site for this purpose in conjunction with the Parish Council and has been earmarked for future housing needs through previous Adopted Local Plans. In order to deliver the affordable housing, it may be necessary to allow some enabling market housing to make the scheme financially viable.</p>



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>to the Parish</p> <p>What is the validity and status of the Housing Needs Survey?</p> <p>Why is there so much more "need" now compared to when Swan Close was developed?</p> <p>The Survey does not distinguish between "need" and "desirability", is not means tested and therefore is a fundamentally flawed piece of research</p> <p>Any increase in the housing stock will impact on village services, particularly the Primary School.</p> <p>Development should not provide strong visual linkages to the adjacent open space as this would be intrusion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>Any development should have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased traffic</li> <li>• access issues onto Belbroughton Road and increased volumes using Birmingham Road junction</li> <li>• affect on Forge Lane residents/access</li> <li>• loss of on street parking for Belbroughton Road residents</li> <li>• effect on Green Belt - intrusion into countryside, noise and light pollution</li> <li>• potential water runoff into the Pools</li> <li>• effect on existing services (sewerage capacities, etc)</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effect on Primary School intake</li> <li>• continued pressure on Haybridge School</li> <li>• disregard of Parish Plan</li> <li>• disregard of Housing Needs Survey</li> <li>• loss of ribbon development pattern</li> <li>• loss of amenity for neighbouring residents - intrusion into gardens</li> </ul>	
Benson A	<a href="#">SALPO172</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development but must be appropriate and what locals want</li> <li>• increased traffic may need calming measures</li> <li>• appropriate junction to be provided</li> <li>• parking issues for houses opposite site</li> <li>• have regard to parish plan</li> <li>• have regard to housing needs survey - most need was for downsizing</li> <li>• affordable housing should be for local residents only</li> <li>• sustainability - reduced services</li> <li>• effect on local school</li> <li>• contrary to pattern of development i.e. ribbon</li> <li>• effect on adjoining Green Belt and Millennium Green</li> <li>• effect on neighbours</li> <li>• increased light and noise pollution</li> <li>• concerns re sewerage capacity</li> <li>• concerns re surface run-off into pools and brook</li> </ul>	Concerns are noted.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO300</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	Site boundary shown on page 168 is incorrect	Comments are noted. Boundary will be amended.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO312</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	The development of the site will be in line with government policies relating to sustainable economic growth. This land will add to the portfolio of residential sites across the District, is in a highly sustainable location, will produce job creation/retention in the housing sector and will assist in helping to maintain vital Village services/facilities such as shops and community uses.	Comments are noted
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO314</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	On street parking and traffic speeds on Belbroughton Road have been identified by the Parish Council and local residents as an issue. It is hoped the development of this site can go some way to address these existing problems whilst providing sufficient on site provision to maintain this improvement.	Comments are noted
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO317</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	<p>Proposals for the Blakedown Nurseries site will follow the policy requirements relating to design, character, local distinctiveness, tree protection etc. Discussions are taking place with the Parish Council and local residents to identify concerns.</p> <p>The site is considered to be critical to the overall housing strategy and not a Rural Exception site. The small numbers of dwellings proposed on the rural sites is unlikely to detract from urban regeneration. Policy CP04 suggests 30% affordable housing in the rural areas. Viability assessment should only be needed if 30% cannot be met. Some local opposition to affordable housing on site.</p> <p>Proposed residential use will have less traffic impact than when used as commercial nursery and planning</p>	Comments are noted

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			obligations will provide benefits to whole village,	
Morris W	<a href="#">SALPO338</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	Concerned about risk of losing on-road parking space on Belbroughton Road if site is developed and double yellow lines are painted opposite site entrance. Concerns are safety of unloading small children, road speed increasing as parked cars act as traffic calming measure, reduced house price if no parking space, lack of space for visitor parking. Assume if lose parking space outside house we will be compensated with dedicated or permit-based parking.	Comments are noted.
Morris W	<a href="#">SALPO339</a>	Policy 54 - Blakedown Nurseries - (SAL.RS.1)	Concerned that new housing will mean lack of school spaces for local children already resident in village.	Comments are noted. However, the Local Education Authority have not raised any concerns relating to the potential allocation of the site.
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO159</a>	Paragraph 18.3	<p>Questions why this is the preferred site. Suggests land at rear of Rectory - Grosvenor Hall's site as an alternative.</p> <p>Site is too large to be developed in its entirety to meet identified affordable housing need and the detrimental effect on Belbroughton Road, Forge Lane, the adjoining Green Belt and the effect on the village as a whole.</p>	The preferred site is the Area of Development Restraint which was taken out of the Green Belt in order to meet long-term housing need. The Parish Council and District Council have looked together at other sites and the Nurseries site is the only site large enough to meet the need identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. Whilst the site is too large to develop for a 100% affordable housing scheme it does offer the opportunity for enabling market housing to help deliver the level of affordable housing required.
Mellor R	<a href="#">SALPO115</a>	Paragraph 18.3	Concerned that Blakedown School is at capacity and that development of family housing will diminish quality of educational provision in village.	Comments are noted. The Local Education Authority have been consulted at each stage of the document's development and have

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
				not raised any concerns regarding education provision.
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO122</a>	Paragraph 18.3	<p>Questions why this is the preferred site. Suggests land at rear of Rectory or Grosvenor Hall's site as an alternative.</p> <p>Site is too large to be developed in its entirety to meet identified affordable housing need and development will have detrimental effect on Belbroughton Road, Forge Lane, the adjoining Green Belt and the village as a whole.</p>	The preferred site is the Area of Development Restraint which was taken out of the Green Belt in order to meet long-term housing need. The Parish Council and District Council have looked together at other sites and the Nurseries site is the only site large enough to meet the need identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. Whilst the site is too large to develop for a 100% affordable housing scheme it does offer the opportunity for enabling market housing to help deliver the level of affordable housing required.
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO167</a>	Paragraph 18.3	<p>Why is this the preferred site for affordable housing development?</p> <p>What other sites have been considered – land at rear of Rectory, Grosvenor Hall's site?</p> <p>The site is too large to be redeveloped in its entirety for the reasons stated above and the detrimental effect on Belbroughton Road, Forge Lane, the adjoining Green Belt and the effect on the village as a whole</p>	The preferred site is the Area of Development Restraint which was taken out of the Green Belt in order to meet long-term housing need. The Parish Council and District Council have looked together at other sites and the Nurseries site is the only site large enough to meet the need identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey. Whilst the site is too large to develop for a 100% affordable housing scheme it does offer the opportunity for enabling market housing to help deliver the level of affordable housing required.
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO161</a>	Paragraph 18.4	<p>It may be sustainable in terms of access to a shop and railway, but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the retail offer is very limited;</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. However, the site is within 10 minutes walk of rail services to

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• bus services between Kidderminster and Hagley have recently been reduced;</li> <li>• there is no healthcare or other social benefit provision in Blakedown.</li> </ul> <p>Support statement that <i>"Housing to meet local needs is one of the types of development which is identified as being appropriate within villages"</i></p> <p>Such housing provision should have regard to the needs identified at recent Parish and Consultation meetings which appear to be at odds with the results of the Housing Needs Survey.</p> <p>Housing should be for Parish residents or those with strong local connection to the Parish.</p>	<p>Hagley, Kidderminster and Birmingham.</p> <p>The affordable housing provided by the development will be allocated in accordance with the Council's local connections policy. However, any market housing provided on the site would be open market housing and could not be restricted to people with an existing connection to the Parish.</p>
Mellor R	<a href="#">SALPO116</a>	Paragraph 18.4	<p>Does Blakedown have a housing need on this scale? With ageing population, it would make sense to provide bungalows to free up family housing in village. Older residents are also more likely to use local facilities. Traffic and parking in Belbroughton Road is already an issue. High density development would not fit with local area.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The affordable housing element of the site will need to meet the demand identified through the Housing Needs Assessment and will be for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to the area. This will be a condition of planning approval. However, the market element of the site cannot be restricted in the same way.</p> <p>suitable accommodation for elderly to free up family housing.</p>
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO123</a>	Paragraph 18.4	It may be sustainable in terms of access to a shop and	Comments are noted. However, the site is

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			railway, but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the retail offer is very limited;</li> <li>• bus services between Kidderminster and Hagley have recently been reduced;</li> <li>• there is no healthcare or other social benefit provision in Blakedown.</li> </ul> Support statement that <i>"Housing to meet local needs is one of the types of development which is identified as being appropriate within villages"</i>	within 10 minutes walk of rail services to both Hagley, Kidderminster and Birmnigham.
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO168</a>	Paragraph 18.4	It may be sustainable in terms of access to a shop and railway, but:  the retail offering is very limited;  bus services between Kidderminster and Hagley have recently been reduced;  there is no healthcare or other social benefit provision in Blakedown.  I support the statement that <i>"Housing to meet local needs is one of the types of development which is identified as being appropriate within villages"</i>  Such housing provision should have regard to the needs identified at recent Parish and Consultation meetings which appear to be at odds with the results of the Housing Needs Survey.  Housing should be for Parish residents or those with strong local connection to the Parish	Comments are noted. However, the site is within 10 minutes walk of rail services to Hagley, Kidderminster and Birmingham.  The affordable housing provided by the development will be for existing residents or those with a family or employment connection to the area. This will be a condition of planning approval. However, any market housing provided on the site would be open market housing and could not be restricted to people with an existing connection to the Parish.

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO162</a>	Paragraph 8.5	The levels of anti social behaviour are low now that the landowner has properly secured the site.	Comments are noted.
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO124</a>	Paragraph 18.5	The levels of anti social behaviour are low now that the landowner has properly secured the site.	Comments are noted.
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO170</a>	Paragraph 18.5	The levels of anti social behaviour are low now that the landowner has properly secured the site.	Comments are noted.
Mellor P	<a href="#">SALPO164</a>	Paragraph 18.6	<p>The importance of screening the site from car park and Green conflicts with the intention in Policy 54 (d) that " <i>Development should provide strong pedestrian and, where possible, visual linkages to the adjacent open space</i>"</p> <p>The site should also be suitably screened from the paddocks and footpaths near Ladies Pool and Forge Pool to safeguard the Green Belt, not encroach, and protect the amenity of neighbouring residents on Forge Lane and Belbroughton Road who are at risk of being overlooked.</p> <p>For these reasons the existing building lines of Belbroughton Road should be retained and any new development should not extend beyond them.</p>	Comments are noted. Consider further when developing the Publication document.
Mellor R	<a href="#">SALPO117</a>	Paragraph 18.6	Development must be sensitive to its location adjacent to Green Belt with main impact from footpaths and countryside to rear. Low density housing surrounds site and this should be reflected in any development.	Comments are noted.
Mellor Mrs F	<a href="#">SALPO129</a>	Paragraph 18.6	The importance of screening the site from car park and Green conflicts with the intention in Policy 54 (d) that " <i>Development should provide strong pedestrian</i>	Comments are noted. Consider further when developing the Publication document.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p><i>and, where possible, visual linkages to the adjacent open space"</i></p> <p>The site should also be suitably screened from the paddocks and footpaths near Ladies Pool and Forge Pool to safeguard the Green Belt, not encroach, and protect the amenity of neighbouring residents on Forge Lane and Belbroughton Road who are at risk of being overlooked.</p> <p>For these reasons the existing building lines of Belbroughton Road should be retained and any new development should not extend beyond them.</p>	
Butler Mrs S	<a href="#">SALPO171</a>	Paragraph 18.6	<p>The importance of screening the site from car park and Green conflicts with the intention in Policy 54 (d) that “ <i>Development should provide strong pedestrian and, where possible, visual linkages to the adjacent open space</i>”</p> <p>The site should also be suitably screened from the paddocks and footpaths near Ladies Pool and Forge Pool to safeguard the Green Belt, not encroach, and protect the amenity of neighbouring residents on Forge Lane and Belbroughton Road who are at risk of being overlooked.</p> <p>For these reasons the existing building lines of Belbroughton Road should be retained and any new development should not extend beyond them.</p>	Comments are noted. Consider further when developing the Publication document.
Marston's PLC c/o First City Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO7</a>	Policy 55 - Smaller Rural Sites	Suggests that the Cookley ADR, off Kimberlee Avenue, be allocated for affordable local needs	Affordable housing need as identified through the Parish Housing Needs Survey

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			housing. Considers that the site be allocated under Policy 55 in addition to the smaller rural sites already allocated as part of the Preferred Options.	will be met on alternative sites elsewhere in Wolverley and Cookley Parish
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO208</a>	Policy 55 - Smaller Rural Sites	The “development principles” for the Clows Top site look more like policies than supporting narrative and should be incorporated into the Policy. The policy may thus need to be split, so that there are separate policies for each of the two sites	Comments are noted. Consider incorporating the development principles into the policy as suggested.
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO320</a>	Policy 55 - Smaller Rural Sites	Parish Council fully support use of Sebright Road site for affordable housing scheme.	Support is noted
Rock Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO324</a>	Policy 55 - Smaller Rural Sites	Supports the suggested housing site at Clows Top but would like to see the existing approval for 12 dwellings incorporated into a bigger development including the Garage Site and Community Centre Site. Keen to see parking to support local services and a bus layby as the school bus uses this site daily.	Comments are noted. Consider expanding this site as suggested.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">SALPO289</a>	Policy 55 - Smaller Rural Sites	Reference should be made to the WCS and the environmental infrastructure constraints available for this site. For section 18.9 on development principles, development should not come forward until the appropriate environmental infrastructure is in place. Once completed the ‘infrastructure Delivery Plan’ would further inform the phasing and delivery of this site.	Comments are noted. Further work on this particular site will be required in order to overcome drainage issues. Through this consultation process further conversations will be held with the land owners to consider options for this site as a whole.
Moss K	<a href="#">SALPO198</a>	Paragraph 18.8	We support the inclusion of the Terrace site, but only as part of a comprehensive allocation together with the adjacent Clows Top Garage.	Comments are noted. The figures in DS01 are indicative figures to support the housing trajectory. Consider extending the allocation at Clows Top whilst being mindful of cross-

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>The Clows Top Garage is a former petrol filling station, and transport yard. Following the closure of the petrol station the front of the site has been used as a car sales lot, whilst the established uses on the remainder of the site include: HGV storage and commercial vehicle repair and associated uses not wholly compatible with the site's central village location. The 2 sites together previously had permission for residential development subject to s106 obligation to commit to the construction of off site foul and surface sewers to Rock prior to a start on site. Detailed design and approval by Sever Trent was not achieved and the approval lapsed.</p> <p>Clows Top falls within the Rural Areas of the District where further development should only generally be permitted on brownfield sites within defined settlement boundaries or for housing to meet local needs. The proposed scheme at the Terrace is for 12 affordable dwellings and connection to the main sewer is required. This scheme is not viable on its own.</p> <p>The following are potential benefits of a comprehensive approach, but which relies on the allocation of Clows Top Garage for residential development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removal of unattractive buildings and uses associated with former garage and transport yard.</li> <li>- Delivery of a mains drainage solution for benefit of whole village.</li> <li>- Unlocking development of The Terrace and securing</li> </ul>	<p>boundary issues and housing need.</p>

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>formal parking area for Victory Hall, school bus drop off provision, visibility splay at junction and enhanced landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preservation of greenfield site adjacent to Highbrae for potential future growth (site suggested as potential allocation for South Worcestershire).</li> <li>- Provision of mixed tenure housing to meet the needs of the Parish and to help support local shops and businesses.</li> <li>- Potential for further planning gain involving Victory Hall and possible provision of local recycling facilities.</li> </ul> <p>We seek the allocation of the Clows Top Garage site for housing to meet the needs of the local community, together with the necessary enabling development. This should be in addition to the currently proposed allocation of the Terrace site, to ensure that a comprehensive redevelopment can be achieved which will deliver the package of planning gain to the Parish, including the connection of Clows Top to the main drainage network.</p>	
Wolstenholme Miss S	<a href="#">SALPO31</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Once the Lea Castle site has been redeveloped would like to see public access restored to allow access by foot, cycle and horseback.	Comments are noted.
Homes & Communities Agency	<a href="#">SALPO106</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>Details land ownership at the Lea Castle site and highlights the fact that the site has significant estate management costs and is currently seen as a priority for delivery by the HCA as part of the Local Land Initiative.</p> <p>Highlights the Adopted Local Plan employment</p>	Comments are noted and support is welcomed. Continue to involve the HCA in discussions surrounding the most appropriate strategy for the site as the Publication document is developed.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>designation for the site and the fact that no interest has been shown in the site for employment uses since the designation. Also refers to WFDC's 2007 Employment Land Review and the issues raised in that document relating to poor access and general viability. This is reinforce by property advice received from Knight Frank by the then English Partnerships.</p> <p>The landowners welcome the policy proposing a mix of uses as set out within the document but would recommend that C3 (residential use) is added to create a mixed use development.</p> <p>Refers to two surveys which were undertaken in 2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle Hospital Infrastructure Appraisal and Abnormal Costs Review - considered access and traffic, drainage, utilities diversion and re-provision, asbestos removal and demolition issues and costs. Concludes that abnormal costs are between £2.5 and 3.4m.</li> <li>• Transport Assessment - indicates that to be more sustainable in transport terms existing services and infrastructure need to be improved or provided and that a dedicated bus service may be required as part of a travel plan.</li> </ul> <p>Refers to a soft market testing event which was held on 6th May 2011. A small number of developers looked at options for the site and concluded that the site would be a prime site for housing development which would provide the high value needed for</p>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>infrastructure which would not be delivered through an employment use.</p> <p>The developers agreed that the site would be ideal for the following uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exclusive high value private housing development, which would provide ample financial priming to facilitate other types of development to be undertaken alongside and would not conflict with the LDF's residential proposals.</li> <li>• A specialist supported housing development for war veterans using a mix of all the uses identified in the site consultation document together with a small number of C3 (residential use) properties citing examples of a similar development in Birmingham.</li> </ul> <p>The HCA and other land owners are keen to continue working with the Council and other key stakeholders to consider potential development opportunities.</p>	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">SALPO155</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	We would suggest that under the 'Proposals will be permitted providing that...' section you include an additional bullet point requiring developments to enhance on and off-site GI as appropriate and in line with guidance and policy elsewhere.	Comments are noted. Consider that Green Infrastructure issues are addressed in other policies which cover this requirement.
Hovi Developments Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO112</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	The potential of existing sites within the Green Belt, such as Rushock Trading Estate, should be maximised to relieve the pressure for green field take up within rural areas. Their development and enhancement should be anticipated and actively	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			encouraged. Restrictions should not stifle development or enhancement and therefore employment opportunity.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO209</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	This policy relates to three disparate sites. Because they are quite different from each other, each should perhaps be the subject of a separate policy or there should be a general policy for the three Major Developed Sites, followed by a separate policy covering each.	Comments are noted. It is not considered that there is enough detail on each of the sites to make it necessary to have separate policies for each site.
Warwick P	<a href="#">SALPO88</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	As a resident of Cookley, I would like to see the Lea Castle site used for one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hospice</li> <li>• Sheltered Accommodation for Retired People</li> <li>• Respite Care for Disabled People</li> <li>• Managed Woodland for Educational/Recreational Use</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
Huntley Mrs W	<a href="#">SALPO92</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	As the population are living longer there is a greater need for suitable housing for the over 50s and it should consider the need for a hospice, with suitable leisure facilities. The main area is Green Belt which could have a trim trail circuit and the woodland managed properly. Which managed properly could attract more people to the area and increase work and training places for the unemployed.	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
Hurcott Village Management Committee	<a href="#">SALPO94</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Raises concern regarding the impact of development at Lea Castle on the levels of traffic through Hurcott Village. No objection in principle to the development of the site but raises concern about the impact on heavy/speeding traffic through the village where there are high numbers of pedestrians accessing the Nature	Comments are noted. Any new development at Lea Castle will need to be supported by a transport assessment.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			Reserve, poor sightlines and difficult junctions.	
Hill Mrs G	<a href="#">SALPO95</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>Would wish to see the site broken up if possible. Return the green to what is was - swings, cricket pitch and benches. The land directly behind the houses on the left hand side of the Crescent (number one upwards) could then be turned into much needed allotments. The land further on (the old tennis court) and the grassed area in front of it directly in front of Number 10 the Bungalow could be turned into wetland/pool. There is no water on Lea Castle site for wildlife at all but many different species have been seen.</p> <p>The large amount of land which housed the actual hospital would be better split up and sold. Animal charity, Outward Bound type centre, golf club, Woodland Trust or similar, hospice, care homes, new school area, further education area.</p> <p>It would be very nice therefore if the council could give thought to obtaining the land adjacent to the houses and providing some amenities as detailed in the second and third paragraphs.</p> <p>The monies gained from the land are desperately needed due to our national debt so hold out very little hope that the local authority can do much.</p>	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
Barrett Mrs J	<a href="#">SALPO104</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Raises concern over the impact that development at Lea Castle will have on the traffic through Hurcott village.	Comments are noted. Any new development at Lea Castle will need to be supported by a transport assessment.



**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
Nicholls C	<a href="#">SALPO105</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	A public meeting was held in Cookley on 1st July. The District Council's options are quite broad and most ideas fell into these categories. The idea of a hospice was very popular. Also a mini retirement village. Lea Castle residents also put forward the idea of a Center Parc type development utilising the wooded areas and existing accommodation/outward bound training centre. Also under the umbrella of localism residents could manage some of the woodland. Affordable housing was mentioned. The multi-use of the site received favourable comments.	Comments are noted and support and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
West Midlands Safari Park	<a href="#">SALPO306</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>WMSP supports the designation of the Park as a MDS in the Green Belt. However, WMSP <b>objects</b> to the boundary of the West Midlands Safari and Leisure Park – Major Developed Site Boundary as defined on page 175 of the SAPDPD Preferred Options document. RPS consider that the boundary should be the same as the 'Development Envelope' area shown in red on the plan (Figure 1) accompanying these representations. The general principle for the identification of major tourist attractions as major Developed Sites is to include all the main operational areas within the attraction, including buildings, amusement park rides and associated infrastructure, animal enclosures and lakes (where they fall within operational area.)</p> <p>It is considered that other operational land (including the Safari Drive Through), the car parks and the other lakes should also be included within the defined MDS. Given the guidance in Annexe C of PPG2, the designation of these areas would ensure that, by</p>	Comments are noted. Further discussions will need to be held as part of the development of the Publication document and the masterplanning process.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>definition, only development that has no strategic impact on the Green Belt will be permitted without the need to demonstrate very special circumstances. All other forms of inappropriate development would need to follow the normal approach where very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated. This wider designation would not be a blanket designation where all forms of development would be acceptable at all locations within the park. This means that, for example, within the Safari Drive area, the replacement of buildings and structures for animals would not need to demonstrate very special circumstances. However, the intensification of these areas outside the parameters of the MDS would need to demonstrate very special circumstances. This is particularly important at WMSP where animal houses and maintenance buildings need to be upgraded, relocated or replaced, and the MDS designation would provide a framework for this.</p> <p>To assist the Council in defining the boundary of the MDS, RPS has carried out a detailed analysis of several similar-sized visitor attractions that are MDSs in the Green Belt. These are attached for the Council's consideration.</p> <p>Outside of the areas currently proposed as MDS in the SAPDPD, the parts of the Park that should be included in the defined area are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Safari Drive Through/other operational areas;</li> <li>(ii) Car park; and,</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>(iii) Lakes and other water features.</p> <p><i>(i) Safari Drive Through/Other operational areas</i>                      The Safari Drive Through and other operational areas have been excluded in the MDS area shown in the SAPDPD. This boundary, drawn tightly around the Amusement Park, Spring Grove House and the Discovery Trail areas is a very different approach to that taken at other major visitor attractions in the Green Belt, where in every case, all operational areas associated with the attraction are included within the MDS.</p> <p>In the case of Chessington World of Adventures, all operational areas that customers pay to visit are within the MDS boundary, including animal enclosures, footpaths, incidental landscaping and service areas. No part of the operational visitor attraction has been excluded.</p> <p>At Thorpe Park, the enclosed area goes well beyond the operational areas (all of which are included), to include all the lakes, undeveloped land under the same ownership, parking areas, the associated farm and watersports areas. In the case of WMSP, we would not argue that the undeveloped/non-operational areas should be included as is the case at Thorpe Park.</p> <p>At Drayton Manor the Council has included all operational areas of the theme park and zoo, which includes all animal enclosures, footways, incidental</p>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>landscaping and service areas. Areas of parkland that are undeveloped and do not form part of the paid attraction are excluded, but these would in our view be separate planning units in any event.</p> <p>At Legoland, the entire enclosed area of the visitor attraction is included within the MDS, including all incidental open space, lakes, pathways and servicing areas. Only the access road and car parks are excluded.</p> <p>At Camelot Theme Park, the MDS again includes the entire enclosed area of the attraction, including all open areas, service areas, car parks, the adjoining hotel and undeveloped overflow car parks.</p> <p><i>(ii) Car Park</i> Some of the theme parks reviewed have car parks which are included within their designated MDS boundary. Thorpe Park and Camelot both have all parking areas included within their respective MDS boundaries. Where local planning authorities have chosen to exclude car parks from the MDS, it is clear that it is due to the nature of the parking surface and the level of physical detachment from the parks. In the case of Chessington World of Adventures, the car parks are physically detached from the visitor attraction site and are located on a separate strip of land north of the main park. In the case of Drayton Manor, the surfaced car parks have been included, but the overflow car parks (which are not fully surfaced and are on separate parcels of land</p>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>separated by hedgerows), are excluded. At Legoland, as can be seen from the aerial photographs, the car parks are physically detached from the main attraction, occupying a distinct and separate piece of land.</p> <p>In the case of WMSP, the car parks are a significant developed part of the site that is integral and not physically separated from the rest of the site, and the inclusion of these areas within the MDS will provide a framework for similar development.</p> <p><i>(ii) Lakes</i> Although the Hippo Lake is included within the proposed MDS, the Boating Lake and the lake adjacent to the Amusement Park have both been excluded.</p> <p>All of the six theme parks reviewed included lakes. Most of these lakes occupy significant proportions of the park in question particularly the core area of Thorpe Park which is surrounded by lakes and where the lakes take up well over 50% of the land area, and the American Adventure, where the lake represents almost 50% of the land area. All of the lakes at all six attractions have been included within MDS boundaries as they are seen as integral features of the parks, whether operational or not. There are no Green Belt reasons why the lakes should be excluded as the development potential of water bodies is limited, but as with the previous two considerations above, it helps if the entire site can be considered comprehensively,</p>	

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>especially where they are entirely surrounded by the operational attraction. There appears to be no reason why the lakes are excluded in the case of WMSP but are not excluded at all other comparable Green Belt visitor attractions.</p> <p>In the light of the information outlined above, it is considered that the case for defining the boundary of the WMSP MDS is strong in the context of planning policy and other considerations, and in particular on the basis of the way that MDS policy has been interpreted consistently by other councils across the UK which have attractions of a comparable scale to WMSP. We therefore request that the plan on page 175 be amended accordingly. We confirm that we would be happy to meet with the Council to assist in the process of defining the exact boundary.</p>	
Crampton Mrs L	<a href="#">SALPO297</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Raises concern about development at the Lea Castle site causing additional traffic within Hurcott Village. The roads are single track and are already use as a short cut, concern that this will be increased raising concerns over road safety.	Comments are noted. Any new development at the former Lea Castle Hospital site will need to be supported by a transport assessment.
Residents of The Crescent	<a href="#">SALPO298</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>Identifies a number of uses for the site which the local residents consider to be suitable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recreational use</li> <li>• educational use i.e. Outward Bound</li> <li>• older persons residential retirement type village</li> <li>• hospice</li> <li>• health services - i.e. rehabilitation for military personnel</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.

**Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper**

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cemetery/crematorium</li> <li>• use by animal charity</li> <li>• a centre parks type development / wildlife</li> <li>• ownership of a small area by the Crescent residents based on locally owned and led community type Big Society idealisms</li> <li>• golf courses</li> </ul> <p>Identifies some use which are considered to be inappropriate for the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prison</li> <li>• place for asylum seekers or migrants</li> <li>• social housing</li> </ul> <p>Raises some additional questions relating to the site.</p>	
Brice Miss E	<a href="#">SALPO291</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>Suggestions for possible uses of Lea Castle site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recreation &amp; leisure facilities e.g. activity/pioneer centre; environmental centre or nature reserve; children's farm</li> <li>• hospice</li> <li>• sheltered care facility - retirement village</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
Jones C	<a href="#">SALPO293</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>Suggestions for site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hospice</li> <li>• Pay &amp; play golf course</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
Morgan D	<a href="#">SALPO295</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	Suggests that development at this site needs to be private sector led and that large scale B1/B2/B8 development would not be viable because of the preference for an Enterprise Zone centred around the	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an

### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			<p>Sugar Beet site. Suggests small scale bespoke offices or live-work units.</p> <p>Supports institutional residential and a small private sports facility could be built in association with this.</p> <p>Suggests best commercial return would be from 30 high value homes in woodland setting. Could also provide some affordable homes in Cookley as part of the development.</p> <p>Suggests that an economic appraisal is undertaken for "Cookley Crescent Hamlet" a domestic scale, mixed-use, environmentally friendly scheme.</p>	appropriate scheme is made.
Swift J	<a href="#">SALPO292</a>	Policy 56 - Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt	<p>Possible uses for Lea castle site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• activity/outward bound centre</li> <li>• nature reserve</li> <li>• sheltered village for the elderly</li> <li>• hospice</li> <li>• cemetery</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision on an appropriate scheme is made.
Hovi Developments Ltd	<a href="#">SALPO113</a>	Paragraph 19.4	It is extremely important that this site is safeguarded for employment uses and development is actively encouraged. The site description is generally considered to be an accurate reflection of the existing site and its potential for continued development, albeit within the accepted constraints of the existing defined estate boundary.	Comments are noted and support is welcomed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO210</a>	Paragraph 19.5	This site although well screened constitutes an exception to the openness of the Green Belt. Ideally would like to see it restored to agriculture but probably	Comments are noted. Any redevelopment of the site will be limited to the extent of the footprint of the existing development in



### Appendix 3: Summary of Responses received to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation Paper

Name	ID	Section	Summary	Officer Response
			not feasible. Otherwise, would wish to see no intensification of development, preferably less intensification. Should be explicitly stated that housing will not be allowed in the plan period	accordance with PPG2.
Meakin C	<a href="#">SALPO1</a>	Paragraph 19.7	The percentages of ownership add up to 103% plus. Figures must be inaccurate.	Comments are noted. Check percentage figures and update with correct figures in the Publication document.
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	<a href="#">SALPO319</a>	Paragraph 19.9	Parish Council agree with the proposed mix of uses suggested for the former Lea Castle site. In addition, a public meeting was held and the following uses were suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mini retirement village</li> <li>• hospice</li> <li>• Center Parc type development</li> <li>• outward bound training centre</li> <li>• small section for affordable housing</li> <li>• sheltered accommodation</li> <li>• swimming pool</li> <li>• allotments</li> <li>• localism - areas of the site could be managed by local people for the benefit of the local community.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and support and suggestions are welcomed. The proposed uses will be discussed with Councillors and the owners of the site before a final decision is made on an appropriate scheme.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">SALPO211</a>	Paragraph 19.10	Proposed treatment of this site is appropriate but boundary needs to be carefully considered in consultation with site owners	Comments are noted.
Barratt Homes	<a href="#">SALPO318</a>	Jargon Guide	Jargon Guide defines greenfield land as "Land which has never been developed..." Site contained offices, retail shop, hardstandings, greenhouses etc. so should not fall into this category.	Comments are noted however, the site is categorised as greenfield land by virtue of its previous horticultural use.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1087</a>	Boddice M	Site is hidden, will give Travellers privacy and has site roads in place.	These comments are noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS186</a>	Coventry & Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust	Coventry & Warwickshire Partnership NHS Trust is one of landowners of Lea Castle Hospital together with HCA and Secretary of State for Health - currently discussing comprehensive redevelopment of site for mixed uses with WFDC.	Comments are noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1602</a>	Department of Health	Secretary of State for Health is one of landowners of Lea Castle Hospital together with HCA and Coventry & Warwickshire NHS Partnership Trust - currently discussing comprehensive redevelopment of site for mixed uses with WFDC.	Comments are noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS254</a>	Durden J	My main concern regarding the proposed Lea Castle site is road safety, particularly pedestrian safety whilst negotiating the busy A449 to reach Cookley village school and shops.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1511</a>	Hackett Mr	I know we need to accommodate these itinerates however this location is entirely inappropriate.	Objection is noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1274</a>	Hall R	Lea Castle hospital site although in a green site area does have some redundant building like Sion Hill. But has no bus route and local shops	Comments are noted.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			for the travellers or a local school.	<p>Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1601</a>	Homes & Communities Agency	<p>HCA is one of the major landowners of the Lea Castle Hospital Site (alongside the Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Partnership Trust and the Department of Health).</p> <p>HCA has not promoted one of the potential uses of the site as being Traveller Pitch Provision.</p> <p>The HCA is responsible for administering Traveller Pitch funding, however, the site has not been identified as a "firm site" as part of the Affordable Homes Programme 2011-2015.</p> <p>HCA will continue to work with Council in respect of future use of the site and its role in wider</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Whilst the Core Strategy indicates a preference for previously developed sites, given the difficulty in finding suitable sites for such development it is sometimes necessary to look beyond previously developed sites.</p> <p>The District Council will continue to work with the HCA to look at future uses for the Lea Castle site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>regeneration of District.</p> <p>Consultation document states that any pitch provision at Lea Castle would be as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site; potential to provide pitches later in plan period; Council may wish to revisit technical work to inform future pitch provision beyond 2017 (Core Strategy has pitch requirement of 23 units up to 2017); Core Strategy indicates preference for previously developed sites within existing settlement boundaries.</p>	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS743</a>	Ivins E	Cookley primary school is already full to capacity.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1243</a>	Jennings N	Site will not come forward soon enough for our needs	Comment is noted and will need to be understood when a decision on allocation is made.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1388</a>	Moss K	Lea Castle Hospital is also in Green Belt, but previously developed and requires the demolition of extensive existing buildings at unknown cost. The site owners- The HCA have an aspiration for a mixed-use scheme (including	Comments are noted. Any future pitch provision on this site would need to be undertaken as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site. This is recognised in the Baker report and identifies that the site

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			residential albeit not in accordance with Policy) and the site is allocated for a business park. Whilst it is recognised that a gypsy or traveller site could form part of a mixed use site the impact on land values of the residual uses could prevent the site coming forward for this purpose. It is likely that the planning and developer selection process could be protracted and delivery delayed.	should, if considered to be acceptable, be phased for later in the plan period.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS883</a>	Perrin R	Considers that the Lea Castle site is better than the Sion Hill site because it is currently un-used, is brownfield, is fairly close to Cookley facilities, is capable of being screened and would have little impact on the small number of nearby properties. A site could be included as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of this site.	Support for the development of Lea Castle site is noted. Any scheme within this location would need to be considered as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of this site.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1306</a>	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent Water has a major operational reservoir to the west of the proposed development boundary but is not currently aware of any negative impacts which could arise from the proposal. There will be below ground assets associated with the reservoir and Severn Trent wish to continue to be consulted in order to ensure that assets are not built over.	Comments relating to this site are noted. Severn Trent will continue to be consulted on any future allocations of this site. Severn Trent would also be consulted on any planning application that came forward on this site in the future.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1480</a>	Smith C	They will turn a wonderful part of the country into a tip.	Objection is noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1548</a>	Sparrow V	I have no strong feelings either way. I do however object to the term Gypsy being applied	Comments are noted. It is noted that Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			to travellers, they are 2 separate entities.	three distinct communities. However, the Government's Draft PPS on Planning for Travellers includes a definition of traveller which combines those for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (Please refer to paras 3.7 -3.9 of the Draft Circular)
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1402</a>	Wakefield D J	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises concerns about safety and the effect on the right of way as well as the fact that the Gypsies would rather extend the existing sites in Stourport-on-Severn.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS904</a>	Ward H	Raises a number of concerns relating to the Lea Castle site including the cost of developing the site being met by tax payers, where the Gypsies horses will be accommodated, the site being so far away from facilities when people will only stay for a short time, how much people using the site will pay, concern that houses will be devalued and difficult to sell, and the possibility of an increased number of youths on the streets in the evening.	<p>Concerns are noted. It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1510</a>	Worcestershire County Council, Schools Information and Planning Section	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The proposed site in Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn are in areas where additional pupils could be accommodated within existing schools. The proposed sites in Kidderminster would add to the pressure on places and for this reason the Local Authority would have reservations about these sites being progressed.</p>	Information relating to school place availability is welcomed and will be used to inform any further decisions relating to the allocation of sites.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1125</a>	Worcestershire County Council Property Services	Worcestershire County Council owns a leasehold building on the site being the former Park Gate School. It is unclear at this stage whether any part of the Council's property would be affected by the proposal. The potential for future development of the overall site for employment or other uses may make allocation of part of the site for a travellers site inappropriate.	These comments are noted. The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS797</a>	Adams G	Objects because Cookley village is too small to	The objections to the use of this site for

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			support a Gypsy site, the roads and bus services as well as local amenities and schools will not support the site.	traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1145</a>	Aldridge D	Fears that development would sterilise rest of site, devalue local housing and fears that waste material would be stored on site	<p>Objections are noted. The Gypsy and Traveller use will need to be considered as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Any businesses operating from the site would be required to obtain planning permission.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1103</a>	Aldridge K	Site should be used for good of local community. Travellers site would blight rest of site. Use site to full potential - homes and starter businesses	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS582</a>	Ali K	<p>Strongly object to Lea Castle for the following reasons:</p> <p>Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to major roads or public transport is poor. Axborough Lane would be totally unsuitable for caravans and equipment used. There are also problems on the road south of the proposed site and development could potentially increase the traffic and cause considerable stress on the road network.</li> </ul> <p>Access to local services and social contact with residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major problems on the site with regard to provision of services (Water, Electricity, Drainage) The tunnels need to be</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to service provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>blocked and protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires removal of asbestos.</li> <li>• The community would be far from its associates in Stourport-on-Severn, where I am led to believe they would prefer to be located.</li> <li>• No shops, doctors or dentists in safe walking distance.</li> <li>• Need for increase in policing a wider community at further expense.</li> </ul> <p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to reach the local services is problematic as public transport is not available.</li> <li>• Integration with the local community will be difficult.</li> <li>• Impact heavily on the local general practice, other health services.</li> <li>• Local school facility not able to cope with additional numbers.</li> <li>• Additional cost of special needs teachers and learning support assistants and extra-tuition to catch up.</li> <li>• There is no flat ground surface except for the local football pitch.</li> </ul> <p>Other Issues</p>	<p>The development and sustainability of the site will need to be considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The Site Allocations &amp; Policies Preferred Options Paper included an outline policy in relation to the future land uses at Lea Castle</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the visual and acoustic privacy because of the proposed high density, which would change the environment quite dramatically and impact negatively to its natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The size of the community which is expected to settle at Lea Castle will cause a considerable imbalance in the proportion when compared to the present community.</li> <li>• Is not at the edge of a large town and the area where it is sited to walk home at night is risky for this particular community and also the host community.</li> <li>• The joint residential/commercial community of this proposal makes it incompatible to the local environment and the existing population.</li> <li>• The provision of mains water, electricity, drainage and sanitation would be a very expensive exercise for the District Council which eventually would have an impact on the tax for the local community.</li> <li>• Applied for an extension at house in Green Belt and it took five years to obtain an agreement because of the planning issues raised.</li> <li>• Cost of developing site is prohibitive - requires water, sewage, electricity and gas connection but also the removal of</li> </ul>	<p>Hospital which is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, this includes a mix of uses centred around employment and business. It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>The proposed alternative use for the site is noted.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>risks posed by the dilapidated buildings, ducts and asbestos etc. There would also be an additional cost for the provision of schools for specific religions, transport for children to and from school, provision of special needs for children.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are many people that use the local lanes for walking, jogging, cycling and horse riding etc. Clearly there is a danger for those users because of the above proposal.</li> <li>• The long term development of Lea Castle has an important role in providing local employment particularly in the current economic cycle. The above recommendation will jeopardise this aim severely.</li> <li>• Proposal will blight the area.</li> <li>• A better and more suitable suggestion for the area is to develop it into a retirement village.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS570</a>	Ali M	<p>Strongly object to Lea Castle for the following reasons:</p> <p>Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to major roads or public transport is poor. Axborough Lane would be totally unsuitable for caravans and equipment</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>used. There are also problems on the road south of the proposed site and development could potentially increase the traffic and cause considerable stress on the road network.</p> <p>Access to local services and social contact with residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major problems on the site with regard to provision of services (Water, Electricity, Drainage) The tunnels need to be blocked and protected.</li> <li>• Requires removal of asbestos.</li> <li>• The community would be far from its associates in Stourport, where I am led to believe they would prefer to be located.</li> <li>• No shops, doctors or dentists in safe walking distance.</li> <li>• Need for increase in policing a wider community at further expense.</li> </ul> <p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to reach the local services is problematic as public transport is not available.</li> <li>• Integration with the local community will be difficult.</li> <li>• Impact heavily on the local general</li> </ul>	<p>full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to service provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The development and sustainability of the site will need to be considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>practice, other health services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local school facility not able to cope with additional numbers.</li> <li>• Additional cost of special needs teachers and learning support assistants and extra-tuition to catch up.</li> <li>• There is no flat ground surface except for the local football pitch.</li> </ul> <p>Other Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the visual and acoustic privacy because of the proposed high density, which would change the environment quite dramatically and impact negatively to its natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The size of the community which is expected to settle at Lea Castle will cause a considerable imbalance in the proportion when compared to the present community.</li> <li>• Is not at the edge of a large town and the area where it is sited to walk home at night is risky for this particular community and also the host community.</li> <li>• The joint residential/commercial community of this proposal makes it incompatible to the local environment and the existing population.</li> </ul>	<p>planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The Site Allocations &amp; Policies Preferred Options Paper included an outline policy in relation to the future land uses at Lea Castle Hospital which is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, this includes a mix of uses centred around employment and business. It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>The proposed alternative use for the site is noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of mains water, electricity, drainage and sanitation would be a very expensive exercise for the District Council which eventually would have an impact on the tax for the local community.</li> <li>• Applied for an extension at house in Green Belt and it took five years to obtain an agreement because of the planning issues raised.</li> <li>• Cost of developing site is prohibitive - requires water, sewage, electricity and gas connection but also the removal of risks posed by the dilapidated buildings, ducts and asbestos etc. There would also be an additional cost for the provision of schools for specific religions, transport for children to and from school, provision of special needs for children.</li> <li>• There are many people that use the local lanes for walking, jogging, cycling and horse riding etc. Clearly there is a danger for those users because of the above proposal.</li> <li>• The long term development of Lea Castle has an important role in providing local employment particularly in the current economic cycle. The above recommendation will jeopardise this aim severely.</li> <li>• Proposal will blight the area.</li> <li>• A better and more suitable suggestion for</li> </ul>	

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			the area is to develop it into a retirement village.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS847</a>	Allen G	Wish to see site used for something else.	Objection is noted - ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site
Object	<a href="#">GTTS990</a>	Anderson J	<p>I would like to object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people</li> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity</li> <li>• Cookley Doctors surgery is nearly full to capacity</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot any shops from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site lies between two busy and fast flowing roads, the a449 and a451</li> <li>• There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site that must be</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			protected	Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS995</a>	Anderson M	<p>I would like to object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people</li> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity</li> <li>• Cookley Doctors surgery is nearly full to capacity</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot any shops from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site lies between two busy and fast flowing roads, the a449 and A451</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site that must be protected</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS987</a>	Anderson P	<p>I would like to object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people</li> <li>Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity</li> <li>Cookley Doctors surgery is nearly full to capacity</li> <li>There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>There is no safe route by foot any shops from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site</li> <li>The Lea Castle site lies between two</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>busy and fast flowing roads, the a449 and A451</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site that must be protected</li> </ul>	<p>process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1289</a>	Anton N	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is situated between two main roads which are very busy and cut the site off from the surrounding area giving no safe pedestrian route to local amenities.	The objection to the use of this site for Gypsies and Travellers is noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS459</a>	Armer M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the school is full. Also the site is within the Green Belt and an area of outstanding natural beauty so shouldn't be used for this type of development.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, under national planning policy a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS463</a>	Armer M	<p>Access to site unsafe as it leads to busy road, Cookley School and surgery full, habitat of wildlife at Lea Castle site will be disturbed. Planning for site totally unforgivable, as we had to put 3 applications for our garage to be built and pay 3 times.</p> <p>It will become an eyesore for these people to be allowed to live on this site, and why should we have to have our properties which we have worked very hard for be devalued. No, No, No.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1370</a>	Arnold L	Site should be used for good of existing local community	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site
Object	<a href="#">GTTS800</a>	Ashcroft M	I know these people need somewhere but they do not look after where they are put. But you always get a few bad which makes it bad for the good ones. They do what most people do and work and make homes for their self	Objections are noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1426</a>	Ashford K	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site suggesting it is too large and using part of the site will blight the remainder. Suggest smaller sites which are better to accommodate the need to eliminate the risk of sites spreading illegally.</p> <p>Suggests Lea Castle should be used for reasonably priced housing targeted at over 50s.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The redevelopment of the site will need to be undertaken on a comprehensive basis and the constraints and opportunities fully understood. Sites being considered are of a variety of sizes.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for the site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1464</a>	Ashford P	<p>Existing building footprint is large; internal roads unsuitable; underground tunnels weak and unsafe. Proposal would blight rest of site and fear unauthorised encampments; costs of purchasing, clearing and servicing site would be prohibitive for this kind of use. Retirement village would be more realistic. Impact on house prices in 3/4 miles radius.</p> <p>The Lodge, bordering on the footpath off Axborough is a Grade II Listed Building recently greatly improved to Grade II standards. No warning of possible traveller pitches.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The site will need to be considered for comprehensive redevelopment and the opportunities and constraints that the site provides need to be fully understood. The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The alternative use for the site for a retirement</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				village is noted.  It should be noted that Axborough Lodge is not a Listed Building
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1428</a>	Atkins P	Objects to the Lea Castle site arguing that it is not government policy to find sites and that they do not pay council tax.	Objections are noted.  The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.  Residents of sites pay Council Tax.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1429</a>	Atkins S	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the A449 poses a safety risk to people trying to access services and facilities in Cookley village.	Objection is noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1552</a>	Babbs M	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1468</a>	Bailey F	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of concerns over the capacity of the school and the security of the public footpath.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS994</a>	Bailey J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no evidence that it is a traditional stopping place for travellers, the primary school and doctors are full, there is no safe pedestrian route to the village, there is no bus route from the site, the site is bounded by 2 major roads, the public footpath would need to be screened, noise pollution and waste need to be considered, heavy traffic could expose the asbestos ducting, and it will have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wildlife.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the immediate environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of the site will need to take into account the potential existence of asbestos and ensure that any proposals are safe.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1410</a>	Baker A	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises questions about why Austcliffe Park is restricted to 11 month occupancy when the Gypsy site will be 12 month occupancy.	Objections to the use of Lea Castle for Gypsies/Travellers is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS258</a>	Baldwin K	Raises objection to both the Lea Castle Hospital and Sion Hill sites for a number of reasons, including cost, access to local services, accident blackspots.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1184</a>	Baldwin T	Do not think the area is appropriate for a gypsy site. Local services are struggling with existing population. Concerned that numbers cannot be limited.	Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS988</a>	Banks J	<p>I would like to object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people</li> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity</li> <li>• Cookley Doctors surgery is nearly full to capacity</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot any shops from the Lea Castle site</li> <li>• There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site lies between two busy and fast flowing roads, the a449 and a451</li> <li>• There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site that must be protected</li> <li>• There is no provision or opportunity for the safe housing of gypsy and traveller horses/livestock.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1079</a>	Bareford D	<p>Objects on the basis that Cookley is the most deprived rural ward in Worcestershire and therefore the site should be used to attract employment in accordance with the current Local Plan. Raises concern that by allowing 10 acres of the site to be used for Gypsies, it risks there is a risk that businesses will not locate on the remainder of the 100 acre site. Unemployment leads to crime and anti-social behaviour and these problems will get worse and if the rest of the site was to remain vacant, there would almost certainly be unplanned expansion from the 15 pitches.</p> <p>Believes it is criminal that the site did not remain as a village for people with learning difficulties.</p>	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1385</a>	Bareford L	Lea Castle is not a traditional stopping site for travellers. District already has more than fair share of sites	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1472</a>	Barker K	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the school is already full and there is no safe	Objections are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			pedestrian routes to the village and the site lies on two main roads. Raises concern about the ducts posing a risk to children.	<p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1437</a>	Barnell R	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the local school and surgery are already full, the travellers will dominate the local community and the proposals will not bring employment.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use of the site to provide employment is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1073</a>	Barratt B	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• The future use is restricted to B1.</li> <li>• A small site should be used, the Lea Castle site could grow to 210 pitches and over 1000 people, there is potential for the site to grow unnoticed.</li> <li>• Existing buildings will need to be cleared and this will be costly.</li> <li>• The ducts feed directly into Broadwaters and are lagged with asbestos.</li> <li>• It could prejudice employment uses on any remaining land.</li> <li>• There is a public right of way through the site.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal does not meet the following guidelines set out within Circular 01/2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt - inappropriate development in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Sustainability - it is not sustainable for housing development so it should not be considered for a Gypsy site. It is the</li> </ul>	<p>The Lea Castle site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>furthest site from current Gypsy provision in Stourport-on-Severn and there is no historical connection to the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure - Park Gate Road is a busy cut through between 2 'A' roads and this makes walking very dangerous. The school and doctors are over subscribed.</li> <li>• The site is isolated and the 15 pitches would dominate the neighbouring area.</li> <li>• Current Gypsy Provision: provides a table setting out provision across the Midlands which shows that Worcestershire provide the most pitches. Suggests joint working with other authorities so that there is a greater choice of land that is not Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests the Lea Castle site should be used for employment, residential institutions or sports facilities in accordance with the current development plan document. Suggests it could also be a rehabilitation centre or a hospice.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1121</a>	Barratt J	Green Belt with woodland, flora and fauna; no history of travellers in area; no limiting boundary to site; doctors and schools in village are full; no safe route by foot to village services; no bus routes; buildings and ducts contain asbestos; would prejudice employment opportunities for local community; public right of way crosses site; concerned there is no pressing need for site;	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			previously deemed unsustainable for residential use; traveller sites should be set around existing developments - this would dominate the local community; Baker Report did not put site in its top 5 shortlisted sites - these sites should be consulted on; important to protect needs of local community - suggest more appropriate uses would be outward bound activity centre, rehabilitation centre, retirement complex, nature reserve or service training centre.	specifically on local service capacity issues.  The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site
Object	<a href="#">GTTS746</a>	Beeston J	Cookley school is full to capacity.	Objection is noted.  The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS868</a>	Bell J	Green Belt - local community should have right to decide on development; Local Plan allocated for employment;  How was no. of pitches calculated?  Local schools and doctors full; protection of public footpath?	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. Local community have been consulted as part of this process

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			How much will it all cost and who will pay?	<p>and as part of the Site Allocations and Policies consultation which provides the opportunity to consider future land uses.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. This is what has been undertaken in Wyre Forest.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1117</a>	Bell J	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle Site due to its location in the Green Belt suggest that the land is either:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fit for residential development - in which case it should be offered as such, giving</li> </ol>	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>anyone of any race equal opportunity to make appropriate use of it, or,</p> <p>2. Not fit for residential development - as already decided by this council, in which case it is not appropriate for residential usage by people of any race or background.</p> <p>Raises concerns in relation to the clearance of the site and the costs.</p>	<p>which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS912</a>	Bennett S	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site as it will have a detrimental impact on the landscape, the archaeological interest of the site, and the flora and fauna and will reduce property values.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1307</a>	Beresford A	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1309</a>	Beresford A	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1304</a>	Beresford M	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS951</a>	Biggs K	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that Cookley is already the most deprived rural ward in Worcestershire, thousands of jobs have been lost over the years, it is not practical to convert the site into something which does not benefit the community, the site is in the Green Belt, the roads are busy making it unsafe to walk, the local schools are full and there are limited amenities. Feels that the site would be better used for employment use.</p> <p>Argues that travellers prefer to live near to existing travelling community and they do not show a preference for relocating to Lea Castle or Sion Hill, surely it is better to develop where they want to live rather than force them to relocate.</p> <p>Lea Castle and Sion Hill sites should only be developed to increase local employment and education.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. The comments regarding the use of the site to increase employment opportunities are noted and will need to be considered when a decision on the allocation of the site as a whole is made.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>throughout the District and Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS604</a>	Biggs M	<p>Questions the requirement for 43 pitches as it is not clear in the Baker Report where this number comes from. Feels that more clarification is required on this matter, particularly as the MP has said the area already has more pitches than it needs to have. Quotes the Baker Report which suggests it may be worthwhile revisiting the technical evidence underpinning the pitch requirements and suggests that this is done.</p> <p>Refers to recent planning applications and argues that this should bring down the number of pitches required but this has not been made clear at the public meetings.</p> <p>Refers to the Government review on policy for Gypsies and Travellers and argues that this should be used as a basis to reduce pitch numbers. Questions where the evidence is for the additional pitches. Questions why Green Belt sites are being considered when this is contrary to guidance. Questions why the Baker report dismissed some Green Belt sites and not others.</p>	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Questions why Lea Castle is being considered when the Local Plan allocates it for employment use. The Local Development Framework should build upon previous decisions.</p> <p>Suggests the Council wait until the Localism Bill is adopted to make their decision.</p>	<p>recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement. Furthermore, Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS261</a>	Biggs Y	<p>In summary my objections are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change of use within the local plan, directly against local opinion and therefore undemocratic.</li> <li>2. Loss of much needed employment and potential +14 yrs education opportunities, Cookley identified as the most deprived area in Worcestershire (OCSI)</li> <li>3. Green Belt</li> <li>4. Inadequate road infrastructure</li> <li>5. The travellers themselves wish to live within their own established communities</li> <li>6. Unsuitability of sites taking into account the requirements of the travelling community e.g. shops, schools (Cookley School &amp; St Oswald's Primary Schools are full and operating within small First School sites).</li> </ol>	Noted. The site is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and the emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD proposes to take it forward for comprehensive redevelopment which focuses on employment generating uses. Any proposals for pitch provision that may come forward should be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1528</a>	Billingsley L	There is no safe route to Cookley shops from Lea Castle.	Objection is noted. The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1543</a>	Bishop P	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises the issue of the 11 month occupancy restriction on Austcliffe Park.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS462</a>	Blakemore L	Objects to the Lea Castle site and feels that the site should be used to bring employment to the	Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site, to bring in

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			area and that a Gypsy site would make the remainder of the land undesirable to a developer. The site is within the Green Belt. The village school and surgery are oversubscribed and the village is the most deprived rural area in Worcestershire in terms of employment, education and health, therefore Lea Castle would be better used for leisure development, health services etc.	employment to a deprived area. The comprehensive redevelopment of the site will need to take into account the potential uses that may be appropriate within this location.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, under national planning policy a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS465</a>	Blakemore N	Cookley Primary School is always full to capacity.	Objections are noted as are the concerns about capacity at the school. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS344</a>	Blick S	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No previous evidence of people in area (GTTS).</li> <li>2. Denies opportunity to develop site for effective and sound economic purposes.</li> <li>3. Green Belt area.</li> <li>4. Cookley village services over-subscribed (School and GP).</li> <li>5. Too costly to prepare and develop site.</li> <li>6. Isolated are for public transport.</li> <li>7. Major concerns re asbestos on site.</li> </ol>	Objections are noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site for economic purposes.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>8. Poor road infrastructure and busy local roads.</p>	<p>of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered when any redevelopment of the site is proposed.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS83</a>	Blount R	<p>Objects to the use of the Lea Castle Hospital Site for Gypsy and Traveller provision: it will be costly; no bus service and local school is full; side roads need widening; underground services? Considers a feasibility study is required to cost the whole project.</p>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1516</a>	Bloy S	The school and doctors surgery are already too full and the roads are now very busy, it would be dangerous for the young and old alike.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1418</a>	Bough D	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the A449 is too busy, suggests the site should be used for housing.	Objections to the use of Lea Castle are noted as is the proposed suggested alternative use. However, it should be noted that the suggested alternative would have the same potential constraints (busy A449) as outlined as objections to the use of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1416</a>	Bough M	Objects to the Lea Castle site and suggests it should be used for social housing.	Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople is noted as is the suggested alternative use.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS342</a>	Bowman J K	I wish to register my objections to the proposal to use Lea Castle site for travelling people on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site is situated between two very fast and busy main roads, namely the A449 and the A451.</li> <li>2. The local primary school is already full.</li> <li>3. This is an area of natural beauty with</li> </ul>	Objections are noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>various plants and wild animals in residence.</p> <p>4. There is already provision at Stourport-on-Severn for travellers themselves are happy to live there.</p> <p>5. The site is totally unsuitable for use this kind.</p>	<p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District, including sites in Stourport-on-Severn.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS336</a>	Bowman M A	I wish to object to the proposal to use Lea Castle site for Travelling Showpeople on the following grounds:	Objections are noted. The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The local primary school is full.</li> <li>• The site itself is not in a secure state for children.</li> <li>• The lifestyle of travelling people is such that it would cause a nuisance to local residents with smoke and fires.</li> <li>• The site is situated between two very fast and busy main roads, namely the A449 and the A451.</li> <li>• A site, with room for expansion is available in Stourport.</li> </ul>	<p>statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1168</a>	Branson S	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS66</a>	Brice Miss E	Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital site being used for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. A huge site - the remainder of the site would become unsalable. Will deny Cookley residents of more suitable future developments that would bring local employment opportunities. Also damage caused to the Green Belt area and rich variety of wildlife. Impossible to manage this site effectively.	Objection is noted. However any gypsy pitch provision on the site would need to be considered as part of a wider redevelopment including a mix of uses and a focus on employment for this Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS67</a>	Brice Miss E	New population would radically overwhelm the Cookley community - any further influx of children would be detrimental. Raises concerns re capacity of Cookley Primary School.	These concerns are noted. However, it should be noted that a maximum of 15 pitches has been suggested for this site which would equate to 15 families. It is therefore not considered that this relatively small population would radically overwhelm the Cookley village community. Worcestershire County Council has been consulted as the Local Education Authority in relation to school capacity issues in the area and we await their comments.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS68</a>	Brice Miss E	Lea Castle site is blatantly too large. Local amenities and services would be inadequate.	It should be noted that a maximum of 15 pitches would be provided on the site should any proposals be allocated through the Development Plan process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1433</a>	Brice S	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is a beautiful site which needs to be developed to bring employment opportunities, using a small part of the site will blight the rest and make it	Objections are noted. The redevelopment of this site will need to be undertaken on a comprehensive basis and planned so that any uses proposed are compatible.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			more likely that a travellers site could spread and there are large costs involved in making the site safe.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1441</a>	Brice S	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is too expensive to clear, it would dominate the local community, it is a prime site which is too large for the proposal and putting a Gypsy site on part of it will diminish the chances of the whole site being fully developed.	Objections are noted. The redevelopment of the site will need to be undertaken on a comprehensive basis and planned to ensure that any uses proposed are appropriate and compatible.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1353</a>	Brighton A	Site is in dangerous location - no safe access to village; fear natural beauty of area will be destroyed; no bus routes serve site; local school is full. Evidence that Showpeople bought their own land in the 40s/50s and returned to Symonds Yat to 'winter'	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The Council is not aware of the arrangements for Travelling Showpeople going to 'winter' in Symonds Yat</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS973</a>	Brittain N	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• More expense to prepare and make site safe</li> <li>• Two major and dangerous roads nearby, and this could make it more dangerous</li> <li>• Cost of providing services - sewerage, electricity, street lighting</li> <li>• Residential communities too close by which would be dominated by the proposal</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS295</a>	Brittain R	I would like Lea Castle to be returned to open fields, as it was when I was a child.	Objection is noted as is the alternative suggested use for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1210</a>	Brookes D	Site should be used to generate income and employment for local people and council. Why not put site on open market to bring in income. Council should put needs of residents first.	Objections are noted as are the proposed alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1381</a>	Brookes E	Fear for safety of horses in area if proposal goes ahead	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1195</a>	Brookes K	Schools, roads and doctors would not be able to cope. Why do gypsies get 12 month residency when other caravan parks do not? Site should	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			be used for employment.	facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS444</a>	Buckley M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of concerns over the future of the football pitches and concerns over possible increased crime within the area.	Objections are noted. As part of any redevelopment of this site the football pitches would need to be retained.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1401</a>	Bullus J T	Objects to the Lea Castle site and questions why Gypsies can live in caravans on these sites all year when the residents of Austcliffe Park only have 11 month occupancy.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1392</a>	Bullus Mrs D	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises the issue of child safety given that the site is on a main road and has many tunnels and ducts.	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS177</a>	Bunyan D	Many of the large manufacturing companies have closed around Kidderminster, therefore anything that creates employment <b>MUST COME FIRST</b> . It would be sacrilege for these grounds to be wasted on a travellers site, because once an area of this land had been designated for them, no-one else would be interested in the remaining land.	Noted. The Site Allocations Preferred Options Consultation identified Lea Castle site as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and therefore suitable for comprehensive redevelopment centred on employment uses. It is recognised that the focus for development must centre on regeneration and the District has a comprehensive regeneration strategy which will be encompassed in the Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan and the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. Any traveller pitch provision that may come forward on the site must for part of a wider comprehensive redevelopment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS181</a>	Bunyan P	Objects to Lea Castle site - should be used to create employment in the area; cost to Council would be enormous. These situations often start out small but can become uncontrollable.	Objection is noted. Any traveller pitch provision on the site would need to come forward as part of a comprehensive redevelopment focussed on employment uses in accordance with the emerging Site Allocations & Policies DPD.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1481</a>	Burke J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley doctors surgery is nearly full</li> <li>• Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle which could add to pollution</li> <li>• Areas of natural beauty should be protected</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1485</a>	Burrows C	Busy roads in the area, no room for extra people for schools, surgery etc. Areas of natural beauty will be spoiled.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS91</a>	Buss J	Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital Site being	Noted. The Lea Castle Site is a Major

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>proposed for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. Certain that the grounds could be used for a more productive purpose. Shops, industrial park, leisure facilities, schools, care homes or even another hospital would serve better purpose.</p> <p>Cites ongoing issues at Dale Farm and huge increase in variety of wildlife on the site. Feels that Cookley is far too small to cope with a large influx of people.</p>	<p>Developed Site in the Green Belt. The emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD will set out a comprehensive redevelopment policy for the site, including the need to progress a development brief. Should gypsy and traveller pitch provision come forward for the site, it would need to as part of a comprehensive redevelopment plan.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1538</a>	Butcher C	Negative impact on village life/schooling.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1453</a>	Caine M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle and so there may be increased smoke nuisance and noise from the proposed site.</li> <li>• Natural beauty and animals must be protected.</li> <li>• Living on an 11 month site and paying council tax - are we going to be found accommodation for the month we come off?</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS975</a>	Cattell J	Consider travellers to be 'above the law'	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS974</a>	Cattell K	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS324</a>	Chapman A	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because there will be no access to local services and social contacts with residents as the site is bounded by two main roads, the safe environment would be compromised because of asbestos, the site is not sustainable as it has no access to school, GPs etc, the joint use of land is not feasible, there would be a high cost to make the site safe for a small number of people, there is little evidence the Lea Castle is needed as a Gypsy site, property values will fall, the sound of vehicles and travellers setting up and moving on would be noisy, the site could spread illegally.</p> <p>Refers to the May 2011 Site Allocations consultation where local residents put forward ideas for Lea Castle, raises concern that these views have been completely disregarded against</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>policy E.4 and GB.4.</p> <p>Questions why a new plan and why it has been decided that a Gypsy and Traveller site must take precedence at Lea Castle, questions why no effort has been made to sell the Lea Castle site, questions why a valuable housing/employment use is being considered for a Gypsy and Traveller site, questions why WFDC are determined to provide more sites when there are already 43 pitches in the area.</p>	<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The new policy framework for the site has not identified that a Gypsy site should take precedence at Lea Castle Site; this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses. Alternative options for the site are still being actively considered and the site will need to be redeveloped in a comprehensive manner taking into account all relevant factors.</p> <p>In response to why the Council are currently considering sites - the Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. It is therefore Government Policy that the Council is looking to implement.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS302</a>	Chapman P	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is asbestos on the site, local services and facilities in the village are not within walking distance, schools and GPs are over-subscribed, the site is bounded by two major roads, there is a lack of street lighting and footpaths, there is no bus service, the grants to the Council are not enough to cover the costs.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Wyre Forest District Council would be able to bid for funding from the £60 million Government Money that has been outlined for use in developing or delivering such facilities. It is uncertain as to how much of this funding would be available for any potential site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1371</a>	Charnock L	Fearful of security and property devaluation	Objections are noted. We recognise that the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1271</a>	Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	<p>Lea Castle</p> <p>The Parish Council considers that, from the information available, the Lea Castle site does not fully meet all the criteria set out, primarily because of sustainability of the site and access issues.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS452</a>	Church-Millward D	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of trouble caused when Travellers previously stayed at Hurcott.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1187</a>	Clare T	Objects to the Lea Castle site because asbestos is present on the site and all of those working or treated there over the years could have been at risk of life threatening disease which may not be identified for many years. A full independent survey and investigation should be conducted into the levels of asbestos and the historical and current levels of risk and exposure.	Objection is noted. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1554</a>	Clarke A	Fear that hard work done to improve Broadwaters Park will be jeopardised by proposal.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1559</a>	Clarke L	Area of natural beauty should be protected. fear rise in petty crime if travellers return to area.	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1363</a>	Clarke P	<p>Has area got history of travellers? Fear traffic problems in area. Derelict buildings pose safety risk. Extra policing needed plus more capacity in doctors, schools etc. Potential property devaluation.</p> <p>Will site be for 12 months? Austcliffe Park is only 11 months occupancy</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				If considered to be a suitable location, it would be identified as a permanent site with 12 month occupation
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1420</a>	Clarke R	Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity	Objections are noted.  The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1169</a>	Clarke S	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS267</a>	Cole B	Lea Castle is a beautiful site and would be better used in other ways. Concerns over rubbish left by travellers in the past.	Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS455</a>	Cole B	Lea Castle site is very beautiful and it would be very sad to see it used in this way. The area should be protected, and used in a more sympathetic way.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS282</a>	Concept Planning	Refers to the criteria for selecting site set out in the Baker Report. Refers to the Lea Castle site and the existing designation under Saved	Objection to the use of the Lea Castle site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Policies E.4 and GB.4 of the Adopted Local Plan. Argues that the designation of the site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is at odds with these policies and the policies set out within PPG2.</p> <p>Baker Report acknowledges the Lea Castle site as having sustainability and achievability issue. The SHLAA discounted Lea Castle for housing as it was not considered to be a sustainable location. Refers to Policy 56 of the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Paper (May 2011) which identifies B1 and C3 as possible uses for the site. It is considered that a Gypsy and Traveller site would be contrary to this policy.</p> <p>Refers to the methodology of the Baker Report and states that it is contradictory that at Stage 2, many sites were rejected for being 'inconsistent with Green Belt purposes' whereas other Green Belt sites were taken forward. Although it is acknowledged that a Green Belt assessment was undertaken, the designation of Green Belt land is a national designation and development within it is regarded as inappropriate except in very special circumstances. There are not, therefore, parts of the Green Belt which can be regarded as more valuable than others and able to accommodate development, against national</p>	<p>With regard to the existing designation of the Lea Castle Site, this is currently being re-considered as part of the Local Development Framework. The site will eventually be allocated through the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document and this will have due regard to all policies, including PPG2. The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>planning policy.</p> <p>Within the Baker Report a number of sites have been identified which are outside of the Green Belt and have been assessed as suitable, achievable and available. Of the 15 sites put forward by the Baker Report, 8 were outside of the Green Belt with a yield of 44 pitches. Of these sites only 3 have been included within the consultation document providing a yield of 10 pitches. There is little or no explanation as to why the remainder have been removed. There is little or no explanation for the inclusion of Green Belt sites over other, more suitable sites. Refers to this not being in accordance with PPG2.</p> <p>Refers to Circular 01/2006 and its statement that Gypsy and Traveller sites in the Green Belt are normally inappropriate development. Argues that alternative sites have not been exhausted and that other suitable, achievable and available sites must be considered before the Green Belt sites are considered.</p> <p>Identifies that Cabinet at their meeting on 20th September appear to have ignored the recommendations of the Baker Report and the Director of Planning and Regulatory Services. The deletion of 8 sites appears contradictory and inconsistent as some sites were removed for</p>	<p>need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Objection to the methodology used by Baker Associates is noted. However, it is considered that the methodology used was sound.</p> <p>The decision on which sites were to be consulted on was taken by the Council's Cabinet and the minutes of the meeting where the sites were discussed can be accessed via the Council's website.</p> <p>Alternative sites have been considered outside of the Green Belt and a number of these form part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.</p> <p>The sustainability of the Lea Castle Site will</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>reasons such as isolation, being in the Green Belt and not previously developed where other sites with similar constraints have remained part of the consultation. If Cabinet were not satisfied that robust evidence had been produced by Baker Associates and the District Council's own planning officers then further research should be undertaken before a final decision on sites is made.</p> <p>The purpose of the consultation is to identify the sites which are most appropriate to meet the identified need. As 8 of the sites were eliminated with no valid justification, it is considered that all options available should be given further consideration. It does not appear that a fair, considered approach has been adopted in relation to Green Belt sites. If it is found that there are no alternate more suitable sites outside of the Green Belt it is necessary to consider other Green Belt sites on the edge of the settlement which perform better in terms of sustainability than the Lea Castle site.</p> <p>In summary, it is considered that the inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital Site within the preferred list of sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople, is fundamentally flawed. The site has an existing land use designation for employment uses and is not considered suitable</p>	<p>need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p> <p>The concerns about the approach taken by the Council is noted and a decision on the future allocation of Gypsy sites, and for the Lea Castle site as a whole, will need to take into account all comments received through this consultation process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			for housing. This is further supported given its isolated location away from services and amenities. For the reasons set out above, the site at Lea Castle Hospital is not an appropriate location for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople, would be contrary to adopted policy and would be wholly inconsistent with the criteria set out by both the Council and their consultants for assessing potential sites.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1110</a>	Connolly M	Objects to the Lea Castle site due to the impact on local services, traffic impact and the increased risk of accidents. Proposes the former British Sugar site as an alternative.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1114</a>	Connolly P	Objects to the Lea Castle site. Proposes the former British Sugar site as an alternative.	Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS44</a>	Cook M	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at Lea Castle Hospital, Cookley. Why was the decision not put before the people before the planning stage? Sure people would have objected before the plans got off the ground.	The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS45</a>	Cook M	Considers the Lea Castle Hospital site is not suitable - area of serene beauty that deserves preserving and nurturing. An area in need of considerate development and improvement not an area for travellers to congregate.  Would this mean that houses/adjacent property can consider themselves not in Green Belt and not subject to restrictions?	Objections are noted. As identified in the Adopted Local Plan and emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD, the Lea Castle site is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. The Site Allocations and Policies DPD will include a policy relating to future development of this large site and a range of uses are currently being looked at as part of this process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS46</a>	Cook M	For the last ten years the Lea Castle Hospital site has been neglected but thankfully not too abused. If development of the site is considered why not open it up for all the community to enjoy? Could be used as parkland, be nice to	Noted. Any redevelopment that takes place on this site will need to be carefully planned to safeguard the character of the surrounding parkland and Green Belt.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			see the buildings renovated. Traveller site development would taint the site for any future development.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS48</a>	Cook M	Buildings on the Lea Castle Hospital Site are unsafe - would they have to be demolished at the taxpayers expense? If buildings were to be made safe/demolished for a traveller development why could this have not been done for benefit and use by all the community? Allowing a legal site on this area would leave it open to further illegal development given its size. Would the asbestos be removed at the expense of the taxpayer?	Noted. Demolition of the buildings would not be undertaken at taxpayer's expense, should any future development go ahead on the Lea Castle site. Should any Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision be allocated at this site, it would be subject to conditions and enforcement to ensure development is properly managed.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS49</a>	Cook M	Use of the Lea Castle site would be to the detriment of the neighbourhood. Shows a distinct lack of imagination, disrespect and lack of knowledge for the area and underutilising such a large beautiful area of land.	Noted. As previously stated the Site Allocations and Policies DPD will take forward policy and a site brief in relation to the future redevelopment of the Lea Castle site, which is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. This will reduce the risk of the site being underutilised in the future and ensure its comprehensive redevelopment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS413</a>	Cook M	Raises a number of concerns in relation to the Lea Castle site to do with deliverability and detrimental impacts. Why invest in a project not for the benefit of all?	The Lea Castle site is a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and the emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD proposes that the site is comprehensively redeveloped focussing on employment generating uses. Therefore any traveller pitch provision that were to come forward on the site would need to be considered as part of a comprehensive

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				redevelopment package for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS619</a>	Cook P	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of the detrimental impact on the landscape, concerns about the development spreading to other areas of the site, concerns about the road infrastructure and healthcare and education infrastructure, concerns about the cost of developing the site, and concerns that there would be difficulties in developing the remainder of the site for employment use.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS535</a>	Cook P	<p>Objects to the use of Lea Castle site as the village is too small to accommodate the added population. The schools are full, the doctors are full, no good roads into Cookley from Lea Castle and no bus service.</p> <p>I live on a Caravan Park and have to leave for 1 month of the year - the Gypsies will want 12 month residency.</p> <p>How much will it cost?</p> <p>Site is riddled with asbestos and so should not be used for residential purposes.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The safety of the site (including presence of asbestos) will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS715</a>	Cook V	<p>Object due to detrimental impact on site and over-dominance of The Crescent. Internal roads unsuitable for large vehicles. Need employment development not gypsy site. Poor access to local services and safety risk of existing buildings on site. Not financially viable to develop as gypsy site.</p> <p>Other sites in consultation are more viable. Lea Castle is up for disposal within 2 years - hope it will go for business, health or residential use.</p>	Objections are noted. It should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS422</a>	Corbett J	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1305</a>	Court K	Object	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1537</a>	Cox A	There is no need or facilities for this proposal and the question of public safety is ignored.	Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1112</a>	Craddock J	<p>Inappropriate use of Green Belt land and using the site as permanent residence for travellers etc would conflict with the ethos of Green Belt land. Highlighted the difficulty of monitoring and controlling these sites and then the resultant cost to taxpayers when matters need to be enforced.</p> <p>The local amenities are already overstretched from the GP surgery to the school, and would not be able to accommodate another community putting a demand on them. The proposed site has no alternative amenities, no bus routes, and would therefore create a very isolated community.</p>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS872</a>	Craddock S	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is in Green Belt and should remain as so</li> <li>• Restrictions in Green Belt include outdoor lighting, noise pollution and lighting would</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>be needed at this site which would be inappropriate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stretched local services (Doctors surgery, school) would over stretch school and increase waiting times at the GP</li> <li>• Site is isolated which means there would be no integration of the communities</li> <li>• Safety and accessibility issues to access local amenities</li> <li>• Site has a substantial amount of asbestos which has already been moved and hidden under vegetation</li> <li>• Size of the site and the potential number of travellers that could reside there and concerned about monitoring, control and enforcement of the numbers without lengthy and costly legal proceedings</li> </ul>	<p>address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site and integration is a key aspect that needs to be understood before a decision on site allocations is made.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Ensuring that sites are monitored and enforced is a key element of the system</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1458</a>	Crumpton J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.</li> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity.</li> <li>• Cookley Doctors Surgery is nearly full to capacity.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to the shops from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle Site lies between two busy and fast roads, the A449 and the A451.</li> <li>• Public footpath number 628 runs through the Lea Castle site - how would it be screened from the proposed site to give privacy and security to residents and travellers?</li> <li>• Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle and so there may be increased smoke nuisance and noise from the proposed site.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site has many derelict buildings and underground ducts and tunnels. How will these be made secure to protect Gypsy and Traveller children?</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected.</li> <li>• Also low cost housing in Cookley for <b>existing residents</b> should be more of a priority that siting Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1460</a>	Crumpton J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.</li> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity.</li> <li>• Cookley Doctors Surgery is nearly full to capacity.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to the</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>shops from the Lea Castle Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle Site lies between two busy and fast roads, the A449 and the A451.</li> <li>• Public footpath number 628 runs through the Lea Castle site - how would it be screened from the proposed site to give privacy and security to residents and travellers?</li> <li>• Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle and so there may be increased smoke nuisance and noise from the proposed site.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site has many derelict buildings and underground ducts and tunnels. How will these be made secure to protect Gypsy and Traveller children?</li> <li>• There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected.</li> </ul>	<p>noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1434</a>	Crutch S	Fear another Dale Farm	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1483</a>	David P	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1501</a>	Day M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too dangerous for children to get to and from school besides all the derelict buildings and underground tunnels which stand and run under the site.</li> <li>• We also don't want the noise and smoke and mess they tend to make.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted. The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1477</a>	Deakin A	Doctors' is near capacity; busy roads surround site; natural beauty and wildlife should be protected	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1475</a>	Deakin J	Natural beauty and wildlife should be protected; busy roads surround site; doctors' is near capacity	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1527</a>	Dean E	School is full; no historical evidence of travellers using area.	Objection is noted. Comments on the capacity of the school will be considered alongside those received from the Local Education Authority who are a statutory consultee in this process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS40</a>	Deathridge G	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at Lea Castle Hospital. Lives on an 11 month site and planning	Objection is noted. The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			permission has been denied for them to live there permanently. Shows that gypsies/travellers have more rights. When they have to vacate their homes for the month of February who will ensure the safety of the homes?	Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. The 11 month occupancy condition is set out in planning policy on mobile home parks which are generally on a much larger scale than gypsy sites where approximately 10-15 pitches are proposed as a maximum.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS366</a>	Derry V	Suggest Lea Castle site should be developed for affordable housing, facilities for the elderly and employment training e.g. college could set up training facility for manufacturing and engineering skills	Objection is noted as are the potential ideas put forward for alternative uses for the site
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1100</a>	Dixon N	Local school is full. Natural beauty and wildlife needs to be protected	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1533</a>	Downs M	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1482</a>	Doyle S	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it lies between two busy, fast roads.	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1517</a>	Dudley P	If this application is successful it renders the rest of the site unusable.	The use will need to be considered as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site and on-going discussions are taking place with the landowners.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS227</a>	Dukes N	15 pitches completely disproportionate to the size of population in Cookley. Introducing traveller community of c.75 travellers is equivalent to inviting 1750 travellers to settle in centre of Kidderminster. Cookley would house 8 times the average proportion of travellers. Sites should consider the size and ability of the surrounding population to absorb the introduction of any new community Cookley already takes its fair share of social responsibility.	These concerns are noted. The 15 pitches is set out as an indicative figure and is considered to be a maximum for provision should any proposals go ahead. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1474</a>	Dunne L	Primary school is full; fear increased smoke and noise from site	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1529</a>	Dunnig I	No gypsies at all.	Objection noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1470</a>	Dunphy J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the doctors and school are already overcrowded.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1208</a>	Dyer N	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises concerns about Travellers coming in from Common Market Countries. Raises the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No proof the Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.</li> <li>• Primary school and doctors' surgery are full.</li> <li>• No safe pedestrian route to school or doctors.</li> <li>• No bus routes.</li> <li>• Site lies between two busy roads.</li> <li>• Public footpath 628 runs through the site.</li> <li>• Concern about increased noise and smoke nuisance.</li> <li>• Concerns about safety because of the buildings and underground tunnels.</li> <li>• Concerns about areas of natural beauty and wild animals which must be protected.</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1530</a>	East A	Lea Castle is not a traditional stopping place for travelling people. A travellers site would be detrimental to the local community	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS477</a>	East J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the travellers have no history of stopping there and it would be detrimental to the local community.	Objections are noted.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1557</a>	Eaton S	Oppose proposal. Daughter had bad experience of travellers in Hurcott Lane. Would feel unsafe living here if proposal went ahead.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1379</a>	Eddleston D	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traveller sites should not be within the Green Belt and no special circumstances have been demonstrated. There are many suitable brownfield sites within the District for example land between Wilden Lane and Stourport Road.</li> <li>2. The suitability of a site should have</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>preference over whether or not it is in public ownership.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. A traveller site in this location would do substantial harm to this site and its surroundings.</li> <li>4. Both Lea Castle and Sion Hill create concerns over potential further spreading of sites beyond allocated provision.</li> <li>5. Lea Castle has no pedestrian access to shops, schools, doctors, and recreation.</li> <li>6. There is no historical evidence of travellers stopping in the area and they have no desire to be in the area.</li> <li>7. The costs of developing the site would be prohibitive.</li> <li>8. A traveller site would devalue the remaining land.</li> <li>9. The site should be developed to benefit the whole area.</li> </ol>	<p>Site suitability is an important consideration for allocation purposes</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of the site will need to take into account all of the constraints and opportunities presented by the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1122</a>	Eddleston J	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 15 pitch site will dominate the small settlement of The Crescent.</li> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt, concern over the loss of wildlife and amenity.</li> <li>• The occupants will be reliant on cars to access local services and facilities in Cookley.</li> <li>• The site has previously been deemed unsuitable for housing; it is therefore unfair to consider it for a Gypsy site.</li> <li>• The site is not viable and capable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There has been no attempt to estimate the cost of delivery.</li> <li>○ The District Council does not seem to have obtained any indication of how much government funding is available to deliver sites.</li> <li>○ There is no attempt to define exactly where the site would be located within the overall site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Locating the site here will undermine attempts to comprehensively redevelop the area.</li> <li>• Lea Castle is a large unbounded site which could result in development</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>spreading beyond the initial 15 pitches.</p> <p>Raises concern that no robust evidence has been submitted to support the number of pitches required. Refers to the Rupert Scott report of 2008 (GTAA) and refers to the fact that this and the RSS express the wants of the Gypsy community. Authorities should look at whether the needs can be met through Gypsies and Travellers purchasing or renting traditional houses using their own funds. The report is 3 years old and the District Council has not tested whether or not the proposed level of need has correlated to the real world indicators such as the number of unauthorised encampments or developments.</p> <p>Argues that Wyre Forest District's strategy of providing pitches in the absence of co-ordinated provision across the region is flawed and potentially an unavoidable burden upon local tax payers. The approach will lead to more travellers migrating to the district and an increased demand for sites.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS326</a>	Eddleston M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is situated in the Green Belt and there are	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>brownfield sites which could be used in areas where Travellers prefer to live, the site is car dependant with no pedestrian access to the village, the cost of making the site fit for purpose should not be borne by tax-payers and any development should be self-financing, development should be for the general community, a Traveller site would devalue the remainder of the land and could lead to the expansion of the site beyond the allocated area and it seems that Wyre Forest District already has its fair share.</p>	<p>land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>be enforced.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1512</a>	Edwards L	Not acceptable to have these people near built up areas.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS828</a>	Eeles H	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt, it contains asbestos, and it would be better used for employment because of the road access.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Alternative uses for the site are also noted</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1332</a>	Elcock I	Site is totally unsuitable and not near to where the gypsies seem to want to be.	Objection is noted. Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1047</a>	Elsworth J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt, it will have a detrimental impact on plant and animal life, there is a public right of way, the site should be used to create jobs and the cost of clearing the site is not justified.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS532</a>	Evans J	To allow the proposed development would impinge on the wildlife of the area.	Objections are noted. The concerns relating to the biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1172</a>	Evanson A	Overwhelming effect on residents of The Crescent and Axborough Lane; Cookley already full; undue strain on GP surgery; access is very dangerous; fear illegal expansion; adverse effect on house prices.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS924</a>	Evanson R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access is dangerous</li> <li>• It could double the population of the area</li> <li>• The school is oversubscribed</li> <li>• It would put a strain on medical services in the area</li> <li>• There is no way of containing the use to a small part of the site.</li> <li>• It would have an adverse impact on house prices.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies and the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1320</a>	Falcon J	Object	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1226</a>	Fallon A	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is home to protected wildlife and is a beautiful place to walk through. Feel the site should be used for affordable housing or light industry.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.  The proposed alternative uses for the site are also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1176</a>	Fallon B	No history of travellers in area - would not be easy for them to integrate. Amount of money needed to make site safe would be prohibitive and disproportionate. Expanse of open space would present difficulties in containment.	Objection is noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.  Wyre Forest District Council would be able to bid for funding from the £60 million Government Money that has been outlined for use in developing or delivering such facilities. It is uncertain as to how much of this funding would be available for any potential site.  Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1328</a>	Fallon J	School and Doctors' Surgery both full; lack of safe route by foot to village amenities, natural beauty and wildlife should be protected	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1180</a>	Fallon S	Village has waited for development on Lea Castle to benefit whole community. Access to village is across busy road; school and surgery are full; no safe routes to school; high costs of making site safe; site is not self-limiting; site should be put to better use.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS517</a>	Farley T	Schools and doctors already over subscribed.	Objections are noted as are the concerns about service capacity and facilities. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1449</a>	Farmer M	Objects to the Lea Castle, it is not a good for too many reasons to list.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS866</a>	Fletcher K	Green Belt should be protected. Finances should be used for benefit of all not a minority. Need to bring jobs to area.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Alternative options for the use of the site are also noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1063</a>	Fletcher N	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is greenfield and it is important to keep the area around the towns and villages green.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS316</a>	Fletcher W J	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attractive Green Belt.</li> <li>• Expensive to prepare - do the Council have funds for this?</li> <li>• Schools/Property Values/Crime Statistics will all be negatively impacted.</li> <li>• Gypsy families would prefer Stourport-on-Severn.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted.</p> <p>There is an existing Gypsy community within the Sandy Lane area of Stourport-on-Severn</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				and they were consulted as part of this exercise. Some of the sites included within the consultation are within Stourport-on-Severn.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS260</a>	Foley R	Raises strong objections. The school is already over-subscribed, the roads from the Lea Castle are very busy with no pavements. The site is deemed unsafe and people who live there can only get there by car. Local surgeries are up to capacity, no bus service nearby for them to use and railways are a distance away. High unemployment in the area. The site is also of conservation value and would impact heavily on the landscape and local wildlife. If lighting was introduced it would also impact heavily on wildlife. Specifies points in relation to national design guidance on gypsy sites. It would dominate a small village community like Cookley may lead to conflict relatively quickly.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS265</a>	Foley R	I have e-mailed a letter to the department noting my objections.	Noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1488</a>	Forrester A	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of many issues including children, road safety, site clearing, asbestos and services underground.	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1264</a>	Forrester J	No evidence of travellers in area; school and doctors full; no safe route to village from site; no buses connect site and village; surrounded by fast roads; public footpath through site; increased noise and smoke from site; derelict buildings and underground tunnels; natural beauty and wildlife should be protected	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1457</a>	Franklin T	Fear increased noise and smoke if proposal goes ahead	<p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1479</a>	Fraye M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the schools are full, there are no bus routes and the doctors surgery is full.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS454</a>	Freeth T	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS993</a>	Fretwell J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no evidence that it is a traditional stopping place for travellers, the primary school and doctors are full, there is no safe pedestrian route to the village, there is no bus route from the site, the site is bounded by 2 major roads, the public footpath would need to be screened, noise pollution and waste need to be considered, heavy traffic could expose the asbestos ducting, and it will have a detrimental impact on the landscape and wildlife.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the immediate environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of the site will need to take into account the potential existence of asbestos and ensure that any proposals are safe.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS943</a>	Fuller D	1. Concerned about travellers having	Objection is noted as are the concerns

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>access to this site</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Concerned it would overload the services in the village - GP and school</li> <li>3. Older people would not feel safe</li> </ol>	relating to the impact on the residential area. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS748</a>	Ganderton D	Lea Castle is not a traditional site for travellers.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS747</a>	Ganderton N	Lea Castle is not a traditional site for travellers.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS705</a>	Gannon N	The increase in crime.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1322</a>	Gardiner J	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt - impact on woodland, wildlife etc;</li> <li>• no tradition of gypsies; local schools and doctors' full;</li> <li>• no safe access to village amenities from site;</li> <li>• discriminates against gypsies by separating them from existing community with no transport links; would dominate settled community</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1522</a>	Gellatly K	Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity	Objection is noted. The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1521</a>	Gellatly M	Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity	The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1523</a>	Gellatly S	Natural beauty and wildlife should be protected	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS479</a>	Goode S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle and there may be increased smoke nuisance and noise from the proposed site.</li> <li>There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site these must be protected.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as is the concern regarding the impact on the environment. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1386</a>	Grainger H	Refers to Austcliffe Park having an 11 month site licence, wants Council to build shower and wash blocks, and allow 12 month occupancy, at the Caravan Park	Objection to the Lea Castle Site is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1390</a>	Grainger R	Refers to fact that Austcliffe Park does not have 12 months licence	Objection to the Lea Castle Hospital Site is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS703</a>	Grainger Z	These are areas of natural beauty and woodland habitats that need protecting.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1399</a>	Grasham A	Fear that house prices will fall. Cookley is already a deprived area	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1400</a>	Grasham R	School is full; no proof of gypsy connection to area	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1296</a>	Gray J	Lea Castle has no history of travellers; Cookley Primary and GP surgery are full; Lea Castle site has no safe access to school, doctors' or shops; no buses to village; many derelict buildings and tunnels on site -safety issues; public footpath crosses site - privacy issue; any development there would be car dependant	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1299</a>	Gray P	No evidence of area being a traditional stopping place for travellers. Allocating part of the site for this use would reduce the site's commercial value. Site should be used to generate local employment and benefit whole community. Do not consider that site hemmed in by main roads with dangerous access to local amenities fits guidance. Proposed sites should be located near schools with spare capacity. Huge development costs at Lea Castle. Urge Council to follow through plans for jobs creation at Lea Castle.	<p>Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about the redevelopment of the site will need to be considered and a comprehensive plan for the area as a whole decided on.</p> <p>The alternative use, as an employment generating area, is noted.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Rather than look to allocate gypsy sites on publically owned land, the Council should scope local land for sale and purchase more suitable sites.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS533</a>	Green A	<p>Objects to the site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.</li> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity.</li> <li>• Cookley Doctors Surgery is nearly full to capacity.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Doctors from the Lea Castle Site.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no safe route by foot to the shops from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• There are no bus routes to Cookley amenities from the Lea Castle Site.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle Site lies between two busy and fast roads, the A449 and the A451.</li> <li>• Public footpath number 628 runs through the Lea Castle site - how would it be screened from the proposed site to give privacy and security to residents and travellers?</li> <li>• Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle and so there may be increased smoke nuisance and noise from the proposed site.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site has many derelict buildings and underground ducts and tunnels. How will these be made secure to protect Gypsy and Traveller children?</li> <li>• There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected.</li> <li>• Concerned about a possible increase in anti-social behaviour and crime rate.</li> </ul>	<p>comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1366</a>	Green G	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no proof it is a traditional stopping place for Gypsies and Travellers, the primary school and doctors are both full, there is no safe route to the village for pedestrians, there are no bus routes to the village, there is a public footpath through the site, the site is not safe because of derelict buildings and asbestos, and the wildlife on the site must be protected. Concerned about crime rates</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS630</a>	Green S	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	The concerns relating to impact on local businesses are noted. However, it should be noted that gypsies and travellers residing on authorised pitches pay Council Tax in the same way all other local residents do.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1050</a>	Gregg H	Site lies between 2 busy roads - not suitable to put in crossing facility to access Cookley village. Potential over capacity at school and doctors' surgery, noise and nuisance to existing residents	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies,

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			and road accidents.	Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1471</a>	Griffiths F	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1489</a>	Griffiths L	As Cookley is a relatively small village the school/doctors surgery would not cope with the extra people they would have to accommodate. Also this is a rural area, occupied by wildlife, not a lot of these areas remain.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1089</a>	Griffiths M	Site is contaminated with asbestos; in Green Belt; access to village amenities means crossing busy A449; no utilities on site; surrounded by A roads on 3 sides; public footpaths cross site; close to residential area	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1513</a>	Gwilliam R	Not acceptable!	Objection noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1545</a>	Gwilliam R	Cookley Doctors' surgery is nearly full to capacity	Objection is noted and will be considered alongside any representations received from healthcare providers who have also been consulted as part of this process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1164</a>	Hadley R	<p>I wish to object to this site as I believe it is totally inappropriate due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within Green Belt land and if it should be developed should be used to allow for employment within the local area.</li> <li>• There are not suitable footpaths and lighting for children to walk safely to school due to the busy A449.</li> <li>• I believe the schools are already very full close by.</li> <li>• The site is isolated with poor public transport.</li> <li>• I believe the Stourport-on-Severn sites are more suitable particularly as other</li> </ul>	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPf reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>gypsy communities live there.</p>	<p>example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school and highway safety are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and the Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1152</a>	Hall P	<p>No easy access by public transport; school is full; disruption to neighbours; poor street lighting; hazardous access onto A roads; extra traffic on local lanes; mains services need to be up to standard</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1525</a>	Hammond A	Public footpath crossing site would need to be screened to give privacy.	Objection is noted. This will need to be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1524</a>	Hammond J	Fear increased smoke and noise from proposed site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1132</a>	Hammond N	Not right location - village will not cope with extra traffic, and limited places at schools and doctors. Village roads already heavily congested especially around school.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS737</a>	Hanbury J	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1526</a>	Hanbury J	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1431</a>	Handy M	Objects to the Lea Castle site as the doctors is full, the site lies between two busy main roads and there are areas of natural beauty and wildlife which must be protected.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS859</a>	Harper A	Question why we are considering spending money clearing this site in the current financial climate. Suggests the site should be sold to raise funds for the NHS and it would then be a	Objections are noted. Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site. The concerns raised through this consultation will need to be

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			private company's responsibility to make the site safe.	considered when a decision is made on potential future allocations of sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS857</a>	Harper M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the schools and doctors are full, the site was not designed for caravans, there is asbestos on the site, it would cost a fortune to clear and we need to save money. The site needs to be sold to a private company who can cover this expense.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1281</a>	Harris A	Green Belt; no tradition of gypsies; no safe route to village amenities; little if any street lighting; no bus service; would dominate settled community; public footpaths - little privacy; would discriminate gypsies as remote from services; differing lifestyles - more outdoors	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1101</a>	Harris B	In Green Belt, between major A roads with limited footpaths, no street lighting, no bus service, no capacity at schools or doctors and is against government policy of locating sites near existing gypsy settlements.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1034</a>	Harris L	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that the site could be used for something more useful to the community for example a youth centre or day centre.  Raises concern about falling property values and already stretched police resources.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1127</a>	Harris M	Green Belt site; impact on woodland, flora and fauna; road safety concerns with limited pavements and lighting; car dependency likely; security of isolated dwellings; no bus services; asbestos; dominance over local community; sloping land - stability issues for caravans; public rights of way; costs of clearing site should be	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			compared with benefits and need; gypsy site should be close to shops, schools, buses and their existing community; other uses for site would provide employment opportunities; would like to see a self-contained retirement village there	come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1092</a>	Harrison C	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is Green Belt, it is between two major roads, there are no safe walking routes to local amenities, the school is oversubscribed, property prices will fall and house and car insurance premiums will rise. Raises concerns about the Cubs, Scouts and Beavers campsite on Axborough Lane.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1098</a>	Harrison L	Objects to Lea Castle because it is in the Green Belt, it has dangerous tunnels, it is situated between two busy main roads making it difficult to access amenities, and the school and doctors are full.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS959</a>	Hart E	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS524</a>	Hawkins R	Public footpath no.625 runs through Lea Castle site.	Objections are noted - any redevelopment of the site would need to take into account the presence of the public footpath.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1446</a>	Haycock L	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of the increase in traffic.	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1411</a>	Haynes C	De-values local properties; cost; mess; general safety / welfare	Objections are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1369</a>	Haywood P	This site could be utilised for the current community	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1055</a>	Hazlewood B	Site should be used for purpose it was built for.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS979</a>	Hazlewood M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better used for the 'settled' community</li> <li>• Need for more housing and employment</li> </ul>	Objections are noted as are the comments relating to the proposed alternative use of the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>within these areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should not be a burden on local resources</li> </ul>	site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1404</a>	Healey J	Suggest retirement village for Lea Castle	Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS589</a>	Higbee E	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle Site for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Underground service tunnels that contain asbestos - dangerous and expensive to remove and/or make safe.</li> <li>Lies between two busy traffic routes.</li> <li>No bus services.</li> <li>Access to facilities by foot is dangerous.</li> <li>Cookley primary school is full.</li> <li>Cookley surgery has very little capacity for new patients and staff would be put under pressure to try and trace medical records of patients living a travelling lifestyle.</li> <li>Site includes natural habitat, birds and animals that need to be protected.</li> <li>A public footpath runs through the site - concern about maintaining privacy and security for all.</li> <li>Not a traditional stopping place for</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to this site are noted.</p> <p>The environment at Lea Castle would need to be made safe for any potential future redevelopment.</p> <p>The objections to the use of this site due to service capacity issues are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>travellers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land at Crossway Green currently on the market and used for caravan storage, well screened by mature trees, which would be far more suitable than Lea Castle.</li> </ul>	<p>any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p> <p>Land at Crossway Green lies outside of Wyre Forest District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS890</a>	Higgs J	<p>Site is unsuitable due to high costs of removing asbestos and building adequate roads on site. Also there is no safe pedestrian access to limited amenities in Cookley village</p>	<p>Objection is noted. Any redevelopment on this site will need to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner and ensure that all issues regarding asbestos and health and safety are fully recognised and mitigated against.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1432</a>	Higgs O	Adverse impact on surrounding area - schools overcrowded. Better use could be made of this large site which would benefit community	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for the site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS251</a>	Hill G	Another Dale Farm waiting to happen. No easy and direct/safe access to the amenities in the village, proposal would dominate the local community which is not in line with Government guidance, older residents in the area will be swamped by young families. Who will pay to make the site safe? If a traveller site is planned, no other buyer will consider purchase and the site needs to be used for employment purposes. Impact on local schools and GP Practices, removal of waste from the area, noise and smoke nuisance, compensation for reduction in property values. How does a traveller site fit in with Green Belt policy. There is no historical need to have a site in Cookley. Considers the sugar beet factory site is a better choice with a clear boundary. Has some questions over land ownership.	<p>The concerns relating to the Lea Castle site are noted. Detailed responses to a number of Mrs Hill's queries were forwarded to her during the consultation process. We will carefully consider these comments alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1514</a>	Hill J	<p>This proposal will only add to the problems this deprived area already has. Schools and medical care will be insufficient to cope with an uncontrolled influx of more travellers once permission has been granted.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The level of deprivation in any area is an important consideration that will need to be taken into account when a decision on possible future allocation is made.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS855</a>	Hill M	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <p>Impact on protected species, danger of crossing A449 to reach village amenities, land designated for employment uses not residential.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The current designation of the land is currently</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				under review through the planning process and ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1148</a>	Hill M	I feel that the Lea Castle site too large an asset for the wider community to be used for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The site is approximately 270 acres of beautiful countryside and could be used for something more suitable and appropriate.	Objections are noted. This use will be considered as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1217</a>	Hill P A	I would like to register my objection for the Lea Castle site to be developed into pitches for Travellers/Gypsies/Travelling Showpeople. I feel that as the majority comes under the Green Belt then it should be left at that.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS850</a>	Hill R	Site is in Green Belt and should not be developed. It is also full of asbestos which will be costly to remove.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.  The presence of asbestos will need to be considered in any potential redevelopment of this site.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1105</a>	Hinksman A	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions why the public were not allowed to put forward their opinions on all sites.</li> <li>• Raises the point that no travellers turned out at the meetings to support the Lea Castle site.</li> <li>• Feels the site should be used to create jobs as there are very few employment opportunities in the village.</li> <li>• Finds it unjust that property prices in the village are likely to fall by 30% should Lea Castle be chosen.</li> <li>• Raises concern about children crossing the A449 to get to school as traffic is fast-moving.</li> <li>• The site should be opened up for public access as it is a picturesque area.</li> <li>• Raises concern about the site being Green Belt.</li> <li>• Suggests the former British Sugar site, it has connections to the existing traveller community as it neighbours many settled travellers and it is close to schools and amenities accessible by safe walking routes.</li> </ul>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS41</a>	Hinksman I	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at Lea Castle	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Hospital. Lists a number of reasons including transport and accessibility, impact on community services and facilities including the local school, provision of utilities to serve the site, presence of asbestos, impact on endangered species such as the pole cat; the site is zoned for employment uses; no history of the travelling community having any links with the site; a history of existing tenants not being properly managed.	carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1096</a>	Hinksman J	<p>Refers to the Cabinet meeting on 20/9/11 and looks at the sites considered there:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clows Top - one of the reasons that this site was rejected was because the schools are full, this is true of Wolverley and Cookley.</li> <li>• Land North of Habberley Road was discarded because the site was disconnected from the edge of Bewdley and Kidderminster and the site was in the Green Belt - why was Lea Castle not rejected for these reasons?</li> <li>• Former Blakedown Nurseries - discarded because it has been designated for affordable housing, I understand Lea Castle has been designated for housing and hi-tech industrial use.</li> <li>• Lawnswood site in Cookley - discarded because it is Green Belt, as is Lea Castle.</li> </ul>	<p>The detailed concerns in relation to the site are noted.</p> <p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land at Wilden Top - isolated and not close to shops etc, so is Lea Castle.</li> <li>• Former Depot at Stone - the traveller community state that they would prefer to be nearer urban developments, Lea Castle is disconnected from the urban areas.</li> </ul> <p>Believes the Lea Castle site is unsuitable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is an area of natural beauty and has ecological value, it is too remote from the village and there is limited parking in the village, there is no street lighting and it lies between two busy roads.</li> <li>• The use would not create jobs.</li> <li>• Cost of clearing asbestos from the site is expensive.</li> <li>• It would dominate the small community of The Crescent.</li> <li>• The underground ducts and tunnels need to be made secure.</li> <li>• Questions whether compensation will be made available for falling house prices.</li> <li>• States that no members of the Gypsy community attended the Lea Castle or Sion Hill meetings in support of the sites and all residents were opposed.</li> </ul>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1183</a>	Hipkins J	Will site be restricted; do they pay rates; can GP surgery cope; underground tunnels contain asbestos - who will pay?	<p>Many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>The relevant health authorities are statutory consultees within this process and any comments received will be considered when determining whether or not a site should be allocated.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS960</a>	Hoare K	<p>Objects to both the Sion Hill and Lea Castle sites because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no recognised facilities in the area, there are no sports facilities in the area and the area already lacks community spirit as there is no central point. Both sites would be better used for community uses.</li> <li>• The roads in the area are congested.</li> <li>• There have been tremendous efforts to improve the area by local people on a voluntary basis.</li> <li>• Council tax payments should be used to promote much needed community facilities.</li> <li>• Concern about house prices falling.</li> <li>• Investment in the community will trigger further investment and new homeowners</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to the use of Lea Castle are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses. However, it should be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers (i.e. road congestion).</p> <p>The concerns relating to traffic and highways issues are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			will benefit from the uplift in value.	values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1235</a>	Hobby A	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1056</a>	Hodgetts E	Objects to the Lea Castle site, it is a wonderful location and could be used for a park for children or employment as Cookley is the worst village in Worcestershire for employment. Feels that travellers will stop businesses moving in.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1455</a>	Holden I	Fear for safety of horses kept nearby	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS939</a>	Holloway G	Objects to the Lea Castle Site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is Green Belt</li> <li>• Already allocated for employment purposes and should remain that way as this would be beneficial to the local community</li> <li>• Local school does not have capacity without further investment</li> <li>• Doctors surgery at capacity</li> <li>• Access problematic - no footpaths and</li> </ul>	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.  The suggested alternative option for employment use of the site is also noted.  The concerns about service capacity and

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			busy main roads	<p>facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1327</a>	Holme E	Site is between busy roads; school is full and village is congested; no safe route by foot into village; site could be used for renewable energy generation; site is isolated and not typical stopping place for travellers; Elan Valley water pipe runs nearby	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for renewable energy generation is noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The presence of the Elan Valley water pipe nearby is not considered to be an issue for any redevelopment of this site. However, utility companies have been consulted as part of this process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS298</a>	Holme H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lea Castle site is isolated, between two very fast, busy roads.</li> <li>• The site is potentially suited to industrial usage. Consideration should be given to the possibility of using this site for future requirements for renewable energy, i.e. wind generation.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site lies next to the Elan Valley pipeline.</li> <li>• No public transport available from this site.</li> <li>• No safe access to Cookley amenities.</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The alternative suggested uses for the site are noted.</p> <p>It is not considered that the Elan Valley pipeline would be a concern through any redevelopment of this site. Should any development go ahead in the future it will be subject to a planning application and the utility companies are contacted as Statutory Consultees in the process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1158</a>	Hooper E	Objects to the Lea Castle site as it is in the Green Belt and should not be considered until all other non-Green Belt sites have been proven to be unsuitable. The site has inadequate access to local services and facilities, there is no safe route to local services including the school, there is no bus service, the site is larger than the area needed and there is no detail of how it will be contained, the site is a prime development site allocated for employment uses, and the area is one of outstanding beauty.	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1287</a>	Hooper S	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of asbestos which would be costly to clear up, the fact that using a small portion of the site for Gypsies would render the remainder useless, the site is remote with no bus service or public footpaths and there are tree preservation orders on the site which would be impossible to police.	<p>Objections to the use of this site for travellers is noted. The redevelopment of this site will need to be considered on a comprehensive basis and the issues about sustainability fully considered.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1091</a>	Hope L	Doctors' surgery will struggle to cope with increase in patient numbers; Primary school already struggling with not enough classrooms and additional pupils may have specific needs; will have immense impact on village resources; decrease in property values. Employment uses less likely if gypsy site is developed	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1450</a>	Hughes S	The village school and doctors surgery would not be able to cope with more influx of people.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1280</a>	Hull A	Does not recognise the need to provide additional accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Wyre Forest District has already accommodated more	Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>than neighbouring authorities. Suggests that Travellers do not require permanent accommodation.</p> <p>Objects specifically to the Lea Castle site which should be used to provide employment, e.g. a leisure centre, retirement complex, or corporate headquarters. Argues that the site should not have been allowed to fall into disrepair and that the high clearance costs are not justified for 15 Gypsy pitches.</p> <p>Cookley village can not cope with the additional population and there are no footpaths to access the village.</p> <p>Raises concern about road access to the site, particularly the junction at the Park Gate pub.</p>	<p>the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>The alternative suggested uses for the site are noted and will need to be considered</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1563</a>	Humm C	Site should be used for affordable housing or become a nature reserve.	Objections and alternative site suggestions are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1397</a>	Hunt D	Primary school is full	Objection is noted.  The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1284</a>	Hunter G	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the site would be harmed by the intrusion of an incongruous feature. Suggests the site should be used for commercial uses, a business park, a school or residential use. Suggests that it would be difficult to stop the site spreading beyond the initial allocation.	Objections to the use of the site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted as are the alternative uses suggested for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS637</a>	Huntley W	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that the site has been earmarked for light industrial and has not been advertised as such, the site is more suited to retirement accommodation or the leisure industry, the nearest doctors is in Cookley and is full, as is the school. Raises concerns over asbestos on the site. Also questions why travellers can stay all year round	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			whereas the caravan dwellers have to move out for a month every year.	need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1398</a>	Hunt S	School is full	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1194</a>	Huselbee M	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site used to be a considerable source of employment and should be safeguarded for business development.</li> <li>• Can not see how if even a small area of land was used for Gypsies and Travellers that businesses would be attracted to the remainder of the site.</li> <li>• How would the Council stop the site from spreading beyond the allocated area?</li> <li>• The schools are oversubscribed.</li> <li>• Lea Castle is in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Raises concern over wildlife.</li> <li>• Argues that there are plenty of brownfield sites available which could be used.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The use will need to be considered as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site and discussions are currently on-going with the landowner.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS614</a>	Hutton R	Objects to the Lea Castle site as there are not enough facilities in the village to support the growth in population.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS441</a>	Iaton L	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1466</a>	Ireland A	Objects to the Lea Castle site and feels the land would be better used for a rehabilitation centre for the armed forces. This would also provide jobs.	Objection is noted as is the alternative suggested use for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS315</a>	Isaccs O	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people. Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity. Cookley doctor's surgery is nearly full to capacity.	Objections are noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS314</a>	Issacs E	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people. Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity.	Objections are noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS378</a>	Jackson D	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1476</a>	James C	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the doctors surgery is full to capacity, there is no safe route to the village and there are natural	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>areas and wild animals on site which must be protected.</p>	<p>facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1224</a>	Jarvis B	Both sites should be for the benefit of Wyre	Objection is noted as is the suggested

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Forest residents - Lea Castle business park.	alternative use for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1473</a>	Jenkins G	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no proof that it is a traditional stopping place for travellers and raises concerns about how the public footpath would be screened for the security and privacy of residents and travellers.	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1384</a>	Jenkins L	Never move them here	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS948</a>	Jennings B	Objects to the Lea Castle site as it is Green Belt and the hardstanding required will cause permanent damage (see Dale Farm picture), the land is badly polluted and insufficiently supplied with water, and the additional traffic the site will create.  Feels that the site would be better used as a country park or nature reserve.	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.  The suggested alternative options for the site

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS765</a>	Jennings S	Wyre Forest already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS955</a>	Johnson H	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too remote from shops and other amenities serving to isolate the community living there.</li> <li>• Poor geographical access to nearby schools, another barrier to integrating this community, particularly the younger element.</li> <li>• Proximity to a SSSI &amp; Green Belt land</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1493</a>	Jones A	Objects to the Lea Castle site because Cookley doctors surgery is full to capacity.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1456</a>	Jones B	The site is completely unsuitable due to the close proximity of major roads and derelict buildings on the site. There is potential for increased incidence of crime and the effect this would have on local residents as well as depreciation of house prices.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1490</a>	Jones B	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no safe route to the doctors.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1422</a>	Jones H	Cookley Primary school is full. Cookley doctors' surgery is full	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS355</a>	Jones J	Potential nuisance	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS720</a>	Jones P	This should be a "flagship" employment/mixed use site.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS2</a>	Jones R	Objects to the proposed use of the Lea Castle site at Cookley for gypsy and traveller provision for a number of reasons including impact on local amenities, poor access, impact on community services and unsuitability and safety of the site itself	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1131</a>	Jones W	Have family in the area.	Objection noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1414</a>	Kearney P	Potential for increase in crime	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1213</a>	Keeble J	Local school is full to capacity. Roads are dangerous for people walking to surgery, no safe route, they lie between A449 and the A451.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1149</a>	Keeling Mr	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site, raises concerns over the loss of employment as a result of the hospital closing, suggests that the Green Belt designation and lack of promotion of the site by WFDC explain the lack of interest from developers, refers to neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Suggests the site is one of the most attractive</p>	<p>Objections and concerns are noted. The use would need to be considered as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site.</p> <p>Alternative use suggestions are noted.</p> <p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>development sites in Worcestershire with direct access to Birmingham and easy access to the motorway. Suggests that a headquarters could be located there and there would still be sufficient space for several high value houses which could include grazing land or perhaps a retirement village. This would provide wealth and employment.</p> <p>Refers to the poor perception of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites and suggests property values in the area have already dropped by 30-40% as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>Suggests the site would dominate the small community of the Crescent.</p>	<p>Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1015</a>	Kendrick A	Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital Site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1011</a>	Kendrick B	Objects to the Lea Castle Site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1318</a>	Kirton K	<p>Worcestershire already has highest number of authorised sites in West Midlands; Lea Castle is in a rural area away from schools, doctors and shops; no history of gypsies in area; site would dominate existing housing.</p> <p>Would suggest that sites are located in Kidderminster close to existing community in</p>	<p>Objections are noted as are the concerns relating to access to the site. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Stourport-on-Severn - suggest British Sugar site	the decision making process.  With regard to the former British Sugar Site - the site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1417</a>	Knight A	Primary school is full; doctors' is almost full	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS547</a>	Kruckow I	Cookley doctors surgery is nearly full to capacity.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS548</a>	Kruckow L	Cookley doctors' surgery is nearly full to capacity.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS345</a>	L'Herroux D	<p>There are areas of natural beauty which must be protected.</p> <p>Local schools are full to capacity.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Statutory Bodies such as Natural England and Worcestershire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1352</a>	Lake A	No history of gypsies in area; school is full; surgery is almost full; travellers have more outdoors lifestyle; wildlife on site needs protecting; surrounded by busy roads	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1351</a>	Lake M	GP surgery almost full; primary school is full; no safe routes by foot to village; no proof that area has history of travellers	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS926</a>	Laker Mr S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No positive influences</li> <li>• Resources already overstretched</li> <li>• Concerned about the reputation of the travellers and the reduction in property values due to the stigma surrounding them</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS923</a>	Laker R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost to develop the site</li> <li>• Property devaluation and increase in insurance premiums</li> <li>• Safety of people using footpath</li> <li>• No taxes but use facilities such as schools, doctors, police, fire services</li> <li>• Rubbish and the associated risk to wildlife</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The cost of developing any site will need to be considered in conjunction with the wider redevelopment of the site as a whole. It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Services and facilities are available to all of society</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1372</a>	Lancaster K	Lea Castle needs to be used productively - feel this proposal would have negative impact	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1008</a>	Lane K	Objects to the Lea Castle Site	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS756</a>	Lavelle J	Objects to Lea Castle for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools and doctors full.</li> <li>• Cookley village too small to maintain a huge number of people.</li> <li>• Animals may kill wildlife.</li> <li>• Site should be left alone, will re-open in the future for some sort of medical or social care.</li> <li>• We do not want another Dale Farm.</li> </ul>	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1344</a>	Lawrence K	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1345</a>	Lawrence M	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1565</a>	Lawrence Mr	Would effect house prices and make businesses reluctant to relocate there. Main roads are very busy and not easy to cross. Village facilities are quite a distance. School is full.	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1190</a>	L C	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site, believes it is not best suited to serve the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and the proposals do not make the best use of the land for local residents and businesses. Feels that Lea Castle should be safeguarded for future employment use and local flora and fauna could be preserved by incorporating 'green park' areas.</p> <p>Feels that local businesses would benefit from a new housing estate as it would bring trade to DIY stores and furnishing stores and could help provide employment to local people. This would also increase local property values rather than decrease them. A housing estate would also bring other improvements such as a reduction in the speed limit from 40mph to 30 mph on the Stourbridge Road.</p> <p>A Gypsy site would jeopardise the remainder of the land.</p> <p>Identifies a number of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle is a gateway into Kidderminster and has significant value</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The use would need to be considered as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site and further discussions are on-going with the landowners.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>for regeneration uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access is restricted and long vehicles and trailers turning into the lane would cause mayhem at the turning into the Park Gate public house.</li> <li>• What gives councillors the right to make decisions, which will impact on the value of local people's land and properties?</li> <li>• What safeguards are WFDC putting in place to help local residents avoid harassment when Gypsies vie for work?</li> <li>• What reassurances are you able to give local residents if the site was approved and the occupants were to expand illegally?</li> <li>• Human Rights Act, a matter of finding the correct balance for ALL parties involved. Where you have a significant proportion of local residents who oppose such intentions for land use, surely this speaks volumes.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS729</a>	Leary S	Cookley doctors surgery is nearly full to capacity.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS299</a>	Leedham H	The site is potentially dangerous to children because of the derelict buildings and underground ducts and tunnels. The site has not been used in the past by travellers as it was a private NHS site. The local school and doctor are full to capacity. There are two busy roads on each side of the possible access.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered when any decision on the potential allocation of the site is made.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS300</a>	Leedham M	There is no evidence that the Lea Castle site has ever been used by travellers. The infrastructure of the local area - both doctors and school are over-subscribed. The site is now derelict and	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			contains many dangerous buildings and underground tunnels, a risk to children.	<p>these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered when any decision on the potential allocation of the site is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS877</a>	Legister M	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unused/derelict buildings which would pose a danger to children, they may also contain asbestos</li> <li>• Site surrounded by two major main roads - could pose a danger for people crossing them to access services</li> <li>• Schools are already oversubscribed meaning that travellers would have to go further afield to access education</li> <li>• Strongly object to house devaluation if the site goes ahead - and is already having an affect on residents before the proposal has been confirmed. Will the Council look at compensation for local residents in the surrounding area if the plans go ahead?</li> <li>• Already facing numerous costs as a</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to the site are noted. The site would need to be considered on a comprehensive redevelopment basis and any development of the site would need to take into account the presence of the buildings and any asbestos on site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>country and this proposal would cause problems for local residents but also for the safety and welfare of the travelling community</p>	<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS563</a>	Legister W	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Derelict buildings - unsafe and would pose a risk to children living on the site. There are numerous tunnels and ducts which contain asbestos and would be dangerous to residents, the covers for these ducts are not safe. The cost of making the buildings and tunnels safe is huge, making this site not cost effective.</li> <li>2. Is Green Belt and home to many species of flora and fauna which should be protected.</li> <li>3. Boarded by two busy 'A' roads which are</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted. Concerns about existing buildings and structures need to be taken into account in any potential development of this site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>often the scene of serious accidents. No safe place to cross the roads to reach facilities and amenities in Cookley.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The school is currently full, leaving the gypsy children with a long journey to the nearest school.</li> <li>5. Doctors surgery is almost close to capacity and development would place strain on local facilities forcing gypsy families to travel further afield for care.</li> <li>6. No local bus service. nearest bus stop across a busy road - especially dangerous at night with no street lights.</li> <li>7. Public footpath running through the site which could impinge on the privacy of the Gypsy/Traveller residents.</li> <li>8. Not a traditional stopping place for travelling people so the site may not prove popular - waste of Council resources.</li> <li>9. Site is huge - concern about pitches spreading (like Dale Farm) Virtually impossible to police without constant monitoring and would be extremely expensive.</li> <li>10. Site should be used to provide jobs, site should remain for employment use, as identified in the Local Plan of 2004.</li> </ol>	<p>comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>We will carefully consider the concerns about services alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>In terms of potential containment of sites - the sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>Comments regarding the use of site for employment purposes are also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS728</a>	Lenton C	Local school is full to capacity and these are	Objections are noted. The concerns about

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			areas of natural beauty with wild animals on the site. These must be protected.	<p>capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1558</a>	Le Riche M	No spare capacity at doctors' or primary school.	The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1505</a>	Lewis J	There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected	Objection is noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS537</a>	Lewis Z	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1423</a>	Livingstone P	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of landscape impact.	Objections are noted.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will need to be taken into account.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1373</a>	Livingstone S	Do not agree with taxpayers providing sites for gypsies. Would you like them on your doorstep?	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS886</a>	Lloyd Perks I	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that the site could be better used for commercial purposes and a traveller site would devalue local properties. It would be better to expand existing sites.	Objection is noted as is the alternative suggestion about commercial development. Ongoing discussions will need to be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1506</a>	Locke D	Objects to proposal. Worked at Lea Castle for 20 years and had to cross busy A449 daily. Understand local school and doctors' is full. What jobs are there in the area? Travellers have traditionally worked on farms in Evesham and Hereford.	Objection is noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS407</a>	Loughran K	Objects to the Sion Hill and Lea Castle on the basis that the proposals would reduce property values.	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS521</a>	Loveridge P	Object	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1321</a>	Loveridge W	Primary School is full; site lies between 2 dangerous roads; area of natural beauty; wildlife needs to be protected	Objection is noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1188</a>	L P	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site and feels the site would be better used for affordable housing or future business development.</p> <p>Identifies the following negative impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative impact on local area</li> <li>• Negative impact for future development of adjacent land</li> <li>• Harder for local people to sell their property</li> <li>• Negative impact on local house prices</li> <li>• Visual intrusion</li> <li>• Fly tipping</li> <li>• Constant stream of complaints from local</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illegal expansion of site</li> </ul>	Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS892</a>	Ludwig C	We should be using this land to create job opportunities and keep the lovely looking aspect. We should look after Cookley and create some homes for young people who live in the area.	Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies and Travellers is noted. The suggested alternative uses for the site are also noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS161</a>	Ludwig K	Considers the Lea Castle site to be unsuitable for these purposes for a number of reasons. There are significant cost implications, presents danger to children because of presence of poisonous mushrooms, Site is idyllic community and environmental resource and needs to be preserved/developed properly, site is isolated from local communities. Alternatively, vehicle use would bring further congestion to local area, Protected species (polecat) on site, Public footpath through site needs preserving and its integrity maintained., effectively preclude its use for commercial or housing purposes, Noise and light pollution emanating from site, The site needs to be developed for employment purposes. Local facilities (primary school and GP) unable to receive further demand. There are better options for the site that will enhance the local community and preserve the "Green Belt" element. e.g. sheltered housing, light industry,	The concerns relating to the Lea Castle site are noted. The Site Allocations preferred options consultation identified Lea Castle as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and as suitable for comprehensive redevelopment based on a mix of uses. Any development that comes forward for this site would need to be considered comprehensively and address all of the issues raised in relation to biodiversity and wildlife, access to services and highways matters.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			recreation. There must be more suitable and less costly options in the County of Worcestershire.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1018</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1412</a>	Mackie S	Cost; local community; schools already full	<p>Objections are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1465</a>	Manning W	Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1556</a>	Manton M	Should make most of wonderful setting - suggest use as rehabilitation centre, convalescent home or young people's facility. Should be used to benefit locals.	Objections and suggested alternative uses are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1555</a>	Marks C	Who would pay for all the work that needs doing to make site habitable?  Wildlife needs protecting.	The sites would be delivered by Registered Social Landlords and not by the District Council. Funding is available via a bidding process for these agencies to deliver such sites. It is however uncertain how much funding would be available for each specific site.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS735</a>	Marks G	It would be a disgrace to use this land for travellers site. It should be sold to create jobs so money can be ploughed back to the Council and to get people off the dole.	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use proposed for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS736</a>	Marks S	Cookley school and doctors are full to capacity. There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people. There are	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			no bus routes and Cookley is only a small village and would not be able to cope with Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.	facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1232</a>	Marlow Mrs	Objects to the Lea Castle site, feels that travellers are people who travel from place to place. Questions why Lea Castle has been identified when it is in the Green Belt, questions why the Austcliffe Park residents have to vacate the site for one month when travellers can stay all year round. The village school and doctors can not cope with additional population. Would like to register two votes against the site (herself and her husband). Question how it will be kept to 15 pitches.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS434</a>	Marsden Terence	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises concerns about containing the use on such a large site, disposing of rubbish, travellers access to facilities such as schools, and healthcare, increased traffic on fast, busy roads and the public right of way.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS421</a>	Marsden Trina	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that it is not a clearly defined site and it could spread, Cookley primary school and GP surgery is full, there is no safe route to school or to the surgery, a public footpath runs through the site, there is no history connecting travellers to Cookley and there is concern about access to the site for large vehicles.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1380</a>	Marshall S	Why can't site be used for housing? Will they pay Council Tax or have mains electric? Will site be for 12 months occupancy?	Objections are noted as is the suggested alternative use of the site for housing. Residents of any sites that will be allocated pay Council Tax. Sites would be for permanent occupation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1405</a>	Marshall T	Cookley school and surgery are both full	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1212</a>	Marsh D	Danger of busy A roads - no safe access to village facilities. Site unsafe with derelict buildings and tunnels.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any redevelopment of the area</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1261</a>	Marsh D	Safety fears from busy roads and underground tunnels	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concerns about the safety of the site would need to be considered when a decision on the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				comprehensive redevelopment of the site is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS864</a>	Martin C	Do not consider this a suitable use for the site - use would not be sympathetic to surroundings	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS902</a>	Martin C	Lea Castle covers many acres and should a part be used for travellers it would in effect render the whole area non viable for any other potential use.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS900</a>	Martin J	Should be used for other purposes - possibly care. Use by travellers would jeopardise other uses on rest of site	Objection to the site being used for travellers is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site. Any development within this location would need to be considered on a comprehensive basis and the constraints and opportunities provided by the site appreciated.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS865</a>	Martin J	Not appropriate use for the site - could not contain use easily. Negative impact	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS456</a>	Martin P	<p>The site in general seems inappropriate for residential settlement, i.e. no easy access to shops, doctors, schools etc, lack of public transport. Unless there is a massive upgrading of the infrastructure it would be unfair on the Gypsy community.</p> <p>The site is in an area of outstanding natural beauty and it would be tragic to lose more Green Belt.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The site is not located in an area of outstanding natural beauty but it is within the Green Belt and although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, under national planning policy a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1535</a>	Martin R	A travellers site would require more policing, larger school, bigger GP surgery and larger buses. Area already has Camping and Caravan Club site plus Austcliffe Holiday Caravan Site which has been developed into residential park homes with only an 11 month residency. Why can't Austcliffe have a 12 month licence?	Objection is noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1532</a>	Martin S	Cookley village amenities could not cope with influx of travellers to area. Why do travellers need a permanent home? Austcliffe Park residents only have 11 month residency.	Objection is noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1120</a>	Masefield J	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the following	The objections to the use of this site for

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic using Axborough Lane.</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure and local services and facilities.</li> <li>• The lane is frequently used for fly-tipping which is likely to increase.</li> <li>• It would dominate the existing population.</li> <li>• The community may increase beyond the 15 proposed pitches.</li> <li>• The schools and healthcare facilities are full.</li> <li>• The derelict buildings and ducts contain many hazards and pose a danger for children living in the area.</li> <li>• The site has provided employment historically and should continue to do so.</li> <li>• The site should be developed for the benefit of the wider community.</li> </ul>	<p>traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1492</a>	Massey P	Concerned about access to the underground ducts being a danger to children. Plus the asbestos underneath is a hazard and who is going to bear the cost of clearing it?	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area. Any cost associated with developing the site would be borne primarily by the company developing it.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1058</a>	Mathews J	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1265</a>	Mathews R	School and medical centre at capacity; safety hazards from main roads; semi-derelict site contains asbestos; Green Belt needs preserving - open spaces, playing fields. Would like to see additional footpaths designated	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				of need.  The request for additional footpaths is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1086</a>	Matthes M	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt, the site being a former hospital has a restriction on its uses to business and light industrial and a gypsy site here could prejudice this. Gypsy and Traveller sites should be small and contained to prevent illegal expansion; contaminated land should not be used for a Gypsy and Traveller site; there is a public right of way through the site; there are concerns about the impact on the landscape and wildlife.</p> <p>The Baker Report states that new sites should be located to the Worcester side of Kidderminster and close to shops and services. Lea Castle scores red on all of these but has still been put forward.</p> <p>The land is within the Green Belt; the site was not considered sustainable for a residential development so should not be considered for this purpose; the site is not within walking distance of local amenities, journeys will need to be made by car; there is no history of this use in Cookley and the site is the furthest away from the existing traveller community in Stourport-on-Severn; the site is bordered by main roads and would dominate the relatively small residential</p>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			community within the area.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1082</a>	Matthews R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt, the site being a former hospital has a restriction on its uses to business and light industrial and a gypsy site here could prejudice this, Gypsy and Traveller sites should be small and contained to prevent illegal expansion, contaminated land should not be used for a Gypsy and Traveller site, there is a public right of way through the site, there are concerns about the impact on the landscape and wildlife.</p> <p>The Baker Report states that new sites should be located to the Worcester side of Kidderminster and close to shops and services. Lea Castle scores red on all of these but has still been put forward.</p> <p>The land is within the Green Belt the site was not considered sustainable for a residential development so should not be considered for this purpose, the site is not within walking distance of local amenities, journeys will need to be made by car, there is no history of this use in Cookley and the site is the furthest away from the existing traveller community in Stourport-on-Severn, the site is bordered by main roads and would dominate the relatively small residential community within the area.</p>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS253</a>	Maver R	This is a large site with numerous possibilities: Extremely dangerous boundary roads; Public footpath running through the site; Impact on the people living in the immediate locality; Effect on local school, doctor's surgery and village. This beautiful site should be developed with employment, leisure and most of all the residents of Cookley in mind.	These comments are noted. The Lea Castle site is identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt within the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options document. This flags up the need for comprehensive redevelopment of the site focussing on employment generating uses. Any proposals for traveller pitch provision that may come forward would need to be looked as part of wider comprehensive site development.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1378</a>	Maxwell G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle is not suitable</li> <li>• The cost of clearing the asbestos is astronomical</li> <li>• No footpaths to Cookley village</li> <li>• Doctors surgery and primary school both already full to capacity</li> <li>• These Travelling People, mainly from Southern Ireland, are not given special privileges there so why here? What great contribution do they make to the area?</li> <li>• Having lived here for 16 years, the proposal is that they have more rights than ourselves who are made homeless for one month in winter by WFDC</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1391</a>	Maxwell P	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises a number of concerns including the capacity of the school and doctors' surgery, access to services and facilities from the site, the cost of developing the site and the impact on council tax, the asbestos on the site, and the current 11 month occupancy at Austcliffe Park.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS276</a>	McLelland B	Suggests another possible use for the site as a Centre for Green Energy and suggests a number of details as to how this could be implemented. The site should become a jewel in the crown for Worcestershire not a source of distress and worry for local residents.	The suggestions for the future use of Lea Castle site are welcome. The site is a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and future development proposals will require comprehensive planning with a focus on employment generating uses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS237</a>	McLelland K	Considers the Lea Castle site is unsuitable because it will have a detrimental effect on local services, the need to make the site safe and habitable, access to be kept clear for the public and privacy resolved for travellers? Thought given to the residents that adjoin the site in The Crescent and Axborough Lane? Busy and dangerous roads, travelling community has no ties to Cookley, enforcement issues, planning should be given for something that will build the economy. Lea Castle is a beautiful place and should be safeguarded as Green Belt land.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues. It should be noted that the site is identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and any proposals for future pitch provision would need to be considered as part of a comprehensive development plan for the site that focuses on employment generation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1550</a>	McLucas L	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt and it will devalue properties and crime will increase. Question who will monitor how long residents stay on the site.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>"Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.</p> <p>Should the site come forward it would be for a permanent site where Gypsy families or Travelling Showpeople would live on a permanent basis.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1319</a>	McQuitty S	Why can sites not just be for a single family group, rather than a large group? Then they would integrate more easily and not put so much pressure on local services	Objection to the Lea Castle Site are noted as are the suggestions for smaller sites. Access to services and integration into communities is something that needs to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS246</a>	Meakin C	Council documents state that such sites should be urban based and/on the Worcester side of Kidderminster; site requires considerable development; site is Green Belt and should be developed for the benefit of the wider community - privately funded retirement village/hospice? Does not have ready access to local amenities, pressure placed on local schools and medical practices, protection of public footpath, negative	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>impact on anti-social behaviour and house prices. Enforcement implications and the cost of these?</p>	<p>harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS823</a>	Meredith M	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt, it is bordered by main roads, there are no amenities, the site is not suitable for heavy vehicles, Cookley school is full, there is no bus route and it is not safe walking distance from Cookley services.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues. Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1216</a>	Millington E	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site and feels that the site could be used for affordable housing, a Travellers site would devalue local properties and there would be security and health and safety problem and there is strong opposition to the proposals.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative option for the development of the site.</p> <p>Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1396</a>	Millward B	Local amenities would not cope	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS760</a>	Millward Jones T	Objects because of the impact on the landscape and flora and fauna. Schools are already full. The land should be used for retirement properties.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1395</a>	Millward T	Fearful that proposal will lead to abuse of lovely area.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1375</a>	Moles S	Would harm natural beauty of site, increase traffic hazard. Lifestyle of gypsies more suited to urban area	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1374</a>	Moles T	Travellers would cause noise and smoke nuisance; semi-rural area of natural beauty and wildlife needs protection. Gypsy site should be in urban area	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1564</a>	Moll N	Questions why 'travellers' need a permanent site and raises issues relating to 11 month occupancy condition at Austcliffe Park. Raises issues relating to the security of properties left empty during February.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1518</a>	Moore J	No thanks!	Objection noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS996</a>	Moore M	Objects to the Lea Castle Site	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1430</a>	Morgan D	Would blight future prospects for site	Objections are noted. The redevelopment of the site would need to be undertaken on a comprehensive basis and planned to ensure any uses proposed were compatible

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS880</a>	Morgan J	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is no access to major roads or public transport,</li> <li>• there is no access to local services,</li> <li>• it would not be sympathetic with the local environment,</li> <li>• development will dominate the tiny community,</li> <li>• the roads in the area will cause safety problems to pedestrians,</li> <li>• site requires huge investment, there is asbestos on the site, there is little street lighting.</li> <li>• Also raises concern that the site will introduce light pollution to the area which will have a negative impact on wildlife.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS881</a>	Morgan J	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is no access to major roads or public transport,</li> <li>• there is no access to local services,</li> <li>• it would not be sympathetic with the local environment,</li> <li>• development will dominate the tiny community,</li> <li>• the roads in the area will cause safety problems to pedestrians,</li> <li>• site requires huge investment, there is asbestos on the site, there is little street lighting.</li> <li>• Also raises concern that the site will introduce light pollution to the area which will have a negative impact on wildlife.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS964</a>	Morgan K	Objects to the Lea Castle site because crossing the A449 is dangerous, pulling out of the Crescent is difficult, the footpath alongside the A449 is too narrow, and the only way to access the facilities in Cookley village is on foot or by car.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS952</a>	Morgan M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why spend money turning Lea Castle into a slum</li> <li>• Concerned about the impact of the village pubs and amenities</li> <li>• Council should be ashamed</li> <li>• How much will it cost to build and facilitate a police station there?</li> </ul>	Objections are noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS907</a>	Morgan R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle Site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would dominate the local community</li> <li>• No easy access to local services (shops, health, education) and social contact - meaning the site will be isolated, physically and socially</li> <li>• Would not be sympathetic to the local environment by encroaching on the visual and acoustic privacy of local residents</li> <li>• Very little street lighting - is a risk to any residents walking in the dark. Introducing lighting would create pollution which could disturb wildlife</li> <li>• No easy access to major roads or public transport.</li> <li>• Due to the proximity of local busy roads - two A class roads - there will be significant safety problems</li> <li>• Site is potentially contaminated with asbestos</li> <li>• Water, electricity, drainage and sanitation facilities would require a huge investment to bring them up to standards</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to local services are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS909</a>	Morgan Ruth	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle Site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would dominate the local community</li> <li>• No easy access to local services (shops, health, education) and social contact - meaning the site will be isolated, physically and socially</li> <li>• Would not be sympathetic to the local environment by encroaching on the visual and acoustic privacy of local residents</li> <li>• Very little street lighting - is a risk to any residents walking in the dark. Introducing lighting would create pollution which could disturb wildlife</li> <li>• No easy access to major roads or public transport.</li> <li>• Due to the proximity of local busy roads - two A class roads - there will be significant safety problems</li> <li>• Site is potentially contaminated with asbestos</li> <li>• Water, electricity, drainage and sanitation facilities would require a huge investment to bring them up to standards</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to local services are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS708</a>	Morris B	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional	Objection is noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			stopping place for travelling people.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS707</a>	Morris P	The local primary school is already full to capacity.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1361</a>	Morton K	Proposal is causing extreme stress to residents in vicinity, their houses have already gone down in value. Please put needs of existing community first. Schools and doctors are overstretched. Don't force travellers into areas where they do not want to be	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1359</a>	Morton M	<p>Insufficient infrastructure and services to support them; schools and doctors' do not have enough room; roads congested; will be costly to clear site and provide utilities</p> <p>Why not allocate areas near industrial estates or perhaps on the Old Sugar Beet Factory ground?</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The cost of developing any site will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS549</a>	Motfield D	Why do travellers need a permanent site?	Objection is noted. The Government's recent

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. These sites are often of a permanent nature.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1052</a>	Mudd M	Do not object to sites being allocated for travellers but feel that Lea Castle site could be better used for large-scale housing. Travellers site would have detrimental effect on Westley Court residents affecting Council Tax revenue.	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS968</a>	Mundy D	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS915</a>	Myatt N	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that there is no direct access to local services and facilities, the schools and doctors are over subscribed and parking for these facilities is limited, the area already suffers with traffic and there are no recognised footpaths with lighting on the site. Feels that the site would be better	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			used to create employment and that a traveller site could harm this potential.	<p>process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The suggested alternative use for this site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1560</a>	Nangle J	<p>Unsuitable site as between 2 busy roads; insufficient amenities in Cookley; no footpath or lighting from main road to site; underground ducts and tunnels plus asbestos; Green Belt land should be protected.</p> <p>Questions how traveller children would access education - many will want Catholic schools - who will pay for transport?</p>	<p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness,</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1486</a>	Nangle M	<p>How would public footpath be screened from proposed site to give residents and travellers security? Site is Green Belt which should not be used for travellers</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The site would need to be considered through a comprehensive redevelopment that took into account issues such as the presence and location of the public footpath.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1562</a>	Nangle P	Natural beauty and wildlife need to be protected. School is full - where would children go?	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1561</a>	Nangle S	Completely inappropriate place to suggest for travellers. Unsafe buildings on site, unsafe access to village. Noise pollution for existing residents. School and surgery could not cope. Natural beauty would be ruined.	<p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1133</a>	Nash A	Site should be used to benefit local community; cost of clearing site and making it safe will be substantial; Cookley ward is most deprived rural ward in County and in top 20% most deprived in England; area needs a boost - putting gypsies on Lea Castle will not help the area	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1084</a>	Neil J	Lea Castle Hospital site suitable for mixed development including housing	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1346</a>	Newman J	<p>Cookley is small village - local services would not cope; school is full; questions whether gypsies would not want to attend Catholic schools; local doctors' could not cope; potential for bats on site; Stourport-on-Severn is more appropriate area for gypsies</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>as part of the planning process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District - including Stourport-on-Severn.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS61</a>	Newton H	<p>Many people are prejudice towards the gypsy and traveller community and we fear that giving them land so close to a housing estate will affect the value and ability to sell our houses if the need was to arise</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right. The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS427</a>	Nicholls C	Lea Castle is an inappropriate site. It is in the Green Belt and would be better suited to provide sheltered accommodation for the elderly/employment uses (high tech) and leisure facilities. This fits in with the LDF proposals and also reflects the view of the community. Have the Travellers been asked for their views?	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site, which reflect the draft policy put forward in the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Paper.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS433</a>	Nicholls C	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is unsafe for children to cross the A449 and A451, there is a requirement for accommodation for the elderly and this site would make a tranquil setting for that purpose and we must plan wisely for the future and not inflict something which is not wanted by local residents.	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS536</a>	Nicholls F	Cookley primary school is already full to capacity. There are areas of natural beauty, wild life and wild animals on the site and these must be protected.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS702</a>	Nicholls G	There are areas of natural beauty, wildlife and wild animals on the site - these must be protected. Cookley primary school is already full to capacity.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1497</a>	Noble G	Lea Castle is lovely wooded parkland with wildlife. Fear that gypsies would have negative impact on this.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1498</a>	Noble N	The school and doctors surgery are already full to capacity. Neighbouring schools in Kinver and Kidderminster are also full. There are no bus routes from this proposed site and no safe route by foot to village amenities.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS443</a>	Nock B	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objections are noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1408</a>	Nock B	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no capacity at schools and doctors and the main roads are a danger.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1448</a>	O'Brien J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because Gypsies have expressed a preference to be in Stourport-on-Severn.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1519</a>	O'Reilly C	Children will not want to go and play outside anymore.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS449</a>	O'Reilly L	Previous experience has been unpleasant and intimidating living local to these people.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1600</a>	Oakley K	I do not think that the amenities in Cookley can handle an influx of many people.	Comments are noted and will be considered alongside those received from service providers including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS936</a>	Osborne T	Concerned about the welfare of the wildlife and areas of natural beauty	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1239</a>	Page E A W	There is inadequate infrastructure in the village including roads, parking places, school and doctors surgery. The site is bordered by two major roads making access dangerous, and property prices will be reduced.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS946</a>	Pagett E	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1452</a>	Palfrey C	Objects to the Lea Castle site as there is no proof that it is a traditional stopping place for travellers.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1478</a>	Palfrey C	Objects to the Lea Castle site because Cookley is a small village and the school is already full.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS846</a>	Palfrey D	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS845</a>	Palfrey H	Roads, water, electric, gas and sewerage on site - should use to provide houses for rent.	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use of houses for rent.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1415</a>	Palfrey S	Suggest more appropriate use such as hands-on college to help youth find work	Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople is noted as is the suggested alternative use.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1454</a>	Palfrey W	Objects to the Lea Castle site as it adjoins two major roads and will cause problems with traffic.	Objection is noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS771</a>	Palmer A	Objects for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site will dominate the local community.</li> <li>• Noise pollution from lorries.</li> <li>• Travellers would prefer to live in</li> </ul>	The Lea Castle site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Stourport-on-Severn near to existing community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local school and surgery are full.</li> <li>Death cap mushrooms on site should be protected.</li> <li>No natural boundary - site could expand - eviction process lengthy.</li> <li>Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<p>which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1377</a>	Palmer A	Not wanted.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1240</a>	Palmer C	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is prime land for employment and allowing a Gypsy site will make it less attractive to investors.</li> <li>The village is small with an over subscribed school and doctors surgery.</li> <li>There are limited employment opportunities in Cookley and the surrounding area.</li> <li>The Lea Castle site contains asbestos and ducts and these pose safety risks.</li> <li>A public right of way exists over the site.</li> <li>Social cohesion needs to be considered, if the proposals go ahead against local wishes and property values are reduced</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The use of the site for employment opportunities needs to be considered when a decision on the future of the whole site is made.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>then there will be animosity between the communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the site is full with permanent gypsy families then travellers will be forced to pitch somewhere else illegally.</li> <li>• Pitches should be created away from local residents and businesses where travellers can temporarily stop. Surely there are enough permanent pitches already.</li> <li>• How would you guarantee that only the authorised part of the site was occupied?</li> <li>• The site should be considered for a retirement/disabled village, a sporting facility, a hospice, armed forces use, a business park or a wildlife park.</li> </ul>	<p>material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The proposed suggested alternative uses for the site are noted. However, it should be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers (i.e. capacity at facilities).</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS767</a>	Palmer L	<p>Objects on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt site with no natural boundary.</li> <li>• Furthest site from bus stop and shops.</li> <li>• No spaces at local school and no safe route to school.</li> <li>• Devaluation of local properties.</li> <li>• No mains services on site that are not Council property.</li> <li>• Asbestos and dusts make site unsafe.</li> <li>• Protected species on-site.</li> <li>• Allocated for employment use in the</li> </ul>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Adopted Local Plan.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1487</a>	Parkes C	Objects to the Lea Castle site because Cookley doctors surgery is almost full.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1484</a>	Parkes G	Objects to the Lea Castle site because Cookley school is already full.	The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1495</a>	Payne J	Travellers have different lifestyle - may be increased noise and smoke from site	Objections are noted.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1503</a>	Payne L	Fear increased smoke and noise from proposed site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1491</a>	Payne S	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1502</a>	Payne V	Natural beauty and wildlife needs protecting.	Objection is noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1435</a>	Payton K	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of the capacity of the schools and doctors and because the site is bounded by two busy roads and has a public footpath running through it.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				service capacity issues.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1403</a>	Peasley	Objects to the Lea Castle site and suggests it should be used to provide a mix of housing including affordable housing for first time buyers.	Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS971</a>	Perry K	As the site can't be developed until 2018 - it should be used for light industrial/high tech business or retirement village - as the economic climate will have improved by then.	Objection is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS969</a>	Perry M	Wouldn't allow a housing development on a 'Greenfield Site' so why are you allowing this?	Noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1368</a>	Perry R	Make them buy a house	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS970</a>	Perry S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will need transport to access doctors, shops, schools and other local amenities</li> </ul>	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should safeguard the Green Environment</li> <li>• Doctors and schools full to capacity</li> <li>• The busy A449 and A451 will have to take extra transport with extra cost to repair the roads</li> </ul>	<p>comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies and the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS972</a>	Perry Steve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is too isolated</li> <li>• Lies between two busy and dangerous roads</li> <li>• Local schools and doctors at capacity - long travel distance to other alternatives</li> <li>• Dangerous with derelict buildings and tunnels</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently has security guards to protect the site from damage and to keep children from coming to any harm</li> <li>• What cost will this be to the tax payers!</li> <li>• Does the Council propose to protect the site and travellers in the future?</li> </ul>	<p>are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>Unsure as to what the reference about protecting the site and travellers in the future means. However should a site be allocated in the Development Plan then it will be safeguarded as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1382</a>	Phillips H	Fearful of anti-social behaviour, falling house prices and increased household insurance premiums	Objection is noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS117</a>	Plant I	Documented evidence that there are protected species at the site. This is Green Belt land and should not be developed. Raises risks relating to asbestos on the site and the impact on the travellers themselves. Asks how a travellers site will create more jobs for the community. Considers that current site at Stourport-on-Severn should be extended as they have no links to Cookley.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process. Any proposals for pitch provision on the site would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment that includes employment uses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS107</a>	Plant K	Objects to the Lea Castle site as it is Green Belt land, walkways will no longer be usable, protected species on the site, land is earmarked for employment purposes, travellers have no ties with the Cookley community, large amounts of asbestos on the site, not enough capacity at the local primary school/doctor's surgery.	The concerns relating to retention of the Green Belt, character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process. It should be noted that any proposals that were to come forward on the site would need to be

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				considered as part of a comprehensive redevelopment package.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS710</a>	Porter R	Cookley is a beautiful village and quiet to live in. Concerned about noise and air pollution. Health hazard to the community, surrounding countryside and wildlife.	Objections are noted.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS706</a>	Porter T	The main road is already a very busy road and there are wild animals which should be protected. Also we do not want noise and pollution in a village where it is a quiet place to live.	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS404</a>	Povey A	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that it is surrounded by busy roads, there is no access to local amenities, it is impossible to screen the public footpath, there is no historical connection linking travellers to Cookley village, and the site should be used for employment uses.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS403</a>	Povey I	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that it has no links to public transport, it is surrounded by dangerous roads, there is no safe access to local schools and health facilities, and the site is more suited to employment uses in accordance with its current Adopted Local Plan designation. Argues that there are no links to travellers or users of travelling fairs in the community.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS446</a>	Povey I	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is surrounded by dangerous roads and has no safe access to local amenities, schools, shops and health provisions.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1553</a>	Poxon P	School is full; access to site is dangerous.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS802</a>	Preece J	Strongly object - realise these people have to live somewhere but Lea Castle and Sion Hill are not suitable. Sion Hill is too near housing and an area where children pass daily and Lea Castle too near housing estates. On any area it would need to be carefully looked at and numbers strictly controlled to allocation.	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions and numbers tightly defined.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS740</a>	Preece R	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS539</a>	Price O	There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected.	Objection is noted.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS39</a>	Pugh S	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at Lea Castle Hospital, Cookley. It could be used to create jobs to benefit the local community. Continuing cost in management of a gypsy site which is tax payers money. The site is an ideal place for small industry.	Objection is noted. The Site Allocations & Policies Preferred Options Paper included an outline policy in relation to the future land uses at Lea Castle Hospital which is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, this includes a mix of uses centred around employment and business. It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS511</a>	Randle R	<p>Objects to Lea Castle for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is deemed 'unsustainable for housing the settled community so why should it be 'sustainable' for travelling people?</li> <li>• It is a large site and there can surely be scope for several different types of development which will help the local community by creating jobs. Allowing a traveller settlement on there would surely prejudice the possibility of future development and make the land worthless.</li> <li>• The HCA has listed this site to be disposed of in the next 2 years, why then consider the site for use for travelling settlements, particularly when any site development will not take place until 2018 - 2023?</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as are the potential other options for use of the site. Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p> <p>Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site. The date suggested was for a potential delivery date, which reflected the fact that the site was more likely to come forward later in the plan period.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS937</a>	Randle S	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that it was not considered suitable for residential development through the SHLAA so therefore should not be considered suitable for a Gypsy site, it will treat the travelling community more favourably than the settled community which is contrary to Government advice, it will blight the remainder of the site preventing economic development taking place there, the travelling</p>	<p>Objection to the use of Lea Castle for travellers is noted. Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site and ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.</p> <p>The suggested alternative locations are noted and as part of this consultation process sites</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>community wish to be located in Stourport-on-Severn, small sites are preferred and this site could become large if development spread, any spread would be un noticed as it is screened from public view, any development would dominate The Crescent.</p> <p>Feels that seeking sites near the existing travelling community is more appropriate. Feels that using Lea Castle which is one of the most significant development sites in the Council's portfolio is negligent and misguided.</p>	<p>have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1269</a>	Redfern J	<p>Strongly objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is isolated and control over illegal use of the site will be costly and difficult.</li> <li>• Site is surrounded by busy A roads and there are no pedestrian crossing places.</li> <li>• Site is car dependent.</li> <li>• School and doctors are full.</li> <li>• There is asbestos on the site.</li> <li>• The site is home to pole cats which are protected.</li> <li>• Cites Bristol as an example of where providing pitches has worked, suggests that sites should be provided on industrial estates as was the case there and should be set up and monitored correctly. Refers to the existing Stourport-on-Severn sites</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>as an example of how this should be done. Suggests that the setting up of illegal sites in Stourport-on-Severn reflects people's desire to be near their families.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests Lea Castle is used as a rehabilitation centre for injured soldiers, providing jobs and boosting the economy.</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District - including within the Stourport-on-Severn area.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for the site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1267</a>	Redfern K	<p>Strongly objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is isolated and control over illegal use of the site will be costly and difficult.</li> <li>• Site is surrounded by busy A roads and there are no pedestrian crossing places.</li> <li>• Site is car dependent.</li> <li>• School and doctors are full.</li> <li>• There is asbestos on the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is home to pole cats which are protected.</li> <li>• Cites Bristol as an example of where providing pitches has worked, suggests that sites should be provided on industrial estates as was the case there and should be set up and monitored correctly. Refers to the existing Stourport-on-Severn sites as an example of how this should be done. Suggests that the setting up of illegal sites in Stourport-on-Severn reflects people's desire to be near their families.</li> <li>• Suggests Lea Castle is used as a rehabilitation centre for injured soldiers, providing jobs and boosting the economy.</li> </ul>	<p>facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District - including within the Stourport-on-Severn area.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for the site is noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1128</a>	Reed C	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it would be expensive to make the site safe, the demolition work would create high volumes of waste for landfill, the schools and doctors are over subscribed, the site is surrounded by busy roads with no pavements or bus services, the traveller community would dominate the small settled community, and there is no proven demand for sites in this location.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1278</a>	Reed H	Cost to make site safe would be prohibitively expensive - asbestos present poses health and safety risk; amount of demolition needed will mean high levels of landfill compared with other sites; local schools and doctors are full; site surrounded by main roads with limited footpaths and no bus service; travellers would dominate immediate community; no proven demand for traveller sites in this area; difficulties far outweigh any benefits  Site has potential to be used to generate jobs and improve local economy	Objections are noted. Any redevelopment of this site will need to be made safe taking into account any of the site abnormalities such as asbestos.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.  The alternative suggested uses of the site are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1293</a>	Reed K	Objects to the Lea Castle site because:	Objections are noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost to make the site safe will be prohibitively expensive as a type 3 asbestos survey will need to be carried out.</li> <li>• The amount of demolition work required will result in high volumes of waste going to landfill.</li> <li>• The local schools, doctors and services are already oversubscribed.</li> <li>• The site is surrounded by two main highways with few pavements and no bus service.</li> <li>• The traveller community would dominate the existing settled community in the immediate vicinity of the Lea Castle site.</li> <li>• There is absolutely no proven demand for traveller sites in this area.</li> <li>• The difficulties raised far outweigh the benefits.</li> <li>• There would be a phenomenal cost to taxpayers.</li> <li>• The site has the potential to be used to create jobs.</li> </ul>	<p>Any redevelopment of this site will need to consider the issues faced by the existing uses.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Environmental Health Officers.  The alternative suggestion for the site as somewhere that could provide jobs is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1539</a>	Reynolds D	Objects to the Lea Castle site, questions why Gypsies and Travellers need permanent sites and raises the issue of 11 month occupancy at Austcliffe Park.	Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS466</a>	Reynolds L	There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected.	Objections are noted as are the concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS916</a>	Riley M	Site contains asbestos - health hazard; access to amenities in Cookley is across major road; Cookley needs regeneration - site needs to bring in employment	<p>Concerns about the site are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS264</a>	Robinson C	We operate a children's home within a close proximity to this proposed site. As you can imagine, the children we care for have been severely damaged by past trauma. I fear for the children if a travelling site was within a walking proximity. Their positive outcomes and future life	These concerns are noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			chances may be severely diminished as vulnerable children will seek out some negative aspects of their local environment.	consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1546</a>	Rodgers J	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises the issue of the 11 month occupancy restriction on Austcliffe Park.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS572</a>	Roper R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in Green Belt.</li> <li>• Lack of safe access to educational, medical and shopping facilities.</li> <li>• Local main roads have poor safety record.</li> <li>• Doctors surgery and Junior School full up.</li> <li>• Asbestos is present in buildings and service tunnels.</li> <li>• Prices and sales of houses will be adversely affected.</li> <li>• Possible increase in crime and Dale Farm type of problem.</li> <li>• It is a beautifully quiet and peaceful little wildlife haven and we would like it to stay that way.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns regarding service capacity are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS522</a>	Rose J	Do these people pay Council Tax and pay rates like we do and do they get prosecuted for littering?	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Residents of the sites pay Council Tax.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1057</a>	Round J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because travellers should not need permanent sites. Questions how many other countries in Europe are obliged to provide sites and whether the sites will be restricted to 11 month occupancy in the same way as Austcliffe park is. Questions where access will be as the farm and the converted barns were not allowed direct access onto the A449. Objects to Green Belt being used, and raises concern about badgers and protected species.	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1427</a>	Rushbrook J	Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS440</a>	Russell E	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of additional traffic and additional noise. Questions the impact on the local school and suggests that there are more suitable sites within the District.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1540</a>	Ryder R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School full to capacity</li> <li>• No safe footpaths to Cookley</li> <li>• Busy roads a danger</li> </ul>	The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1343</a>	Sadler A	Site has considerable investment potential - proposed use would waste that potential; Green Belt; large areas are sloping and unsuitable for caravans	<p>Objections are noted as are the comments relating to the investment potential of the site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. This is also a major developed site in the Green Belt, which identifies the potential for some development to occur.</p> <p>Consider that the site would be suitable for caravans, and that the topography would not be a limiting factor.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS223</a>	Sadler N	Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital site because	The Council has not discarded the comments

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			it is allocated in the ALP for employment purposes therefore has restrictions on its uses to Class B1; needs of the settled community should be protected, partial use of the site as proposed will deter the more ideal future investment to develop the whole site to create employment opportunities. Wants to know why the Council has discarded the outcome of consultations with the local community? Considers a great waste of potential, travellers have no historical requirements in the area; site is within the Green Belt, impact on local community infrastructure - no capacity, the site is car dependent, security issues for isolated properties, health and safety issues within the site, large parts of the site are sloping and irregular.	submitted in relation to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Consultation and these were reported to the Council's committee. Through the Site Allocations process it is still the intention to allocate the Lea Castle site as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. This would necessitate comprehensive redevelopment focussing on employment uses. Any future provision for Gypsies and Travellers that may come forward at this site would need to do so as part of a comprehensive redevelopment scheme.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS224</a>	Sadler N	Considers the Lea Castle site does not meet the Government's own guidelines for the selection of Gypsy & Traveller sites and good practice guidance as it is poorly located and not easily accessible to local services and there are safety issues on the site.	Noted. We will carefully consider these views alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS226</a>	Sadler N	If traveller sites are allowed there is a known risk of additional illegal sites being set up. What are the contingency plans for legally removing such illegal sites? Has the Council considered potential impacts on the local settled community?	Noted. Should any provision go ahead at this site then it would be subject to a detailed planning application and planning conditions to limit the area of the site and number of pitches. This would include statutory consultation with Environmental Health



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Officers and West Mercia Constabulary relating to enforcement issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1547</a>	Salt D	I do not agree with ANY of these proposals. I would prefer a hospice or a clinic.	Objection and alternative use suggestions are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1209</a>	Sanderson A	My objection to this proposal is that I think that it would be better used for some sort of employment purposes to provide jobs for local people.	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1376</a>	Scriven B	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1355</a>	Shakespeare C	Village is across busy A road with school already full and GP surgery nearing capacity. Village cannot sustain increased volume of traffic and people	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1356</a>	Shakespeare I	Not enough school or doctors places; dangerous main road between site and village with unsuitable access; users of public footpath facing intimidation; no power to site	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>It is considered that utilities are already available that could be used for any redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1354</a>	Shakespeare T	No crossing point over busy main road to access village; primary school is full; fear natural beauty of site will be spoilt	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS445</a>	Sharpe R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about economic impact.</li> <li>• Not a traditional stopping place.</li> <li>• Concerned about the capacity at Cookley School.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The economic impact of the redevelopment of the site will be a factor to consider when looking at the options for the future use of the site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area of natural beauty and the impact on this.</li> </ul>	<p>these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS873</a>	Shaw D	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle Site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The introduction of a traveller site could dominate the settled community</li> <li>The Government Criteria states that <i>caution should be used when seeking locations for sites to ensure that they are based on need in a particular area and not the availability of inappropriate land for alternative uses'</i> it must be borne in mind that the land has already been deemed unsuitable for development for housing to be built. I believe that the Travelling community have as much right to suitable land on which to live as</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Any potential site in this location would need to be carefully considered and be part of a wider mixed use development. Furthermore, sustainability issues will need to be considered in any potential re-use of this site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>anyone else therefore if it is not suitable for housing it is not suitable for their community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough facilities to cope - local school is small and at capacity and Doctor's Surgery is small and only just copes with the tiny community</li> <li>• Danger of families accessing amenities, again Government Guidelines identify that '<i>travellers prefer rural locations but on the edge or closely located to a large town or city. They do not like isolation or great distances to facilities (i.e. walking home at night)</i>'</li> <li>• Limited bus services</li> <li>• Site has an array of wildlife which should be protected</li> <li>• Presence of asbestos that would be easily accessible to young children of the proposed site</li> <li>• Site has no suitable roads, pavements or street lighting and the introduction of further lighting would impact on light pollution</li> <li>• Again quoting the Government Guidelines '<i>all sanitation to meet legislation, regulations and British Standards</i>'; it is widely known and backed up with evidence from a former Engineer of the site that the current sanitation is not suitable without re-laying</li> </ul>	<p>service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Any redevelopment of the site would need to consider the presence of asbestos, as well as the access and services.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>new pipes across the whole site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed site does not offer sustainability or a safe environment for any potential residents or promote integrated co-existence between the site and local community.</li> <li>• Concerned about house values and depreciation</li> <li>• It is appreciated that the Gypsy and Travelling community require sites on which to settle however it was overwhelmingly a 'no' vote by the local residents at the meetings held in the Cookley Community Centre; this can in no way promote integration between the site and the locals.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1166</a>	Shurmer H	<p>I wish to object to this site as I believe it is totally inappropriate due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within Green Belt land and if it should be developed should be used to allow for employment within the local area.</li> <li>• There are not suitable footpaths and lighting for children to walk safely to school due to the busy A449.</li> <li>• I believe the schools are already very full close by.</li> <li>• The site is isolated with poor public</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I believe the Stourport-on-Severn sites are more suitable particularly as other gypsy communities live there.</li> </ul>	<p>authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school and highway safety are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and the Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1256</a>	Simpson N	Refers to Government guidelines para.2 sections 3.3 & 3.16 on safe environments for residents and contaminated land. Asbestos ducts on site	Objections are noted. The concerns regarding ensuring a safe environment need to be considered when a decision is made on

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			are unsafe and mowers had strictly defined routes to avoid potential collapse. Consider that asbestos should be removed before any planning application is considered.	the allocation of the site for any redevelopment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS825</a>	Skelding D	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site as there are no services nearby and schools, doctors and dentists are over subscribed and there are no bus routes.</p> <p>Suggests a better use for the site would be a home for old people with dementia which would also create employment.</p>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The suggested alternative use for the site is noted</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS796</a>	Skelding T	Schools at capacity and doctors almost at capacity. No safe pedestrian access to village. Site would better suited to use as a hospice or hospital	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS947</a>	Smith B	Cookley is a small village and unsuitable for Travellers.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1413</a>	Smith B	Convert back to Green Belt and leave as natural	Objections are noted. However, the site is classified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and therefore it is unlikely that the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				land would convert back to a 'natural' state.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1444</a>	Smith B	Objects to the Lea Castle site as the ducts are dangerous and suggests that with people being made redundant and having no job prospects the area does not need an influx of new people.	Objections are noted.  The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS538</a>	Smith D	Concerned about noise and air pollution.	Objection is noted.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS755</a>	Smith D	If permission is granted the whole site would be impossible to be used for any other purpose. Is the best the council can do with 200 acres of potential other use?	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS899</a>	Smith D	Consider Lea Castle site would be better used for care homes and day centres for elderly and others requiring specialist care. A smaller site for gypsy use would be more practical not in a rural area or in Green Belt	Objection is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.  Concerns about the principle of development in the Green Belt are noted and although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1421</a>	Smith D	Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protected wild animals.</li> <li>• Cost - derelict buildings.</li> <li>• Between 2 'A' roads</li> <li>• No other Gypsy sites.</li> </ul>	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS897</a>	Smith E	Should part of this site be used as a gypsy/traveller site who would want to use the rest? It would render it unusable and unsuitable for anything else.	Objections are noted. Any redevelopment on this site would need to be considered on a comprehensive basis taking into account all of the potential constraints and opportunities that exist here.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS805</a>	Smith G	Questions whether there are any smaller sites which Travellers could use.  Questions whether if only a small part of the site is used the remainder will be of any interest to anyone else.	A number of sites have been considered as part of this process.  Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS905</a>	Smith G	Under the impression that the site was to be used to bring employment into an area which is in great need of job opportunities. The proposals do not meet these criteria.  Is on Green Belt land and in an area of natural beauty and should be developed in a sympathetic way. The current proposals would not benefit the flora or fauna there  The proposed development would create a	Objections are noted. Employment development was one of the options that the Council had looked at for this site and any redevelopment of the site would need to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner in conjunction with the owners of the site.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Gypsy/Traveller community which would outweigh and dominate the local residents, which is against Government advice</p> <p>Cookley needs positive regeneration to bring in businesses and jobs, there is a chance to provide this at Lea Castle, instead of it being blighted.</p>	<p>and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The alternative uses for the site, for businesses and jobs, are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1081</a>	Smith G	School is already full; concerned about illegal travellers coming to site at later date as is huge area; travellers site is likely to put off other potential buyers; land should be used to benefit locals	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1260</a>	Smith G	Cannot get across the village with speeding	The concerns relating to access to the site are

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			traffic and large lorries blocking the shops	noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1499</a>	Smith G	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the Council propose to sell the land to "dwellers".</li> <li>• If not will they be charging rent to "dwellers"</li> <li>• Will they be recouping Council Tax for amenities i.e. schools, libraries, policing etc...</li> <li>• Will 'dwellers' come and go as and when they please and will there be some kind of register.</li> <li>• Will there be a time limit of residence for "dwellers" or will they be allowed to reside permanently all year round.</li> <li>• Can anyone apart from Gypsy Travellers and Romanies take up pitches on the site, if not how will the Council monitor this and what proof of culture must be produced?</li> <li>• Who will pay for the setting up of the site i.e. proposed fencing, toilet and washing</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>Any site that came forward would be licensed for Gypsy use and would be managed to ensure that the site was used solely for Gypsy families</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>facilities, clearing land and setting up of pitches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How many more areas of natural beauty will be destroyed by the Council if the proposal is approved and on-going.</li> <li>• Will the children of these families be given priority in our surrounding schools over residential children.</li> </ul> <p>Question whether Austcliffe Park residents will be allowed to live on the Gypsy site during their 4 week shutdown.</p>	<p>mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Any children would have the same rights as any other child who live within the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1451</a>	Smith H	This site is more suitable for a safe environment for 'people with learning difficulties/disabilities'	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1245</a>	Smith P	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is located too close to an established community, it will reduce property values, the site is allocated for light industrial/commercial development and has a complex ownership which may lead to high legal costs for the Council, the local schools and doctors are over-subscribed, consultations with the existing community suggest they want to be between Kidderminster and Worcester therefore Lea Castle is not appropriate, whilst it is appreciated that this has been handed from above it is badly conceived, someone has to address this and do what is right for our people.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1419</a>	Smith P	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because the schools and doctors are full and people will need to cross the A449 to get to Cookley.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1407</a>	Smith S	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School full to capacity.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doctors surgery full.</li> <li>• No bus routes to Cookley.</li> </ul>	<p>these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1142</a>	Smith V	Property will be devalued; hidden dangers e.g. asbestos on site; danger of children playing in underground tunnels; sanctuary for wildlife plus rare flora and fungi; lessons should be learned from Dale Farm situation	<p>Concerns are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS896</a>	Smith W	Why should 'travellers' need a site? It will ruin our peaceful village	<p>Objections are noted. The requirement to identify sites is outlined in the Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers which specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS599</a>	Southam W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dismayed the site is being considered - concerned about ability to 'spread', like</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Dale Farm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle isn't suitable because cost of getting the site fit for habitation, Asbestos , roads, schools ,doctors, polecats , house depreciation etc.</li> <li>• Main concern aside from house depreciation is the loss of a lovely open space.</li> <li>• A sympathetic build (care home) could be developed which would benefit the local community.</li> <li>• There are already 'travellers' on site and apparently the land owners leased them part of it for grazing to keep the grass down &amp; they've moved caravans/cars/statics on to the site.</li> </ul>	<p>the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The concerns regarding services are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				as part of the planning process.  Proposed alternative uses for the site are noted and ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1409</a>	Spare N	There is no safe route by foot to Cookley Primary School	Objections are noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1178</a>	Stafford J	Site is unsuitable for following reasons:  Would lead to planning blight of remainder of site; large site could be used for housing or a retirement village thereby creating jobs; would be ideal site for leisure and tourism development which would bring jobs to area	The use will need to be considered as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the site.  The alternative uses suggested are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1536</a>	Stafford J	Not a good use of the site - suggest housing, business park, nature reserve or retirement park	Objection and suggestions for alternative uses are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1447</a>	Stanley C	Proposal would make me fear for safety of both myself and my horses	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS732</a>	Stephenson P	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.	Objection is noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS675</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the Lea Castle site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS843</a>	Swift J	<p>Considers the Lea Castle site is unsuitable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it will be difficult to stop the site spreading, the remainder of the site will become unviable,</li> <li>• it should be used to create employment opportunities,</li> <li>• the site is unsafe,</li> <li>• the site would dominate the small community of The Crescent,</li> <li>• the school is over subscribed, and</li> <li>• the baker Report did not recommend the site as suitable.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The alternative option suggested for the site is noted.</p> <p>The safety of the site would need to be considered in any potential future redevelopment of the area</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The Baker Report did identify that the site may be suitable for delivery through a wider redevelopment of the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1438</a>	Swift J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it should be used to encourage employment, it will dominate the community and it is expensive to make the site safe. Suggests using it as a rehabilitation centre for injured soldiers.	Objections are noted. The alternative use for the site to provide employment opportunities is noted as is the suggested alternative use as a rehabilitation centre for injured soldiers.  The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS838</a>	Tallas J	Why not use Lea Castle for building homes that people can afford?	Objection is noted, as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1365</a>	Taylor G	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no proof it is a traditional stopping place for Gypsies and Travellers, the primary school and doctors are both full, there is no safe route to the village for pedestrians, there are no bus routes to the village, there is a public footpath through the site, the site is not safe because of derelict buildings and asbestos, and the wildlife on the site must be protected.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1364</a>	Taylor J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no proof it is a traditional stopping place for Gypsies and Travellers, the primary school and doctors are both full, there is no safe route to the village for pedestrians, there are no bus routes to the village, there is a public footpath through	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>the site, the site is not safe because of derelict buildings and asbestos, and the wildlife on the site must be protected.</p>	<p>Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1436</a>	Taylor M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because this type of development is totally unacceptable for a Green Belt site.	Objection is noted.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS961</a>	Taylor V	Objects to the Lea Castle site as it is not an appropriate area. Feels the site would be better used for a different use.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS991</a>	Tebbett K	Objects to the Lea Castle site on following grounds; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access to local services and facilities, particularly pedestrian access,</li> <li>• Site is surrounded by busy roads.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on the landscape.</li> <li>• Detrimental impact on wildlife.</li> <li>• Significant increase in noise from lorries and vans.</li> </ul>	Objections are noted.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Travellers may use other parts of the site on an illegal basis.</li> <li>• No street lighting around the site.</li> <li>• Asbestos is present on the site.</li> <li>• Site is remote from the services and facilities in the village and is not sustainable.</li> </ul>	<p>process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1201</a>	Tebbett M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is a significant distance from local shops and services, there are no spaces at schools and	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>healthcare facilities in the area, there is no pedestrian access to local amenities, the site is bordered by two main roads, there is a lack of street lighting, the space could be developed in a more sympathetic manner for example a retirement village with its own amenities, it is home to polecats, a mixed use proposal would not be practical because developers would not want to locate private homes so close to a Gypsy site, the site has asbestos, there is a significant risk that the site could spread beyond the allocated area.</p> <p>Also suggests consulting with Gypsies to determine where the sites should be situated. Also the travellers Assessment from 2008 is three years out of date , if a further assessment is due in 2013 why are sites being allocated on the basis of the old one?</p>	<p>noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Sustainability issues will need to be considered for any potential re-use of this site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions to mitigate against harm.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for this site is</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>noted. Any redevelopment of this site would need to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner taking into account all of the opportunities and constraints that are relevant.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p> <p>There is a current need to provide for a net of 23 pitches from 2008 - 2013 and we need to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				try and identify sites to meet this need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS487</a>	Thomas J	Travelling people cause anxiety amongst locals and they are a hazard to all the wildlife with all the mess they decide to leave behind when they move on.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1515</a>	Thompson S	The local amenities are already full to capacity.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1500</a>	Tibbetts A	Natural beauty and wildlife needs protecting.	Objection is noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1099</a>	Tilly R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 15 pitch site will dominate the small settlement of The Crescent.</li> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt, concern over the loss of wildlife and amenity.</li> <li>• The occupants will be reliant on cars to access local services and facilities in Cookley.</li> <li>• The site has previously been deemed unsuitable for housing; it is therefore unfair to consider it for a Gypsy site.</li> <li>• The site is not viable and capable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There has been no attempt to estimate the cost of delivery.</li> <li>○ The District Council does not seem to have obtained any indication of how much government funding is available to deliver sites.</li> <li>○ There is no attempt to define exactly where the site would be located within the overall site.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Locating the site here will undermine attempts to comprehensively redevelop the area.</li> <li>• Lea Castle is a large unbounded site which could result in development spreading beyond the initial 15 pitches.</li> </ul>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Raises concern that no robust evidence has been submitted to support the number of pitches required. Refers to the Rupert Scott report of 2008 (GTAA) and refers to the fact that this and the RSS express the wants of the Gypsy community. Authorities should look at whether the needs can be met through Gypsies and Travellers purchasing or renting traditional houses using their own funds. The report is 3 years old and the District Council has not tested whether or not the proposed level of need has correlated to the real world indicators such as the number of unauthorised encampments or developments.</p> <p>Argues that Wyre Forest District's strategy of providing pitches in the absence of co-ordinated provision across the region is flawed and potentially an unavoidable burden upon local tax payers. The approach will lead to more travellers migrating to the district and an increased demand for sites.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1053</a>	Timmis Motors	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1077</a>	Timmis R	Objects to the Lea Castle Hospital site.	Objection is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1541</a>	Tolley J	Fear increased smoke and noise from proposal	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1462</a>	Tolley L	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of the increase in smoke and noise from the travellers outdoor lifestyle.	Objections are noted.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1544</a>	Tolley R	Fear increased smoke and noise from proposal.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1198</a>	Udy A	Site would have to be purchased from owners. No local infrastructure or services available.	Objection is noted. The majority of the site is owned by the Homes and Communities Agency.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1393</a>	Wakefield P	Fear rise in crime; houses will be harder to sell; walkers facing abuse; doctors and schools are full. Suggest use site for sheltered housing.	Objections are noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site for Sheltered

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Consideration should be given to existing residents	<p>Housing.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1459</a>	Waldron M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is an area of beauty and wildlife habitat which needs protecting.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1520</a>	Walford N	Why not build a new hospital on this ground?	Objection is noted. Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1542</a>	Wall R	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises the issue of traveller pitches being permanent when Austcliffe Park residents are limited to 11 month occupancy.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1367</a>	Wardell-Hill A	Concerned about drain on public services and impact on local community and area	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1439</a>	Warrilow L	Proposal will damage area; Green Belt	Objections are noted.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1440</a>	Warrilow S	No boundary; footpath; Green Belt	Objections are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1463</a>	Warsap K	Primary school is full; fear increased smoke and noise from site	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1202</a>	Warwicker P	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle and supports a vote of no confidence in the Cabinet as proposed at the public meeting. The Cabinet are not acting in the voters best interests. Considers it inappropriate to spend £17,500 of taxpayers' money on the Baker Report. Considers Wyre Forest are more than generous in providing sites for Gypsies and Travellers already and no more should be provided.</p> <p>Considers Lea Castle should be safeguarded for future employment use and that a retirement village or hospice or a hotel with leisure use/sports facilities would be ideal.</p> <p>Highlights that there is asbestos on the site which would cost a lot to remove, money that could be better spent on the local village school. Services would have to be considered and this would cost more money. The local schools are full, there would be a detrimental impact on the local GP surgery.</p> <p>Growth, if needed should be provided around the existing sites in Stourport-on-Severn or on the former British Sugar site Stourport Road. There</p>	<p>Objection to the use of Lea Castle as a Gypsy site is noted.</p> <p>The alternative suggested uses for the site are also noted and these will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made. Any redevelopment of this site will need to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner taking into account all of the constraints and opportunities provided by this site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			are several other sites along the Stourport Road which could be looked at if we have to provide sites however, it is felt that enough have been provided already.	as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1443</a>	Watkins A	Too expensive to make site safe; too expensive to make roads safe; no safe route; GPs full; school full and old	<p>Objections are noted. The site will need to be considered on a comprehensive basis taking into account costs.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS944</a>	Watkins C	Amenities in village already stretched to full capacity. Has any thought been given to how it will affect the price of properties in village?	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1442</a>	Watkins J	Green Belt; no boundary; school full; surgery full; roads not good	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, national planning policy states that a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS927</a>	Watkins M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it will impact on those people who have bought property in the area and feels the site should be used to create jobs.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The suggested alternative use for the site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS450</a>	Watts G	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The local school is full to capacity.</li> <li>• There are tunnels and derelict buildings on the site how would these be made</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>safe?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No safe footpath routes to local shops and amenities.</li> <li>• Potential noise pollution.</li> </ul>	<p>Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1549</a>	Watts J	Road safety issues and no bus service to site.	Objections are noted and will be considered alongside any comments received from the Highway Authority who are a statutory consultee in this process.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1551</a>	Watts R	Natural beauty, wildlife and public footpath need protecting.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS451</a>	Watts S	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site because it lies between two busy, fast roads, there is no safe route to the school or amenities, the school and doctors are at capacity and there are asbestos ducts on site which are unsafe for children, Raises concern about screening footpath 628 to prevent overlooking of traveller site, protecting local wildlife and increased noise and smoke from the site because of the outdoor lifestyle of travellers.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1013</a>	Watts S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located between two very busy roads</li> <li>• No footpath or public transport from the site to local amenities in Cookley</li> <li>• How will the existing footpath be screened from the proposed site to give privacy and security to residents and travellers</li> <li>• Wildlife and natural beauty of the site must be protected</li> <li>• Travellers have more outdoor lifestyles so there would be increased smoke nuisance and noise pollution</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1291</a>	Webb G	Outstanding parkland area must have potential for commerce or light industry giving employment, education and recreation for local area. Allow a small area for travellers, and the whole area will be blighted. Concerned about negative impact on rare plants.	<p>Objections to the use of the site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted as are the suggested alternative uses of the site. This will need to be taken into consideration when a decision on allocation, and the comprehensive redevelopment of the site, is made.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1294</a>	Webb P	This beautiful area should be preserved. Any development should add to local economy and benefit community. School and doctors are full.	<p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions to ensure its compatibility.</p> <p>The alternative suggested use for the site, to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>aided the local economy, is noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1146</a>	Wellsbury B	Feel the Lea Castle site is not the right place for a gypsy site for all the reasons discussed at the consultation meetings. Fear another Dale Farm	Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1150</a>	Wellsbury N	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is in the Green Belt; flora and fauna; more suitable for housing or employment; asbestos on site; fear another Dale Farm; school and surgery full; busy roads pose safety risk.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, the Local education Authority, and the Highways Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1394</a>	West C	No proof of traveller connection to area; schools and doctors' are full	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1406</a>	West D	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it lies between 2 busy roads and the wildlife on the site must be protected.	Objections are noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1266</a>	Westwood D	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1461</a>	Whatmore J	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it lies between two busy main roads.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS726</a>	Wheatley S	Properties will decrease in value by 30-40% if this proposal goes ahead. This is extremely unfair on the residents of Cookley.	Objections are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS187</a>	Whiston R	No traveller or fairground connections to Cookley, no safe walking routes to local services, dangerous roads, unsustainable location, impossible to screen a traveller/fairground site from the footpath, allocated for employment uses -contrary to development plan policy. Must attract sustainable employment to the site. Policy GB.4 of the ALP deals with major development sites in the Green Belt.	Noted. Any pitch provision for travellers would need to be viewed as part of the wider comprehensive development of this Major Developed Site in the Green Belt in accordance with the emerging Site Allocations and Policies DPD.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS560</a>	Whiston S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This site is inappropriate development within the Green Belt.</li> <li>• This site is dangerous for children walking to school.</li> <li>• This site should be utilised for employment as per WFDC own adopted plan.</li> <li>• This site would be ideal for an allotment.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1119</a>	White E	Objects to the Lea Castle site on the basis that the doctors and schools are full, there is a lack of infrastructure including street-lighting and no safe access to local services and facilities, it would dominate the existing community, Gypsies do not have a history of staying in the area, the site has historically employed people and should be used for this purpose, it has previously been set out as being unsuitable for residential development, if the Gypsy site is allowed the rest of the site may not be attractive to businesses increasing the risk of further Gypsy families being allowed to settle on the site.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS319</a>	Whitehouse C	Cookley doctor surgery is already full to capacity. There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these MUST be protected.	Objections are noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS393</a>	Whittall J	Lea Castle should be developed to enhance area.	Noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS330</a>	Wilkes F	Objects to the Lea Castle site because there is no proof it is a traditional stopping place for Gypsies and Travellers, the primary school and doctors are both full, there is no safe route to the village for pedestrians, there are no bus routes to the village, there is a public footpath through the site, the site is not safe because of derelict buildings and asbestos, and the wildlife on the site must be protected.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1043</a>	Wilkinson C	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <p>Gypsies have no historical connection with Cookley; land could be used for industrial development bringing jobs in; use will deter future purchasers; better to build bungalows for elderly; health and safety risk of ducts and tunnels on site; limited utilities on site; no bus routes from site to Cookley village; bordered by 2 busy roads with limited footpaths; local primary school not close by and needs refurbishing; doctors' surgery is only small; significant impact on landscape; impact on wildlife; public footpath crosses site; likely to cause noise pollution and air pollution; cost of monitoring site and removing waste</p>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1048</a>	Wilkinson J	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <p>Health and safety risk of ducts and tunnels on site; limited utilities on site; no bus routes from site to Cookley village; bordered by 2 busy roads with limited footpaths; local primary school not close by and needs refurbishing; doctors' surgery is only small; significant impact on landscape; impact on wildlife; public footpath crosses site; likely to cause noise pollution and air pollution; cost of monitoring site and removing waste; land could be used for industrial development bringing jobs in; use will deter future purchasers; better to build bungalows for</p>	<p>The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			elderly; gypsies have no historical connection with Cookley.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1424</a>	Willetts K	local school already full to capacity	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1445</a>	Williams B	<p>no safe route to primary school and doctors</p> <p>what disruption / noise levels will be caused?</p> <p>will the travellers unlawfully attempt to use other areas of Lea Castle site?</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Environmental Health Officers.  Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1496</a>	Williams D	Objects to the Lea Castle site because of concerns that the site would spread.	Objections are noted.  Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1508</a>	Williams H	Fear for safety of gypsy children with derelict buildings and tunnels etc.	Objection is noted. The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS749</a>	Williams L	Property will be devalued. Crime rate will double in the village.	Objections are noted.  We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS470</a>	Williams M	Objects to the Lea Castle site because the GP surgery is almost full, the site lies between two main roads and the areas of beauty and wild animals must be protected.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1494</a>	Williams S	Objects to the Lea Castle site because it is between two main roads.	Objections are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS816</a>	Willins D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completely against this site.</li> <li>• Too dangerous for children.</li> <li>• Wyre Forest has way more than fair share of Travellers sites in Worcestershire.</li> <li>• It should be used for commercial activity and job creation.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions and would need to ensure that it was suitable for occupation.</p> <p>In terms of providing sites - the Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1151</a>	Wills G	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The guidance in PPS3 states that sites should be available, suitable and achievable, this site is not available for this use as the owners do not consider it to be, the site is unsuitable because of the long distance to travel to local services and facilities and it is not achievable because the owners wish to dispose of it by 2013 for uses which do not include a Gypsy/Traveller site.</li> <li>• The site contravenes guidance in Circular 1/2006 because it has the potential to dominate the existing community and it is a Green Belt site and all other non Green Belt sites have not been exhausted.</li> <li>• Draft National Planning Policy Framework (2011) the site contravenes the guidance set out because it will have a negative impact on biodiversity, it will have a negative socio-economic impact, a negative impact on highways, will increase noise pollution, will have a negative impact on the landscape, has poor accessibility to services and facilities, will have a negative impact on the character of the local area and will</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The land is assumed to be available for this use because it is in public ownership.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>have a negative impact on the ability of the site to provide economic growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning for Traveller Sites Consultation Document (DCLG, April 2011) - the policy states that traveller sites in the Green Belt are inappropriate development. There has been no justification to demonstrate a local need for a Gypsy and Traveller site in the Lea Castle area, and therefore there are no very special circumstances to justify releasing the land from the Green Belt. There are other preferable sites in Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn which are available, suitable and achievable.</li> <li>• Former West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy and Evidence Base - The consultation is based on the need to provide a figure identified within the Regional Spatial Strategy. However, the Localism Bill received Royal Assent by Parliament on 15th November confirming abolition of RSSs. A refresh should be undertaken which identifies need on a local basis. No specific need has been identified within Cookley.</li> <li>• Adopted Local Plan 2006 - designates Lea Castle as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and states that the site would be suitable for employment and health uses. The site should be protected</li> </ul>	<p>sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Although the RSS is in the process of being abolished, the evidence base which it was founded upon is still valid. The GTAA for the South Housing Market Area was undertaken in 2008 and the need until 2013 is based on that assessment.</p> <p>The Adopted Local Plan is currently in the process of being replaced by the Local Development Framework. This process must take account of changes in legislation and advice relating to the plan-making process as well as changing economic circumstances. Sites allocated through the Local Development Framework must be</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>for such uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted Core Strategy (December 2010) - Refers to policy CP06 and argues that the Lea Castle site does not meet the criteria set out within it.</li> </ul>	<p>demonstrated to be deliverable, therefore, consideration needs to be given as to whether it can be demonstrated that the Lea Castle site is deliverable for employment uses.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy sets out criteria to guide the determination of planning applications, and the allocations of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The policy was used to inform the Baker Report. However, given the difficulty in finding suitable sites for this use, these criteria are guidelines only and can not always be met on every site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS928</a>	Wills L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would not enrich the community</li> <li>Not conducive for such a settlement</li> <li>No supporting infrastructure in place</li> <li>School and Surgery full to capacity</li> <li>School already supporting classrooms in temporary buildings - where is the extra funding coming from?</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS942</a>	Wills P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would make it impossible to develop the rest of the site</li> <li>Would be impossible to control numbers as there is no natural boundary</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Any redevelopment of this site would need to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner taking into account the relationship between any proposed uses. Sites would still need to apply for planning</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1191</a>	Wilson P	Cookley has no tradition of travellers; school could not cope with more pupils	Objection is noted. Comments will be considered alongside those from the Local Education Authority who are a statutory consultee in the process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS473</a>	Wilson R	There is no proof that Lea Castle is a traditional stopping place for travelling people - I know I worked there 17 years.  Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity.	Objections are noted.  The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1106</a>	Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	Do not agree that Lea Castle is appropriate location for gypsy use.  2009 report looked at rural deprivation in Worcestershire - village of Cookley is most deprived rural LSOA in Worcestershire on employment, education and health domains with 16% of working age population not working. Suggest site should continue to be marketed for employment use.  In July 2011 Parish Council held consultation	The Lea Castle Site is safeguarded as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and emerging policy in the Site Allocations & Policies DPD sets out the requirement for comprehensive redevelopment of the site which focuses on employment uses. Therefore any gypsy pitch provision that may come forward for the site in the future would need to be considered as part of comprehensive redevelopment of the site.  Baker Associates did research the possibility

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>event on Site Allocations DPD where residents suggested following uses for site - Center Parcs type development, retirement village, hospice, military rehabilitation centre.</p> <p>Site has no easy access to buses; isolated location with no easy access to services; schools oversubscribed; GP surgery oversubscribed; site would dominate tiny community; need footpaths on A roads; gypsies have no historical links to Cookley - Baker Report states that sites should be close to existing family sites; asbestos at Lea Castle and underground ducts; likely to prevent future development of remainder of site; pedestrian safety concerns; in Green Belt so special consideration needed; Travelling Showpeople use would put strain on roads system within site; not easy to stop site expanding; Council has failed to notify all residents in Axborough Lane; potential privacy issues with nearby dwellings; management of woodland and protection of fauna and flora on site; concerns of blight and property devaluation; significant site clearance costs.</p> <p>Suggest alternative sites - British Sugar and former industrial area on Wilden Lane</p>	<p>of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion at Wilden is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS605</a>	Wood D	Objects to Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS687</a>	Wood M	Objects to the Lea Castle site and raises a	The requirement to provide the additional

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>number of concerns as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic value of site and surrounding area.</li> <li>• Environmental integrity - there is asbestos on the site and the site is not suitable for occupation without significant alteration.</li> </ul> <p>Seeks clarification on the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On what grounds does the authority have to provide sites for travellers?</li> <li>2. What are the potential numbers of travellers proposed and which source is the data being drawn from?</li> <li>3. What is the period and length of tenure for such a site?</li> <li>4. What is the criteria for the evaluation of the seven sites and eventual decision to be made?</li> <li>5. What will be the compensation given to residents in areas where properties will be devalued?</li> </ol>	<p>pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Policy Statement. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1425</a>	Woodward M	Objects to the Lea Castle site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS478</a>	Woodyatt G	Cookley Primary School is already at full capacity. There are areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site must be protected.	<p>Objections are noted. The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1531</a>	Woodyatt P	Natural beauty and wild animals on site need protecting. No proof that travellers have traditionally used area	Objection is noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1534</a>	Woodyatt P	Natural beauty and wildlife need protecting. No history of travellers in area.	Objection is noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS486</a>	Woodyatt S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity.</li> <li>• Areas of natural beauty and wild animals on the site - these must be protected.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1467</a>	Woodyatt S	Cookley Primary School is already full to capacity	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1129</a>	Wridgway N	Objects to the Lea Castle site because surrounding roads and local amenities will be unable to cope. There have been a number of accidents on the A449 and A451. There is asbestos on the site which will be unsafe for residents, and the increase in population will put a strain on the schools and doctors surgery.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS940</a>	Wyatt R	<p>Objects to the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Busy road network which makes crossing difficult, especially at peak times</li> <li>• Is Green Belt</li> <li>• Doctors and school overstretched, where will the travellers go?</li> <li>• The travellers would have to use cars to access the village, where do we park.</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1469</a>	Young P	Cookley Doctors' Surgery and School are already full to capacity	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS350</a>	Youren D	Doctor's surgeries are nearly full to capacity.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS351</a>	Youren L	Doctor's surgeries are already full to capacity.	Objection is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS417</a>	Bennion N	Supports the Lea Castle site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large site with good supporting infrastructure.</li> <li>• Low impact on existing area residents.</li> <li>• Already being used by Travellers for grazing their horses.</li> <li>• Site already close to use by public.</li> <li>• Existing accommodation on site.</li> </ul>	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS118</a>	Glover S	Support for the Lea Castle Hospital site, a virtual stand alone site which cuts down conflict. Close to village amenities and good access. Won't cause landscaping issues as can be tree lined. Cookley village is within walking distance and Kidderminster very close by.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS28</a>	Grove Mrs B	Support for the Lea Castle Hospital site to	Support is noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			provide for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople since it is a very large area. Considers this is the best option.	
Support	<a href="#">GTTS34</a>	Narrainen C	Supports site at Lea Castle Hospital, Cookley for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS550</a>	Osborne M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing there is rubbish collection and annual checks by council member.</li> <li>• There are many people who light fires in their gardens possible producing more smoke than travellers.</li> </ul>	Support for the Lea Castle site is noted. Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS1315</a>	Smith P	Suggests Lea Castle is an ideal place for the Travelling Showpeople's site as it would be akin to a garage or a yard and could easily be fitted into a business or housing development and it is near major roads.	Comments are noted and allocation of sites will be considered following the close of the consultation.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS211</a>	Whitehouse T	Supports Lea Castle Hospital location as affords some privacy.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS31</a>	Wilson N	Support for the Lea Castle site as the best option for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. A parcel of land could be isolated	Support is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Lea Castle Site, Cookley, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			which would be semi private.	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS53</a>	Botham E	Objects to the proposed site for Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. Amazed the Council sees fit to demolish the home of a longstanding resident and destroy businesses that operate. Once the fields are divorced from the premises they will no longer be able to effectively manage the livery service. Lists a number of issues relating to the vitality of the current businesses operated from the farm.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS878</a>	British Waterways	<p>Our priorities relate to the canal corridor and land and development within and immediately adjacent to the corridor.</p> <p>The Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal within the Wyre Forest District is an important form of infrastructure that can potentially be affected by all scales and types of development located adjacent to or in close proximity to this asset.</p> <p>Of the sites identified, site 7 Site at St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn, is in close proximity to the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal.</p> <p>BW would require development within and immediately adjacent to the canal corridor to safeguard the safety and structural integrity of</p>	Comments are noted. Should the site at Manor Farm be considered as a potentially suitable site for allocation for Gypsies and Travellers then the impact on the Canal corridor would need to be considered through any design or development of the site

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			waterway infrastructure and the safety of users and neighbours; protect and safeguard inland waterways for water resourcing purposes, including the need for water management, improving water quality, managing land drainage, and avoiding, reducing and managing flood risk; protect and enhance the heritage, natural environment and landscape character of inland waterways; encourage public access to and recreation use of inland waterways; protect and support the navigation of inland waterways and waterway related tourism; and protect the operational waterway infrastructure.	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1338</a>	Natural England	<p>We note that several of the sites are in close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 7: Manor Farm Adjacent to the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The impacts on any adjacent features would need to be fully considered through a planning application.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1308</a>	Severn Trent Water	Severn Trent Water has landholdings associated with a former operational use within this area. Whilst the site does not appear to include land owned by Severn Trent it is suggested that if this site were to be taken forward a review should be undertaken to confirm the extent of the District Council's landholdings to ensure the development does	Comments are noted. If a site were to be considered suitable in this area then further discussions will be held with Severn Trent to ensure that the land holdings identified did not impinge on their land holdings.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			not impinge on Severn Trent's land holdings.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1596</a>	Anonymous	It would be a great shame if this proposal was to go through, the farm is still a full working farm with residents and animals alike, living and working there! I have lived in Stourport-on-Severn all my life and although it may get missed at times Manor farm has always been there as part of the community, influencing a lot of young and old people's lives with their animals/live stock and horse riding/training that takes place there.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS236</a>	Ainsworth K	No consideration has been thought for local residents. An absolute farce so far and I for one will be extremely disappointed if Manor Farm goes ahead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS304</a>	Allen T	This location is already in use as business premises. Would not the change of use conflict with current planning policy on this land and with the Council's priority to promote business and enterprise across the district?	Objection is noted. The Council does view business and enterprise as a priority and this will need consideration in the allocation of possible sites. The land is Green Belt and therefore development would need have to be viewed as

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				"very special circumstances" and although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS611</a>	Andrusiak J	Objects to the Manor Farm site - it is a working farm, inappropriate development in the Green Belt; gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; highway safety issues, detrimental impact on biodiversity, extra pressure on local services.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS329</a>	Arnold B	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is Green Belt land and should remain as such.</li> <li>2. The first picture to greet visitors/tourists to Stourport-on-Severn will be Gypsies.</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The impact on tourism is also noted and will need</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				to be considered through the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS790</a>	Arnold P	I feel that Stourport-on-Severn does not have the size and amenities to take any large influx of people - affecting as below - i.e. schools, roads, etc. Stourport-on-Severn already has a great percentage of site basis than is required.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS801</a>	Ashcroft M	I know these people need somewhere but they do not look after where they are put. But you always get a few bad which makes it bad for the good ones. They do what most people do and work and make homes for their self	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS911</a>	Aspinall M	This is not a redundant farm. It provides a physiotherapy service and thriving equine businesses. It is on Green Belt and is totally inappropriate for gypsy use.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS199</a>	Ball J	Site is still a thriving farm, businesses should be supported. Impact on tourism within Stourport-on-Severn in a gateway location to	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			the town?	The concerns relating to the town's tourism and are an important factor in considering whether sites should be allocated for future provision. It is important that the separate identities of the towns are retained.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1283</a>	Banks CJ	<p>Farm is home to 3 businesses; would be inappropriate development in Green Belt - narrow belt between 2 towns; at gateway to Stourport-on-Severn - potential negative effect on tourism; prejudices highway safety; conflict with character of area; includes safeguarded route of relief road; extra pressure on local services.</p> <p>Wychavon DC recently approved 35 pitches near Ombersley Golf Course - too many sites in Stourport-on-Severn area.</p> <p>Ecological study would be required; increase in numbers of gypsy children will have detrimental effect on exam results; fearful that site could easily expand.</p>	<p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highway safety are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The only recent planning application in Wychavon was for 5 static caravans, 5 touring caravans and an amenity block, which was refused.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1069</a>	Barham C	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road	a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1071</a>	Barham E	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1070</a>	Barham M	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Road	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS210</a>	Barnes T	Manor Farm is occupied by Mr & Mrs Tim Barnes through an Agricultural Holdings Act Tenancy. Provides a service not only to local people but also creates full and part time jobs.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS212</a>	Barnes T	Area within the Green Belt, therefore should constitute inappropriate development. A number of other sites vacant and meet the criteria of being suitable.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1576</a>	Barnes T	Manor Farm is a tenanted farm protected by a legal tenancy agreement and further protected by the 1986 Agricultural Holdings Act as supported by Morton & Fisher Group Solicitors. The tenants have no plans to cease this tenancy.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1577</a>	Barnes T	<b>Manor Farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn &amp; Kidderminster</b> - Manor Farm is a landmark at the entrance to Stourport-on-Severn from the north and the entrance to Kidderminster from the south. The gateway is the direct route to the Stourport Road Employment Corridor and the South Kidderminster Business Park included in the Rewyre Initiative. If the use of this land is changed then the vital identity of the gateway will be lost.	Objection is noted. The issues raised will need to be considered in detail in determining which sites should be allocated.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1578</a>	Barnes T	<b>Green Belt land</b> - The potential site is labelled as Green Belt land.  The report from Baker and Associates states that development within this site would lead to an inappropriate development in the Green Belt that separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster. Development is also against advice of PPG2 and Core Strategy.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement:

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1579</a>	Barnes T	Site of planned <b>Stourport Relief Road</b> - The planned road is mapped to take a route directly through the proposed site.	It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1580</a>	Barnes T	<b>Business and small enterprise</b> on the site - At present there are 3 successful small businesses based at Manor Farm with employment of 6 people. The tenants have no plans to cease these.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1581</a>	Barnes T	Area of <b>ecological interest and conservation</b> - Manor Farm has a wide variation of protected wildlife as reported in an ecological survey by Worcestershire Wildlife Consultancy.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1582</a>	Barnes T	<b>Unstable</b> built up <b>land</b> - The area proposed for the potential site is sand land fill created by infill and is susceptible to subsidence.	This would need to be fully considered in accordance with national planning policy should any planning application come forward for the site in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1583</a>	Barnes T	<b>Access</b> concerns and <b>safety</b> issues - limited access to the site from the busy dual carriageway or from a narrow residential road creating safety issues.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1584</a>	Barnes T	<b>Increased pressure on public services</b> and amenities - already pressurised over subscribed schools and increased pressure on local health services.	The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1585</a>	Barnes T	<b>Listed farmhouse</b> on local list of buildings of local architectural and/or historical interest in	This will need to be considered when determining the exact route of the relief road and the exact

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Stourport-on-Severn - under PPG2 4 <sup>th</sup> identified purpose.	position of any possible site for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS810</a>	Barnett S	I object because of the road safety issues, it being in the Green Belt and the impact on the local wildlife.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS202</a>	Bateman R	Raises safety issues relating to local roads in the area. Considers that travellers are supposed to be people that don't stay in one place so why do they need a permanent site?	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on Planning for Travellers states at paragraph 2.4 "Although some Gypsies and Travellers travel for some of the year, the vast majority do not now travel on a daily basis all year round. Increasingly, as traditional seasonal work has declined, Gypsies and Travellers have adapted to permanent residential sites where they can more easily access a doctor, schools and other services and employment while maintaining their cultural traditions. Permanent authorised pitches can also help to promote integration and inclusion with settled communities."</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1185</a>	Baylie J	Expresses disgust at the Manor Farm site being considered and raises concern over the fact the farm is described as redundant within the Baker Report. Sets out information on the businesses operating from Manor Farm. Raises concern that the proposal would lead to	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Highway objections will be considered alongside any comments received from the Highway</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>a loss of jobs as the farm employs 6 people. Raises concern over the increase in traffic on St Johns Road, the impact on runners and children walking to school, and the impact on the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Authority who are a statutory consultee in this process.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS3</a>	Beechey S	Objects to the potential use of the site at St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn for Gypsy,	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. It would cause disruption within a quiet residential area and devalue properties. Considers that a more suitable site could be found in the rural areas where they will have less impact.	guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.  We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS686</a>	Bell S	Appalled to see that physio business at Manor Farm is under threat. Hope that site will be removed from list.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS32</a>	Bennett A	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. Asks that Manor Farm is removed from the proposed sites and the family are allowed to continue to live and work there. Prospect Physio provides first class care for the people of Worcestershire.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS644</a>	Bennett P	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS97</a>	Bettridge P	Objects to the potential use of the Manor Farm site for gypsies and travellers. Expresses confusion at the Council's attitude and the farm is not redundant and also the definition of a "traveller." Those who want to be permanent residents should be subject to the same planning rules and shouldn't be given preference.	Noted. The Government's recent consultation on Planning for Travellers reiterates that gypsies and travellers are recognised as having a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. Case law has also established that the Government has a duty to "facilitate the gypsy way of life" for ethnic Gypsies and Travellers under the Human Rights Act (para. 2.5) Furthermore, Annex A of the Government's Draft Planning Policy Statement on Planning for Travellers provides a definition of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS402</a>	Billingham K	Objects to the Manor Farm site on the basis that the site is already used for businesses.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS833</a>	Bird P	Objects to manor Farm site as it is the gateway to the town and would be even more obvious if the bypass goes ahead. If there is to be an increase in sites in Stourport-on-Severn they should remain in the Sandy Lane area. Questions why all provision should be in	Objection to Manor Farm is noted. The concerns about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Stourport-on-Severn.	As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS775</a>	Bland J	Manor Farm is not redundant and should not be considered.  Sites which should be considered are the former British Sugar site, and the site opposite the new Council HQ which has a service road, electric, water, and hardstandings.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS695</a>	Blewett J	Objects to the Manor Farm site as there is enough provision within Stourport-on-Severn and new sites will not attract new businesses to the area or provide jobs.	The comments in relation to the regeneration of Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS503</a>	Botham E	Understands the need to find suitable land for traveller families but concerned that Wyre Forest are providing a greater number of sites than other areas.  Objects to Manor Farm proposal - should not be destroying businesses, should be supporting them.  Is a practical, working farm that is long established. The physiotherapy business also benefits from the fact patients can look out onto the fields and see the animals as this is part of the rehabilitation - the treatment is a better	Objections are noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The existence of businesses within this area will need to be considered when a decision on allocating sites is made.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>service because of its location.</p> <p>Concerned about the wildlife value of the farm - it's very easy to destroy these places, but once gone, they can never be replaced again.</p>	<p>process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS664</a>	Bough G	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is a working farm and there are enough sites in the area.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS666</a>	Bough J	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is a working farm and there are enough sites in the area.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS359</a>	Bower C	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Already have gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn less than 2 miles away.</li> <li>2. Will be opposite high school and new Sports Centre.</li> <li>3. Gypsy site will not have positive impact on gateway to town for visitors.</li> </ol>	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS358</a>	Bower T	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Already have gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn less than 2 miles away.</li> <li>2. Will be opposite high school and new Sports Centre.</li> </ol>	Objections are noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			3. Gypsy site will not have positive impact on gateway to town for visitors.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS832</a>	Bowkett H	Stourport-on-Severn already has one gypsy site. I feel in a small town as we are we cannot support another. I believe Bewdley or Kidderminster does not have a site at all.	Objections are noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS804</a>	Bradbury R	<p>Objects to Manor Farm for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt and should be protected</li> <li>• St Johns Road is narrow and access is poor and will only be improved with a relief road</li> <li>• Having a traveller site on the proposed Relief Road is madness - Proposed developments (Old British Sugar Site) on the Stourport side of Kidderminster adding more pressure on Stourport's roads is crazy</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>It is anticipated that if this site were to be considered further then a traveller site would be developed alongside the relief road, and therefore would not hinder its implementation.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS531</a>	Brazier J C	Object to Manor Farm as it is a working farm - it	Objections are noted. The District Council

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			is inappropriate to replace a business with travellers. It is too near to a local school. Stourport-on-Severn already has 2 sites and 2 tolerated sites, there are other towns in this area who could and should play a part in this situation.	acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS214</a>	Bristow D	Manor Farm is not a redundant - there is the prospect of future ventures there. Site should not be altered.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1362</a>	Brookes C	Very successful equestrian business run from Manor Farm; in Green Belt - sites nearby rejected for this reason; Baker report states that sites should not negatively impact on green landscape; access to site will cause major issues to local residents; Stourport-on-Severn is a tourist town - site is gateway to town; refers to interview in local media with gypsy who has lived in town for 50+ years - gypsies want own privacy away from other housing and would prefer Lea Castle as site would give them privacy	Objections are noted.  The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.  The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS229</a>	Brookes G	Site is leased by the Barnes Family and is used for business purposes as well as a home.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS230</a>	Brookes G	The proposed land is actually listed as Green Belt, which obviously makes it completely unsuitable to be building on or altering in any way.	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."</p> <p>Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS231</a>	Brookes G	Cost of putting utilities/services in. There are much more suitable sites in the area such as the land of the old Sugar Beet factory which already has hardstanding,	Noted. Baker Associates did contact the owners of the British Sugar site re the potential provision of gypsy and traveller pitches at this site. However, they are considering alternative uses for this site and have just gone out to public consultation on a masterplan for the future use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS232</a>	Brookes G	For another access to be put in along the dual carriageway would not only be costly but also cause very recent changes to the road shape and structure to be completely irrelevant.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS233</a>	Brookes G	Factually, Mr Barnes and his wife run 3	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			businesses from this land and his home: Ranch Rug Cleaning Company - specialised in cleaning horse rugs, Prospect Physio and of course the livery business.	land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS234</a>	Brookes G	Running 3 businesses means Mr Barnes employs a handful of people to help out.	Noted. The retention of local businesses is very important to Wyre Forest District Council.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS235</a>	Brookes G	Would the travellers want to be so close to the dual carriageway? Not only this but the land also backs on to the proposed site of the Stourport Relief Road, would travellers want to be surrounded on 2 sides by busy and noisy roads?	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS917</a>	Brookes P	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; would put extra pressure on local services; would make local property unsellable.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1199</a>	Brookes P	Objects to the site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn because it is a home and a number of businesses operate from the site, it is a	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Green Belt site, it is part of the Stourport Relief Road route, it may cause friction between the Gypsy families which are housed on the site and the settled travellers in the locality, the traffic would make St Johns Road hazardous as it is narrow with no footpaths, it will be overlooked by the residents of St Johns Road.</p> <p>Suggests the former British Sugar site or the former National Standard site would be more appropriate.</p> <p>Feels that the Baker Report leaves a lot to be desired with many inaccuracies. We have a duty to help Gypsies and Travellers set up homes but not at the expense of someone else's home and livelihood.</p> <p>Feels that Stourport-on-Severn has accommodated enough pitches and it is time that the rest of Worcestershire provided help for these communities.</p>	<p>land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>It was proposed that a site may be able to be</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. However, it should be noted that the former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS367</a>	Brookes R	There are vacant and more suitable sites in the area. No reason to use Green Belt and oust businesses. Council should listen to reasoned objections being put forward.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS754</a>	Brookes S	Manor Farm is a working farm in an already	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			deprived area. The proposed development would mean job losses, lower house prices and increased traffic.	land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS250</a>	Brooks Miss	Objects to the potential allocation of Manor Farm for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS820</a>	Brown P	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is the gateway into Stourport-on-Severn.  Suggests the site opposite the Council's new HQ as it already has hardstanding.	Objection to the site is noted as is the suggested alternative site - officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS699</a>	Brown S	Raises objections to the Manor Farm site based around three specific areas as follows:  1. Green Belt: Refers to the narrow strip of Green Belt which separates Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn and argues that this purpose of the Green Belt should not be compromised. Argues that development could lead to further development in this location further undermining the Green Belt. Refers to DOE Circular 1/94 which states that Gypsy sites are not regarded as being appropriate in the Green Belt and that Green Belt land should not be allocated in development plans for Gypsy sites. Also refers to the baker	The reference to conformity with the District's Core Strategy and safeguarding the separate identity of the three towns is noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Report which rejected four sites solely because they were in the Green Belt.</p> <p>2. Ecological and Landscape: District Council should be aware of its duties under the NERC Act. Refers to the Core Strategy policy within the Core Strategy and argues that this suggests Manor Farm is unsuitable for the proposed use. Argues that the site contains important flora and fauna as well as animal and bird habitats which are legally protected. A full Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out which may demonstrate the unsuitability of the site.</p> <p>3. Safety: Quotes the Core Strategy which states that Gypsy sites should have 'safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and that the site can be easily accessed by towing caravans. Argues that Manor Farm does not meet this requirement because St Johns Road is narrow with parked cars and is used by pupils walking to school. Additional traffic could endanger these children. St Johns is a designated cycle route and part of the green infrastructure leading to the canal. The site prejudices highway safety and accessing via a new road through the</p>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>field will have a negative impact on the Minster Road junction. Need to consider the impact on traffic in Stourport generally.</p> <p>4. Other: The proposal would result in the loss of livelihood for the 6 employees of the farm.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS623</a>	Bruce M	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it at the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and would create a poor first impression.	Objection is noted. The retention of Stourport-on-Severn as a day trip destination is extremely important to the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1348</a>	Burley M	Town already saturated with sites; farm is home to businesses; would destroy gateway to Stourport-on-Severn.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1323</a>	Burley S	Manor Farm provides employment; site is in Green Belt; gypsy is not good use for 'gateway' to Stourport-on-Severn; town already has many gypsies - fear reputation of High School will be affected; road alongside site used by school children.	<p>Objection is noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS116</a>	Butler J	Asks why the DC has a duty to provide all these sites. Our country is going PC mad. There are enough caravan parks in Stourport-on-Severn.	Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1231</a>	Butler V	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would</p>	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.</p>	<p>Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS616</a>	Caffery V	Objects to the Manor Farm site because of access problems, reduction in property values, and because Manor Farm is a home and a business.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS509</a>	Callanan J	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flawed initial consultation - the Farm is in Green Belt and is not redundant.</li> <li>2. Decision by Council Cabinet to retain Manor Farm in the consultation process is based on flawed initial evidence.</li> <li>3. There are no pavements in St Johns Road. Any increase in traffic will increase the hazard to local residents and schoolchildren walking to and from school.</li> <li>4. Robins lorries come down St Johns Road from the main road so that they are able to reverse into their yard. This itself is a hazard, but can only be increased by extra traffic in St Johns Road. Alternative routes through the Manor Estate are even more hazardous.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS714</a>	Carrier S	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road and added pressure on existing services.	It should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS321</a>	Chamberlain J	There are several businesses on the farm that would suffer if it was set up as a travellers site. It would mean redundancies which as a country we are trying to avoid.	The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  Objection is noted as is the support for the existing businesses on the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS190</a>	Chapman H	Farm tenanted by same family since 1957 and there are current businesses there. Cites personal experience of using Prospect Physio. Businesses and livery yard provide employment for local people.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS919</a>	Churchill M	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>have detrimental effect on biodiversity; would put extra pressure on local services.</p>	<p>the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS268</a>	Cole B	St Johns Road Farm is someone's home and business. Concerns over the mess left by travellers in the past.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1046</a>	Colley J	Objects to the Manor Farm site because businesses are operating from there, it is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn, it would increase traffic congestion, and if the other Stourport-on-Severn sites are accepted then provision within the town will be sufficient and areas in Kidderminster and Bewdley should be utilised.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1162</a>	Common A	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; would	Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.  The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			put extra pressure on local services.	<p>The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted and views have been requested from the Highway Authority as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities re noted and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS73</a>	Community Action Newtown	Totally opposed to a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn for the following grounds; Green Belt - important green wedge; line of proposed Stourport Relief Road; inappropriate	Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			development for the gateway into Stourport-on-Severn; adjacent to SSSI; impact on wildlife; Stourport-on-Severn already has a high proportion of traveller sites; flawed consultation; local settled travellers on the estate are opposed to the development.	traveller provision in the future.  With reference to the relief road, the exact line of this has not yet been developed however, it is considered that there is sufficient space for both the relief road and a Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site.  With reference to biodiversity and wildlife comments, Natural England and Worcestershire Wildlife Trust have been consulted as part of the process and their comments will be taken into consideration when making a decision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS668</a>	Conway D	This planning is ill-conceived as:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will adversely affect the farm business, which has been operating for 50+ years...</li> <li>2. The Green Belt land should not be blighted by the horde of caravans, spoiling the country view for travellers and locals alike.</li> <li>3. As well as adding to the already heavy strain on local services, GP, Schools etc, Stourport Road will become even more log-jammed than it is now.</li> </ol>	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS552</a>	Conway J	Access is from a very busy dual carriageway	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>which provides severs safety concerns.</p> <p>Extra pressure will be put upon already stretched local services.</p>	<p>these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and the Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS5</a>	Cooper C	<p>Objects to the use of site at St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople as it is not redundant land and falls within the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS638</a>	Cooper J	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-</p>	<p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS360</a>	Cope C	<p>Concerned that more site are proposed for Stourport-on-Severn. Why use external consultants? Money could have been used to help local people.</p> <p>Manor Farm is home to several businesses. It is visible form main road into town and providing pleasant view for visitors. Stourport-on-Severn already has 2 large gypsy sites - must be more suitable locations in outlying areas. Gypsy site would devalue property.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Consultants were appointed following a competitive tendering exercise to provide independent advice to the Council.</p> <p>Concerns regarding Manor Farm are also noted and the fact it supports businesses will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS69</a>	Cope L	Objects to the proposed traveller site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn. Is on the main road and will give the wrong impression to seasonal visitors. Should put a new site as away from as much contact with the locals as possible. The value of properties will fall in the area. Already	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			have two gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn.	this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS70</a>	Cope L	Notes that are no sites are proposed in Redditch, Bromsgrove and Tenbury Wells so why not create these sites in other towns or is there a policy of putting them all in one area?	The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from a number of sources. Firstly, a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was undertaken for the whole of the West Midlands Region. The Regional Spatial Strategy outlined that Wyre Forest District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 and a further 15 by 2022, with 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken and considers that a more appropriate number of pitches to plan for would be 35 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. Each District Council within Worcestershire will need to allocate sites to meet their identified needs in the same way that Wyre Forest District Council is addressing this now.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS71</a>	Cope L	Asks why so much money was spent on the Baker Associates report when it contains so many mistakes?	The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS920</a>	Cotterill L	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road; development would put extra pressure on local services.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS654</a>	Cox S	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.</p>	<p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS667</a>	Craven D	Objects to the site in Manor Road as property prices will fall, there is already a refuse site and a crematorium there. The site is in the Green Belt and will create a poor first impression for visitors to the town. The land supports a number of businesses.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS510</a>	Crawley P	Not a redundant farm - supports six livelihoods in 3 or more small businesses, it is therefore not available for use in any other way.  One of the businesses is Prospect Physio, an excellent service to people with disabilities and difficulties. To lose that would be a tremendous blow to the public, as would the loss of all the businesses.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS741</a>	Crumpton M	A gypsy site will have negative impact on Stourport-on-Severn's tourist economy.	These concerns are noted. The tourism industry is very important to Stourport-on-Severn's economic wellbeing.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS204</a>	Cullen A	Considers more suitable sites in Stourport-on-Severn than the Manor Farm site.	Noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1301</a>	Daniels G	Objects to the Manor Farm site because the farm is not redundant, there are businesses operating from the site, Stourport-on-Severn is seeing investment come into the town and this is not a good use for a gateway site. Questions	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			the feasibility of a site being located so close to a school, housing estate and leisure facilities. Please listen to local opinion and Save Manor Farm.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1349</a>	Darby R	Object	Objection noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS584</a>	Darren	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surrounding residential properties.</li> <li>• Proximity of school and capacity issues. Also concern about the increase of volume of traffic.</li> <li>• Concern about the sports development area located close by and the potential negative impact.</li> <li>• The area around Manor Farm has a real community spirit and with the inclusion of the developing school and sport facility it has given the area a persona of an up and coming area. it would be a real shame to jeopardise this with the inclusion of a travellers site.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1310</a>	Dennington S	Plea to keep physiotherapy business going at Manor Farm.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1312</a>	Dennington V	Jobs at Manor Farm should be protected; land is Green Belt.	Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted as are the suggested

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS368</a>	Doran P	Support for continuation of physio business at Manor Farm.	Objection to using the site for Gypsies and Travellers is noted - as is the support for the continuation of the business at Manor Farm.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS874</a>	Duffy L	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1230</a>	Duggan D	Objects to further Gypsy provision in Stourport-on-Severn and feels the town has made enough provision.	Objection is noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1163</a>	Dunlop S	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; would put extra pressure on local services.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted and views have been requested from the Highway</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Authority as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities re noted and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1214</a>	Durnell Mr K G	Manor Farm is family farm and base of several businesses - not good planning to remove these uses; proposal opposed by locals and incompatible with nearby schools and proposed care home; Green Belt site at gateway to historic canal town.	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS657</a>	Eades M	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.</p>	<p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS248</a>	Eastwood S	<p>I fail to see how Manor Farm (a large, long term, working farm and home) can be included (morally or legally) in this report as the</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			information therein is so inaccurate and has taken nothing of importance into account.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS602</a>	Elliott G	Objects to the Manor Farm site because of the effect on property values, the effect on the businesses at Manor Farm, the impact on the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn, conflict with the proposed relief road. Suggests it is more appropriate to focus sites at Sandy Lane/Watery Lane.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS601</a>	Elliott R	Objects to the Manor Farm site because of the effect on property values, the effect on the businesses at Manor Farm, the impact on the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn, conflict with the proposed relief road. Suggests it is more appropriate to focus sites at Sandy Lane/Watery Lane.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS106</a>	Farley L	Considers that no one will want to move into an area where there is a gypsy/traveller site proposed. Will lose a great deal of money on her property. Asks whether she will be compensated for the loss of value to the property?	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS595</a>	Farmer N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to Manor Farm - it is a living, working farm on Green Belt land with important bio-diversity, three working businesses that would not continue to operate if any of the site was taken for Traveller sites.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awkward access.</li> <li>This place would not pass the govt criteria for a site and is only listed because it is council land.</li> </ul>	<p>traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS207</a>	Farmer S	Is of the opinion that travellers disturb the peace of the neighbourhood and fly tip in the Kingsway. Would make for more trouble.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS671</a>	Fellows J	Object as is working farm providing employment.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1068</a>	Fletcher N	Objects to the Stourport Road site as it is too large, in the Green Belt, a gateway to Stourport-on-Severn which would create a poor first impression for visitors to the town, and the	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			site currently provides employment.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS863</a>	Fox J	Suggest Lea Castle is more suitable site.	Support for Lea Castle is noted as is the objection to Manor Farm being used for this purpose.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS651</a>	Franklin A	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS15</a>	Frizzell A	Objects to the potential use of land at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Understands that the District Council has a duty to find sites for particular categories of travellers. Considers that the District Council has handled the consultation process extremely badly. Has lacked consideration for the health, security and property values of residents.	The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a <u>consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</u> The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

<b>Support / Object / Comment</b>	<b>Response ID</b>	<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Response Summary</b>	<b>WFDC Response</b>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS16</a>	Frizzell A	Manor Farm is not redundant. The Barnes family run three successful businesses from the farm. It is morally wrong to remove people from their home and place of work for so many years.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS17</a>	Frizzell A	Concerns over access to the site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn. St Johns Road is very narrow. It is a route to school for many school children and a designated cycle route.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS18</a>	Frizzell A	Development of the Manor Farm site will have considerable impact on the character and biodiversity of this area and on the difficult junction at the end of the dual carriageway and increased difficulties for school children walking to school.	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Concerns relating to highway safety are noted and will be considered alongside any representations made by the Highways Authority who are a statutory consultee in this process.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS19</a>	Frizzell A	The Manor Farm site is an area of open countryside. The green space separates Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn and prevents urban sprawl. Recently, the land has been subject to continual whittling away. Lists a number of developments that have taken place in this area including the crematorium, District Council Offices, Sports Ground and trading estate.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS20</a>	Frizzell A	Refers to the Adopted Core Strategy and the vision it sets out to retain the separate identities of the three towns and the importance of the area of open countryside between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster.	The reference to conformity with the District's Core Strategy and safeguarding the separate identity of the three towns is noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS21</a>	Frizzell A	Stourport is a tourist town and the presence of a gypsy site at the gateway entrance into the town will have a negative impact on tourism and the local economy. The residents of St Johns Road don't feel it is reasonable for them to look down on such a mess. Keep the road as tidy as possible to ensure the area is a pleasant environment for everyone who lives here - should not be ruined by unsympathetic planning decisions.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers .The impact on Stourport-on-Severn as a tourist town and the local economy is a particular concern in relation to this site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS22</a>	Frizzell A	The crime rate in the St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn area has been significantly reduced by the CAN group. Fear that introducing substantial new communities who have different lifestyles, brings with it a significant risk that the good work done so far will be wiped out. Understands that this view is also held by members of the travelling community who have settled in the Newtown area.	The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS23</a>	Frizzell A	Sets out a number of policies/issues included in the Adopted Core Strategy - retaining the separate identity of the three towns and limiting the number of caravan, mobile home and chalet developments due to the collective impact on the landscape.	The reference to compliance with the overarching policies set out within the Core Strategy is noted. Any site allocations that come forward following detailed analysis of consultation response will need to be made in conformity with these overarching policies.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS24</a>	Frizzell A	Further highlights issues in the Adopted Core Strategy relating to the fear of crime (Para 9.12). Within this context the site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn is unsuitable.	Please refer to earlier response in relation to public perception and sometimes misunderstanding with regard to traveller developments.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS25</a>	Frizzell A	Further highlights Core Strategy policy CP06 and the criteria this sets out for the provision of sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Considers that the site at Manor Farm would not comply with these criteria.	The reference to compliance with the overarching policies set out within the Core Strategy is noted. Any site allocations that come forward following detailed analysis of consultation response will need to be made in conformity with these overarching policies.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS856</a>	Frizzell A	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse impact on the businesses operating from the site.</li> <li>• The site is within the Green Belt and the proposed use is inconsistent with that designation. Four other sites within the Baker Report were rejected for this reason. The Green Belt between Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn is only a narrow ribbon and the Core</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Strategy refers to the importance of safeguarding that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St Johns Road is narrow and has cars parked along it. The route is used by children walking to school and is a designated cycle route. Therefore, the site prejudices highways safety.</li> <li>• The site is included within the safeguarded line for the relief road.</li> <li>• The site is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and will be particularly exposed in Winter when the leaves fall. The Core Strategy landscape character policy suggests that the use would be inappropriate on this site.</li> <li>• There are better sites available within Wyre Forest District.</li> </ul>	<p>of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character of the site are noted. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future then detailed and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>A number of sites have been identified through this process and a decision on potential allocations will need to consider all of the concerns and issues raised through this consultation.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS913</a>	Fudge D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Manor Farm is a working farm. Family live on land</li> <li>- Access from dual carriageway is an issue - safety concern</li> <li>- Access from small narrow minor road - safety issue</li> <li>- Site on Green Belt land</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS120</a>	Glover S	Access to Manor Farm site is rubbish. Showpeople can only be accommodated if the bypass is built. Site doesn't stand alone as problems with neighbouring residents.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS219</a>	Glover S	Considers proposed site is a step too far, Stourport-on-Severn has already given considerable support to travellers. Green Belt should be the overriding factor. Siting such	Noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			development at the entrance to the town is illogical.	provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS308</a>	Greenhow F	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it is the gateway to a leisure area and town.	Objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS698</a>	Green Party - Stourport	<p>Raises objections to the Manor Farm site based around three specific areas as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green Belt: Refers to the narrow strip of Green Belt which separates Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn and argues that this purpose of the Green Belt should not be compromised. Argues that development could lead to further development in this location further undermining the Green Belt. Refers to DOE Circular 1/94 which states that Gypsy sites are not regarded as being appropriate in the Green Belt and that Green Belt land should not be allocated in development plans for Gypsy sites. Also refers to the Baker Report which rejected four sites solely because they were in the Green Belt.</li> <li>2. Ecological and Landscape: District Council should be aware of its duties under the NERC Act. Refers to the Core</li> </ol>	The reference to conformity with the District's Core Strategy and safeguarding the separate identity of the three towns is noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Strategy policy within the Core Strategy and argues that this suggests Manor Farm is unsuitable for the proposed use. Argues that the site contains important flora and fauna as well as animal and bird habitats which are legally protected. A full Environmental Impact Assessment should be carried out which may demonstrate the unsuitability of the site.</p> <p>3. Safety: Quotes the Core Strategy which states that Gypsy sites should have 'safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and that the site can be easily accessed by towing caravans. Argues that Manor Farm does not meet this requirement because St Johns Road is narrow with parked cars and is used by pupils walking to school. Additional traffic could endanger these children. St Johns is a designated cycle route and part of the green infrastructure leading to the canal. The site prejudices highway safety and accessing via a new road through the field will have a negative impact on the Minster Road junction. Need to consider the impact on traffic in Stourport-on-Severn generally.</p> <p>4. Other: The proposal would result in the</p>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			loss of livelihood for the 6 employees of the farm.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS635</a>	Green S	Objects to the Manor Farm site.	The concerns relating to impact on local businesses are noted. However, it should be noted that gypsies and travellers residing on authorised pitches pay Council Tax in the same way all other local residents do.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS256</a>	Griffiths A	Appears that four out of seven sites are all in Stourport-on-Severn, why does Stourport-on-Severn always have to take the brunt of all these sites? Stourport-on-Severn is already an undesirable place to go out in the evening due to many problems caused by a certain element of the travelling community, without adding further to this problem.	It is noted that historically Stourport-on-Severn has provided the majority of gypsy and traveller pitches and that this has continued to generate a historical need in the area. Stourport Town Council has submitted a number of responses to the Local Development Framework consultations stating that it considers that Stourport-on-Severn has provided more than its fair share of sites within the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS412</a>	Griffiths J	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS274</a>	Grinnall G	Access is very bad, and St. Johns Road is far too narrow. This would lower the value of all the properties in this road.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.  We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS26</a>	Grogan L	Objects to the proposed use of the site at Manor Farm for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. It is not a redundant farm, people are at risk of losing their home and livelihoods.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS328</a>	Groves A	Did any official view the site before calling it redundant?	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS612</a>	Guppy D	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it would prejudice highway safety, it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is a working farm and a home, the local healthcare services can not cope, the farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and it would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS786</a>	Hadley J	Manor Farm is not redundant - 6 people employed there.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS8</a>	Hadwell P	Objects to the potential use of site at St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. The land is already a home to a family and the buildings and land are used.</p> <p>Considers that provision should be spread across each town/village within the District.</p>	<p>redundant and apologises for its listing as such. In general, traveller sites should be located in areas where there is easy access to local services. However, the Draft National Planning Policy Statement does specify that Local Planning Authorities are also able to use a rural exception site policy to enable small sites to be used specifically for affordable traveller sites in small rural communities that would not normally be used for traveller sites. Such a policy could be used to manage future applications. (Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites: Policy D: rural exceptions sites (April 2011))</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS6</a>	Hadwell V	<p>Objects to the use of site at St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Manor Farm has been incorrectly stated as redundant. This site should be removed from the process.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS252</a>	Hardiman S	<p>St. Johns Road is Green Belt and the proposed site is already earmarked for the relief road.</p>	<p>The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS798</a>	Harding B	Manor Farm is Green Belt and a working farm. Suggest National Standard factory site.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS37</a>	Harman J	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. Is a current customer at Prospect Physiotherapy. People's livelihoods are involved here it is ludicrous to sacrifice all this.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS201</a>	Harradine J	Objects to Manor Farm Site, Stourport-on-	Objection is noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Severn being used for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1340</a>	Harris M	Site is home to businesses; unsuitable as at entrance to town; 'travellers' don't need permanent homes; Stourport-on-Severn already has enough sites.	<p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will therefore need to be taken into account.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS197</a>	Hawes R	Disgraceful to take farm off them and use as a travellers site. Is the Government going to pay the loss in house prices?	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS608</a>	Heal L	Objects to the Manor Farm site on the following grounds of unsuitable access to the site, the site is within the Green Belt, and the land is not previously developed.	<p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has requested comments from</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS176</a>	Helliwell A	<p>Reasons for strong objection: Green Belt land; farm is not redundant and is the base for three businesses, is a family home; access is from a busy dual carriageway or from minor St Johns Road - potential traffic and safety concerns.</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS272</a>	Hewitt A	Manor Farm is not a redundant site it has been part of the same family for over 50 years and hosts valuable local businesses and an asset to area providing jobs and equestrian services.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1303</a>	Hingley P	Plea to keep businesses going at Manor Farm.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS225</a>	Hinton R	Objects to Manor Farm site as it is on Green Belt land, lies on the line of the proposed Stourport Relief Road, is a tenanted farm since 1957, extra pressure on local services, accessibility issues, is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn.	These objections are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS505</a>	Hollis T	Objects to the Manor Farm site for a number of reasons:	Objections are noted.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt - would not receive consent for housing so why Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</li> <li>• Is occupied by a working, diversified farm providing a livelihood to 6 people</li> <li>• Kidderminster and Bewdley should take priority if more pitches are required in the Wyre Forest</li> <li>• Wyre Forest (and therefore by extension, Stourport), currently houses 30% of all of the Gypsies, Travellers &amp; Travelling Showpeople currently residing in Worcestershire. Surely Wyre Forest is fulfilling and exceeding its obligations to Gypsies, Travellers &amp; Travelling Showpeople.</li> <li>• There are extant plans to 'acknowledge' 10 unauthorised or tolerated pitches at Sandy Lane which will increase Wyre Forest's commitment to Gypsies, Travellers &amp; Travelling Showpeople still further.</li> <li>• If Wychavon District Council have plans to house Gypsies, Travellers &amp; Travelling Showpeople at a site at Comhampton near to Ombersley Golf Club, then this will further impact upon services in Stourport. This would further undermine the, already weak case for Wyre Forest to extend its provision by</li> </ul>	<p>Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Sites in Kidderminster and Bewdley are also being considered.</p> <p>Applications within Wychavon District Council are out of Wyre Forest District Council's control.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>commandeering Manor Farm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The junctions of St Johns Road and Kingsway (Buggy Lane) with the A451 form a complex and potentially hazardous environment for motorists, other road users and pedestrians. The current road layout is unsuitable for the access/egress to and from a site at Manor Farm by large, multi-axle, articulated vehicles or towed trailers. Such vehicles would present an additional hazard at what is already a potentially dangerous junction.</li> <li>The site is low-lying in relation to existing dwellings and would be overlooked. Privacy and security could not be assured to any residents of a Gypsies, Travellers &amp; Travelling Showpeople site at Manor Farm.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS929</a>	Howarth A	There is already a high proportion of 'travellers' living in Stourport-on-Severn. This particular area is deprived anyway, and the influx of more travellers to Stourport-on-Severn will generate more poverty to this area.	Objections are noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District and the concerns about all of the sites will need to be fully considered when a decision is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS188</a>	Hudson J	Manor Farm is not redundant. The land is Green Belt and the proposal would bring Stourport-on-Severn even closer to Kidderminster. Safety and highway issues.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS627</a>	Hudson J	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it is a	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>home and a business, it prejudices highway safety, it is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn, it would have a detrimental impact on tourism in the area, it would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity, and it is part of the route of the Stourport Relief Road.</p>	<p>between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1012</a>	Humphries H	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baker Report refers to Manor Farm as redundant; it is a working farm with employees. The site should be rejected because of this.</li> <li>• Manor Farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and is in the Green Belt, the land is highly visible and forms only a small area of Green Belt which separates Kidderminster from Stourport-on-Severn. The site would dominate the immediate residential community and the landscape.</li> <li>• The site is rich in wildlife and this should remain protected and unharmed.</li> <li>• It would impact negatively on highway</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>safety; St. Johns Road has no footpath and is narrow and used for children walking to school. The dual carriageway is already busy and has fast moving traffic; an entrance directly off this road would mean that the slow moving traffic would be hazardous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools and GPs in the area are oversubscribed and would have difficulty accommodating a sudden increase in residents.</li> <li>• The proximity to the rubbish tip is surely contrary to CLG Guidance for gypsy and traveller sites.</li> <li>• Stourport-on-Severn already caters for a large number of gypsy families and placing even more here would affect the balance of the population. The remainder of Wyre Forest and indeed Worcestershire have little or no provision.</li> <li>• Expresses shock at the way the tenants of Manor Farm have been treated over the years.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1157</a>	Hunt J	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to	Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road and added pressure on existing services.</p>	<p>traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted and views have been requested from the Highway Authority as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities re noted and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS625</a>	Hutton F	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it would prejudice highway safety, it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is a working farm and a home, the local healthcare services can not cope, the farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and it would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS396</a>	Ingram H	Objects to loss of Manor Farm as family home and business location.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS684</a>	James G	Farm supports local workers connected with horse riding.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS634</a>	Jauncey B	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Stourport Relief Road.	from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS938</a>	Jennings J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about destroying the currently attractive approach into Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>The Lea Castle site at Cookley, would be a better option given the layout and screening.</li> </ul>	Concerns about the Green Belt environment are noted as is the support for the Lea Castle site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1244</a>	Jennings N	I don't feel this site should have been brought forward at all after attending the meeting.	Comments are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS761</a>	Jennings S	Stourport-on-Severn already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1263</a>	Jones F	Erosion of Green Belt; important view on approach to town; potential traffic hazard; loss of businesses.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS38</a>	Jones L K	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. Currently a patient at Prospect Physio. Search for a more suitable site which would not cause the loss of the clinic, a home and other businesses.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS724</a>	Jones P	This is clearly unsuitable being a tenanted farm business and Green Belt.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1156</a>	Jubb DJ	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road and added pressure on existing services.	<p>Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>and views have been requested from the Highway Authority as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities are noted and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS317</a>	Kay W	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not a vacant site.</li> <li>• The geography of the site is quite clearly wrong: a) end of a dual carriageway; b) so close to a school; c) too close to other dwellings.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS812</a>	Kelly P	<p>Objects to Manor Farm site for the following reasons:</p> <p>Traffic Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potentially 25 caravans and 30 vehicles - if accessed via St Johns Road it will have a negative impact on traffic flow</li> <li>• Concerned about the heavy increase in volume of traffic which will compromise the safety of residents</li> <li>• If used by Travelling Showpeople it will result in the small road being used for considerably large vehicles, for which there is not sufficient turning room</li> <li>• A full transport assessment is required</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted as are the concerns about the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Environmental Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic will compromise the air quality</li> <li>• During wet weather the hedgerow tends to release mud and this could increase risk of accidents</li> <li>• Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Would require drainage and disposal of chemical toilet waste - both causing damage to the environment</li> </ul> <p>Impact to the Travellers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about noise and transference through walls of caravans</li> <li>• Is adjacent to a well used household waste site making it unsuitable</li> </ul> <p>Other Grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorrectly described as redundant - as a diversified working farm consisting of 3 thriving businesses</li> <li>• Government Guidance says '<i>Sites should respect the scale of and not dominate the nearest settled community</i>'. Only a small minor road would separate the residents of St</li> </ul>	<p>subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>These concerns will need to be considered when a final decision on potential allocation is made.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Johns Road from the Travellers, and the travellers could potentially outnumber existing residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A proposed site on Land off Kimberlee Avenue, Cookley (site ref COOKOO I) was rejected on the grounds that <i>'The site is immediately adjacent existing residential properties and would impact on residential amenity. The housing would also overlook the site and impact on the Gypsy and Traveller community'</i>. These circumstances also apply to the site proposed in St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>• A proposed site on land on Bewdley Road North (Site ref ST000I) was rejected as <i>'The site would have an unacceptable impact on landscape character and residential amenity (for any location immediate adjacent residential properties)'</i>. These circumstances also apply to the site proposed in St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>• The following proposed sites were rejected as <i>'The site would have an unacceptable impact on landscape character and would be inconsistent with Green Belt purposes'</i></li> </ul>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Land to the north of Stanklyn Lane (Site Ref KIDO12)                      Land off Wilden Lane (Site ref WR106461)                      Bewdley Road North (Site ref ST000 1)</p> <p>Land at Burlish Crossing (ST00022)</p> <p>Land off Wilden Lane (Site ref ST0003)                      Bewdley Road North (Site red ST00021)</p> <p>These circumstances also apply to the site proposed in St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS609</a>	Ketley S	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site because it would prejudice highway safety, it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is a working farm and a home, the local healthcare services can not cope, the farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and it would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity.</p>	<p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS636</a>	Knott S	<p>Object on following grounds:</p>	<p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS949</a>	Krawec J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only Green Land left between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• It is not spare land - it provides livelihoods.</li> <li>• Would be wholly inappropriate in this position opposite a large school and almost adjacent to a crematorium.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS278</a>	Leon G	Travellers, Gypsies and Travelling Showpeople should be made to live in houses like the rest of us hard working people, Caravans are an eye	These comments are noted. Gypsies and Travellers are recognised as having a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. Case

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			sore and should be left as holiday homes as they were designed for.	law has established that the Government has a duty to facilitate the gypsy way of life for ethnic Gypsies and Travellers under the Human Rights Act.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS568</a>	Leonie-Handford J	<p>Objects to Manor Farm site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt - precedent already set by the High Court at Dale Farm regarding Green Belt land so why are Wyre Forest considering it?</li> <li>• It is a waste of money and it is causing distress.</li> <li>• The former Sugar Beet site would be a much better option with transport links and local amenities.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS776</a>	Leonie-Handford N	Objects to any more Travellers in Stourport-on-Severn and specifically objects to Manor Farm because it will displace the existing residents and their businesses, it is in the Green Belt and there are many species on the farm including grass snakes and bats.	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				part of the planning process
Object	<a href="#">GTTS500</a>	Lloyd R	This has been a working farm and business development for over 50 years and was never a redundant site. Does not object to the other sites in Stourport-on-Severn as they are already being used for a similar purpose.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS222</a>	Macaulay-Collins C	The report was incorrect which labelled Manor Farm as redundant. It should continue as a working farm.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS656</a>	Macaulay-Collins C	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS653</a>	MacAulay D	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject  <a href="#">Info</a>  to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1022</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to site at Manor Farm	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS361</a>	Mantom R	Object to loss of physio business at Manor Farm - is lovely peaceful rural spot on edge of residential area. Wrong location for a gypsy site.	Objections are noted. Concerns about the loss of Manor Farm are also noted and the fact it supports businesses will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.  The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1339</a>	Marshall P	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to	Objections are noted.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road; site is likely to put extra demand on local services and infrastructure.</p>	<p>address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS270</a>	Marshall T	I appreciate that there has been a longstanding tradition of a small gypsy/traveller site in Stourport-on-Severn. I do not think a further one in the Green Belt is desirable, particularly as farm work is carried on there.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS559</a>	Merrick B	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS394</a>	Middleton A	Gypsies should remain in Sandy Lane area. Manor Farm is Green Belt, too near school and site would deter visitors to town. Fear fly-tipping	Objections are noted. Sites are also being considered in the Sandy Lane area as part of this

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			of canal. Would ruin tourism.	<p>consultation.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1160</a>	Middleton C	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted and views have been requested from the Highway Authority as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities re noted and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1324</a>	Millward A	Site is in Green Belt and very close to existing housing on St Johns Road.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The impact on the residential area is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS206</a>	Mock D	Green Belt land would be lost along with businesses and jobs. Notes how many of the potential sites are in Stourport-on-Severn -	These concerns are noted. Stourport Town Council has also submitted comments to the District Council which state that they believe the town has

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			what about Bewdley, Chaddesley Corbett etc?	provided more than its fair share of gypsy pitches over the years.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS75</a>	More A	Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn site is inappropriate for use as a gypsy site because; site is within the Green Belt - result in loss of identity of the towns and amenity value in the area; located at the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn - will not be a welcoming sight for visitors; not compatible with other land uses in the locality; proximity to new crematorium and graveyard; located very close to the Canal and Heritage Lottery funded canal basin restoration; site is not redundant; other parts of the District should take their share; if Stourport-on-Severn is deemed the best location then other sites in the Sandy Lane area should be taken up first as is preference of gypsy families themselves.	Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. It should be noted that a number of sites within the Sand Lane area have also been put forward for potential provision through the Consultation process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS43</a>	More D	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. It has three thriving small local businesses. Impact on tourism in the area and encroachment on the Green Belt boundary; compromise the route of the proposed relief road; opposite to excellent high school; impact on local household waste site and new crematorium; popularity of the canal towpath.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS74</a>	More S	Objects to proposal for Manor Farm site to be used for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Pretty ridiculous that the report cannot take people's livelihoods into account. Area is a gateway into Stourport-on-Severn. The first view of Stourport-on-Severn will be a gypsy site. Strongly detrimental to the image of the town.	<p>The concerns relating to the image of the town are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS255</a>	Morris M	Objects to site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn being proposed for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS858</a>	Moseley E	3 businesses run from farm	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St. Johns Road is not

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Site development would prejudice highway safety - St. Johns Road has no footpath and is designated cycle route used by school children.</p> <p>Inappropriate development in Green Belt - narrow wedge between towns</p> <p>Is gateway to Stourport-on-Severn - potential negative impact on tourism</p> <p>Development would have negative impact on biodiversity</p> <p>Site lies on proposed Stourport Relief Road</p>	<p>redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.  It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS733</a>	Mound D	Concerned over lack of school places which means local children are denied place at preferred primary school.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS58</a>	Newton H	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling People at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. Manor Farm is an important part of the community.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS59</a>	Newton H	Cannot see the justification of turning people out of their home and closing down a thriving business. Finds it absurd that the Council are considering this.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS60</a>	Newton H	Ridiculous that the people of Manor Farm should suffer because of someone else's negligence.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS238</a>	Oadley S	Considers there are enough travellers in Stourport-on-Severn and that travellers should be accommodated for in a more rural environment. People do not understand the difference between Irish travellers, gypsies and normal travellers.	In general, traveller sites should be located in areas where there is easy access to local services. However, the Draft National Planning Policy Statement does specify that Local Planning Authorities are also able to use a rural exception site policy to enable small sites to be used specifically for affordable traveller sites in small rural communities that would not normally be used for traveller sites. Such a policy could be used to manage future applications. (Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites: Policy D: rural exceptions sites (April 2011))
Object	<a href="#">GTTS691</a>	Orbell H	Objects to the Manor Farm site as there are currently enough sites within the town and additional sites will not encourage new businesses to the area or provide jobs.	The comments in relation to the regeneration of Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS785</a>	Pagett I	Objects on the basis that there are already enough Gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn, dentists, doctors and schools already struggle to accommodate residents, should not build on Green Belt or by nature reserves. Land should be used for affordable housing.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS325</a>	Parker A	Manor Farm is a working farm and therefore should not be considered, the land is not redundant and people's livelihoods depend on	The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			the farm being able to continue in business.  Stourport-on-Severn already houses a large traveller community and therefore Stourport-on-Severn sites should not be considered, also why have 4 sites been proposed in Stourport-on-Severn and only one in Bewdley and 2 in Kidderminster?	The short listed sites have been identified through an independent assessment looking at the District as a whole.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS241</a>	Parsons P	There is always a certain amount of pests that will always be there with a working farm. If a gypsy site is allocated then the possibilities of future pests multiplying is very probable.	Noted. Any proposals that came forward for this site would be subject to detailed consultation with Environmental Health Officers about the control of such issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS795</a>	Parton D	Former National Standard site or Sugar Beet site would be more suitable than this site which is Green Belt and a working farm.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS114</a>	Payton L	Believe it could have negative impact on current value of their property and ability to sell.	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS178</a>	Payton L	I am also concerned about traffic congestion on the narrow lane of St Johns Road and the fact that there will already be increased traffic on Minster Road due to the new crematorium.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS146</a>	Payton T	I believe it could have a negative impact on	We recognise that the impact on property values is

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			current market value of my property and ability to sell later on.	a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS147</a>	Payton T	I am also concerned about traffic congestion on the narrow lane of St Johns Road and the fact that there will already be increased traffic on Minster Road due to the new crematorium.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS198</a>	Perkins A	Housing association will be inundated with applications to be moved. You cannot take someone's livelihood.	Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1587</a>	Phillips M	Object to proposed use at Manor Farm - is a home and work place. Stourport-on-Severn already provides sites for gypsies.	Objection is noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>listing as such.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1288</a>	Phillips R	<p>Unsuitable site - too close to housing and encroaches on Green Belt; Stourport-on-Severn takes more than fair share of sites already - would be better to enlarge existing gypsy sites at Nunn's Corner, Saiwen and Gables Yard. Referred to low level of provision in Malvern Hills.</p> <p>Feel Barnes family have been treated badly.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The approach to enlarge existing sites are noted as are the comments regarding the split of sites throughout Worcestershire.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS764</a>	Phipps E	<p>Totally unsuitable site; working farm; main entrance into town an eyesore; drop in house prices; more strain on already stretched services.</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS824</a>	Phipps R	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it is a working farm within the Green Belt. The Baker Report does not take the proposed Stourport Relief Road into account.	<p>Objection is noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The Baker Report does recognise the Stourport Relief Road and identifies that a site could be developed on the back of the implementation of the road.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS674</a>	Photiou A	Object to Manor Farm being closed down. Object to Green Belt land being used for gypsies. We have enough travellers in Stourport-on-Severn area. When bought home, thought that Green Belt land would not be developed for this sort of use. Should remain as working farm.	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations."</p> <p>Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS512</a>	Pickering A	Concerned about the view from their property in St Johns Road and the de-valuation of the property if a Traveller site were to go ahead. Who will provide compensation? Spoken to insurance companies and this will definitely have a dramatic effect on policies.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS645</a>	Pitt D	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS933</a>	Porter K	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recently purchased a property in the town and did not know a travellers site would be so close, may not have purchased the property if known.</li> <li>Proposals will further reduce house prices</li> </ul>	Objections are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS945</a>	Porter L	Recently moved into Stourport-on-Severn and considering moving again if the site were to go ahead. Concerned about having more travellers in the area.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS931</a>	Porter M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already enough travellers in Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>Would reduce tourism, and lead to closure of more businesses.</li> <li>If developed it will be the first thing people see when entering Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>Cause upset and distress for the local</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment and the residential areas are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			communities.	amenity and local environment. This will therefore need to be considered when a decision on allocating sites is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS655</a>	Pound J	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS652</a>	Preece W	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS365</a>	Price F	Manor Farm is a working farm - used to be riding school; provided livery and has horse related businesses operating from there.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS213</a>	Price J	Raises concerns relating to value of local properties and security issues.	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS640</a>	Price J	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1219</a>	Price J	Object for these reasons:	Objections are noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Green Belt; businesses on site - working farm; opposite school and sports club	<p>Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS271</a>	Price R	I can not understand why the travellers park in Watery Lane is not fully occupied yet you are trying to develop another site. Object to any traveller site in the Wyre Forest until all present traveller sites are fully occupied.	The comments in relation to occupation of existing sites are noted. Officers will research the issues relating to spare capacity with the site managers to determine whether this is the case.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1233</a>	Price R	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is in the Green Belt, there is a school and sports club opposite, people will loose their home and people will loose their jobs, where will the horses go and where will people take their rugs to be washed?	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS90</a>	Print G	Objects to the Manor Farm site being used for gypsy and traveller provision. It is not a redundant farm and provides work for 6 people;	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			access issues; Green Belt land; land is currently being properly managed and adds greatly to the wellbeing of local people; clear boundary between individual communities of Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster, proximity of the school and block of flats for the elderly are a cause for concern; sends a fatally flawed message to the rest of the rural community.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1347</a>	Ralph M	Manor Farm is still a working farm and dwelling.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS312</a>	Randle M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manor Farm provides employment and therefore should remain as is for businesses.</li> <li>Enjoyment of the common may be put at risk from an increase in the traveller population.</li> <li>The land around the proposed site will become a rubbish dump and provide a very poor impression of our historic town.</li> <li>Dale Farm problems - is there a risk that similar problems may arise at this site?</li> <li>Highway safety concerns.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The employment role that Manor Farm plays is noted and will need to be considered when decisions are made on the possible allocation of sites</li> <li>Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</li> <li>The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues</li> </ul>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</li> </ul>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS591</a>	Reading P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stourport-on-Severn already has its fair share of sites - Kidderminster or Bewdley should have sites as well.</li> <li>The Manor Farm proposal can not be a going concern - too close to the highly regarded school, which could cause problems for them.</li> <li>Employment would cease at the farm.</li> <li>Stourport-on-Severn seems to be the poor relation in Wyre Forest - Gypsies, a Tesco that nobody wants, no relief road/bypass.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted - as part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p> <p>The other concerns are noted and will need to be fully considered when a decision is made on the allocation of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS273</a>	Reep T	The farm is still a working farm and always has been ever since I have lived in the area. Let it continue as such.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1090</a>	Robbins P	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it is a home and business, the residents of St Johns	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Road will directly overlook the site devaluing homes, the site is Green Belt, Manor Farm includes the safeguarded line of the Stourport Relief Road. There are more suitable sites and Stourport-on-Severn has done more than its fair share of accommodating travellers.	redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS950</a>	Roberts S	How can you say it is a redundant farm when it still has a thriving business?	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS372</a>	Robinson J	Negative impact on house values; loss of jobs, disruption - should have site away from residential areas.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS373</a>	Robinson J	Objects to site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS218</a>	Rogers D	Considers there are enough travellers in the area. Need more jobs in the area.	Noted. The District Council is committed to comprehensive regeneration for the area and this will be delivered through the Local Development Framework process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS792</a>	Rogers J	Object to proposed gypsy site on grounds that	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			farm houses thriving businesses. Feel that councillors should listen to community concerns.	land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1350</a>	Rollins S	Site is too close to schools; farm is home to family and businesses; inappropriate development in Green Belt; gateway to Stourport-on-Severn - negative impact on tourism; prejudices highway safety; detrimental effect on biodiversity; includes safeguarded route for relief road; extra pressure on local services.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS758</a>	Rooney B	This is a working farm, someone else's home and livelihood, not an unused area. Persons will be put 'on the scrap heap' if this goes ahead. Also would mean more traffic on an already very busy main road (Minster Road). It is not a good idea to put houses there.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS641</a>	Rose J	Objects to the Manor Farm site on the basis that it is not a derelict site, it is on the route of the Stourport Relief Road, and Stourport High School is full. It also questions the impact that travelling children would have on Stourport High School.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>We will carefully consider these views alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS580</a>	Rose K	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objects to another site being sought to be built in Stourport-on-Severn - the value of houses will drop.</li> <li>2. Why was Manor Farm listed? Who listed this and at what cost to myself and fellow rate payers? Paying someone to list that is bringing income into the council.</li> <li>3. Stourport should not have yet another site.</li> </ol>	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The sites were recommended by an Independent report as areas that may have potential for development of this type. Sites have been identified in areas other than Stourport-on-Severn.</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS203</a>	Round P	<p>Raises concerns about site's proximity to school and residents of St Johns Road. States that Gypsies and Travellers do not pay council tax, rent or water rates.</p> <p>Site is on Green Belt land, proposed on Stourport Relief Road route, home to three thriving businesses, extra pressure on stretched local services, access issues, is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn.</p>	<p>Noted. It is important to clarify that Gypsies and Travellers located on authorised sites that are allocated through the Development Plan do pay Council tax and also pay an annual site fee.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the location of the site are noted, in particular its location within the Green Belt and at the gateway to the town of Stourport-on-Severn.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS836</a>	Russell E	<p>This is a working farm and people have businesses there. Also it is vitally important to keep Green Belt land - particularly so as this is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS807</a>	Russell M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is a working farm employing people. There are businesses employing people</li> <li>• The site is Green Belt dividing Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS27</a>	Save Manor Farm	Objects to the potential use of the Manor Farm site, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. It is not a redundant farm - provides a livelihood for 6 people. If this proposal continues then our workers will be made redundant and our family will lose their home.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS840</a>	Scott R	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS221</a>	Scully K	Believes the farm should have never been considered, also that Stourport-on-Severn has done its bit towards the travelling fraternity. It is the choice of Gypsies to live their lifestyle, we shouldn't have to be responsible.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The comments in relation to Stourport-on-Severn's contribution to providing pitches are noted and these concerns are echoed by Stourport Town Council.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS93</a>	Sharp J	Objects to the use of the Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn site for use as a gypsy/traveller site raises personal circumstances and devaluation of property in the area. Impact on tranquillity of the area.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS94</a>	Sharp J	Raises some general concerns in relation to	Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople relating to damage and waste and impact on the land.	consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS95</a>	Sharp J	Makes no sense to put people into a Green Belt area that will be so visible that it would not only spoil every ones outlook but it will affect the environment irrevocably.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS96</a>	Sharp J	If you want to give these people a better standard of living then do it but don't lower mine and my neighbours standard of living.	Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS42</a>	Shaw G	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. The site is not redundant and there is inadequate local infrastructure to support a new site; increased traffic will compromise pedestrian safety; visual impact will be detrimental to the area.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1031</a>	Sheppard D	Manor Farm - this is a working farm in the Green Belt, employing 6 people. Tim Barnes and his family have rented the farm from WFDC for many years and should never have been in the Baker report in the first place. There is a danger that WFDC 'jump the gun' - what are the other District Councils in Worcestershire doing?	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS239</a>	Shilton S	I believe the people of Manor Farm have been living and working there for a life time and think it is very unfair to go ahead with the site.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS852</a>	Shuttes J	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site and to the proposals for additional sites in general on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is giving conflicting information on the policy as the detailed route of the relief road is not clear.</li> <li>• Conflicts with national and local planning policy, specifically in relation to Green Belt.</li> <li>• The Council have not liaised with other authorities in the County.</li> <li>• The Baker Report is flawed and was carried out on the basis of a poorly drafted brief.</li> <li>• The Council have ignored the observations of the Baker Report.</li> <li>• The MP will be arguing for fewer pitches.</li> <li>• Increased vehicle movements on the Stourport Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The Baker Report identified that a site may be developed in this area on the back of the development of the relief road.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biodiversity of the Manor Farm site.</li> <li>• Loss of a successful business.</li> </ul>	<p>in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The need for sites has been taken from a regional wide survey that identified need throughout the County, the other authorities will also be required to identify sites in the future.</p> <p>The Council does not consider the Baker Report to have been carried out on the basis of a poorly drafted brief.</p> <p>Any representations received from the MP will be considered as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to traffic movements to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1002</a>	Slack L	Objects. Site is on Green Belt land, is a tenanted farm. Extra pressure on local services.	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1000</a>	Slack L	Objects. Site is on Green Belt land, is a tenanted farm. Extra pressure on local services.	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS650</a>	Smith G	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS700</a>	Smith M	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Road.	mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS183</a>	Smith Mrs P	The inclusion of Manor Farm is totally outrageous. These people have lived there and contributed to the local economy for many years.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS621</a>	Smith T	Objects to the Manor Farm site because it would prejudice highway safety, it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is a working farm and a home, the local healthcare services can not cope, the farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and it would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity.	<p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1115</a>	Spiteri E	Raises concerns in relation to accessibility, safety and transport impacts.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1155</a>	Stables C	Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road and added pressure on existing services.	<p>Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted and views have been requested from the Highway Authority as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities re noted</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS240</a>	Stanley M	Objects to the use of the Manor Farm site for provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS179</a>	Steward M	St Johns Road is a very narrow road and very busy onto New Manor Estate and to have more traffic is not at all viable. The field in question floods in winter and is already earmarked for the Relief Road and first and foremost it is in the Green Belt.	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>In relation to concerns regarding flooding, the Environment Agency have also been consulted as part of this process and their comments will be given full consideration in the decision-making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS680</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the Manor Farm site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS685</a>	Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Close to major 'gateway' to Stourport-on-Severn - oppose development of caravan site here.</li> <li>2. Local small businesses should be encouraged not destroyed.</li> </ol>	The site's location at the entrance to Stourport-on-Severn is important. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS891</a>	Stourport on Severn Town Council	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site on the basis that it is not redundant, it is in the Green Belt, and it will have a detrimental impact on landscape character.</p> <p>The Town Council maintains its objection lodged with the District Council on the 6 July, 2011.</p>	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>Concern about development in the Green Belt is noted and although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS55</a>	Sturges C	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn. It provides employment for local people as does the livery yard that continues to exist.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS56</a>	Sturges C	Comments on the success of the physiotherapy business ran from Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn.	These comments are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS57</a>	Sturges C	Interested to know views of Highways relating to the junction from the main A451 and the impact development of the Manor Farm site could have.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS835</a>	Styles H	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is a working farm. Raises concern about the impact on Stourport High School.	Objections are noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The potential impact on the school would need to be considered when a decision on potential allocations is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS901</a>	Taylor A	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is a home	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>and businesses operate from there, the farm is in the Green Belt, the road infrastructure is not suitable, it will impact on a designated cycle route, the residential properties in the area will overlook the site.</p> <p>Encloses four photographs of the views of the site.</p> <p>Suggests the British Sugar site would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions</p> <p>The British Sugar Site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates; however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS885</a>	Taylor B	Objects to the Manor Farm site on the basis that it is not redundant, three small businesses operate from there and it provides employment for 6 people. Raises issues relating to inappropriate development within the Green	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The objections in terms of Green Belt are noted</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Belt, the merging of Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn, poor access with St Johns Road being very narrow, impact on a designated cycle route, overlooking from existing residential areas, and impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Questions why the site was shortlisted and asked for it to be removed. Refers to the current Government focus on small businesses. Suggests the former British Sugar site and the former Romwire site as alternative locations.</p>	<p>and although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>In terms of the Former British Sugar Site - The site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The Former Romwire site was not considered and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS965</a>	Taylor G	<p>I object to the proposed development on the grounds below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Manor Farm should be removed from the shortlist by applying the same criteria the Council used to rule out Naylor's Field in Kidderminster's Sutton Park.</li> <li>2. Manor Farm is home to protected species of animals including Badger and bats as confirmed in a recent ecological survey. Bats are protected by at least 12 laws in the UK.</li> <li>3. The land is confirmed as Green Belt and should be protected and conserved as such.</li> <li>4. The land is ecologically diverse, home to pockets of acid grassland which is a Biodiversity Action Plan habitat.</li> <li>5. The farmhouse is a locally listed building and should be protected as such.</li> <li>6. The farm is a working farm providing</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>valuable employment to local families</p> <p>7. The farm is home to a hard working, honest family. Why should they be forced out of their home?</p> <p>8. Development would infringe WFDC's own protection policy NC.7 which is in place to ensure that NO development causes harm to ANY PROTECTED species.</p> <p>9. The council are basing the proposed development on recommendations gathered from a flawed report.</p>	apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS658</a>	Thacker I	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.</p>	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS751</a>	Thomas M	Manor Farm has always been a working farm. Stourport-on-Severn has enough gypsy sites	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			already	redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS275</a>	Thomas N	<p>Agreement with the three other Stourport-on-Severn sites as clearly it makes perfect sense to utilise existing sites - possibly adding more pitches.</p> <p>Raises a number of concerns relating to the site relating to access, Green Belt and impact on adjacent property prices. How could the Council destroy the heart of the community? This beautiful, tranquil place that attracts people from far and wide to enjoy the scenery, walk, fish, cycle along the canal and surrounding countryside. What will this area have to offer?</p>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS220</a>	Thompson D	Cites a number of reasons as to why the site is not appropriate including access issues, proximity to sports and educational uses, traffic generation, farm is a thriving business, wrong place for such a need.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS615</a>	Thornton Anna	Strongly objects to the Manor Farm site as it is a home and a business and is Green Belt land.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS811</a>	Thornton M	Concerned that putting caravans on the main road into Stourport-on-Severn will turn it into an eyesore, whereas currently the approach is	Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			attractive and in keeping with attempts to improve the town. Objects to Council Tax being used to support such a development.	protection of local amenity and local environment.  In terms of the objection about using public money to provide sites - the Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS839</a>	Tristram I	Objects to the Manor Farm site because of additional traffic, and because Stourport-on-Severn already has an abundance of caravan sites, as well as the potential impact on the canal.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions controlling this.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS643</a>	Turner A	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS659</a>	Turner M	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity; site includes safeguarded route for Stourport Relief Road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS216</a>	Turton M	Objects to site at Manor Farm Stourport-on-Severn being proposed for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision.	Objection is noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS930</a>	Twining B	Objects to the Manor Farm site as the primary and high schools are close by. Raises concern about additional youths hanging around streets in the evening.	Objections are noted. The location of services for families to access is a key planning consideration.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS488</a>	Underhill M	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is a working farm and will cause traffic problems. Stourport-on-Severn already has more traveller sites than Kidderminster and Bewdley so should not have to provide any more. Raises concern about the Green Belt.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1182</a>	Valler-Jones T	Manor Farm is working farm with 3 businesses in the Green Belt. Site has diverse ecology with poor access. School places and GP surgeries already at capacity in Stourport-on-Severn.	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>alongside the views from the service providers, and the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS997</a>	Vincent T	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site on the basis that it is a working farm, it will create traffic problems and safety concerns, it is the only Green Belt land between Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn, it is directly on the Relief Road route.</p> <p>Questions why the Travelling Showpeople can not just rent a site on the open market.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. However, the retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS593</a>	Voysey Mr	This site is still a working farm employing 6 people. It should not be considered as a potential site for travellers and gypsies.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS410</a>	Walker T	Objects to the Manor Farm site on the basis that it is a working farm, and that the site is at the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn. The site is also in close proximity to the High school and to residential properties.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such. Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS196</a>	Walters A	Do travellers pay rates etc?	Travellers located on permanent sites pay Council Tax in the same way that all residents do. They are also required to pay site fees for the maintenance and running of the sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1566</a>	Walton L	Manor Farm is a tenanted farm protected by a legal tenancy agreement and further protected by the 1986 Agricultural Holdings Act as supported by Morton & Fisher Group Solicitors. The tenants have no plans to cease this	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			tenancy.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1567</a>	Walton L	<b>Manor Farm is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn &amp; Kidderminster</b> - Manor Farm is a landmark at the entrance to Stourport-on-Severn from the north and the entrance to Kidderminster from the south. The gateway is the direct route to the Stourport Road Employment Corridor and the South Kidderminster Business Park included in the Rewyre Initiative. If the use of this land is changed then the vital identity of the gateway will be lost.	Objection is noted. The issues raised will need to be considered in detail in determining which sites should be allocated.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1568</a>	Walton L	<b>Green Belt land</b> - The potential site is labelled as Green Belt land.  The report from Baker and Associates states that development within this site would lead to an inappropriate development in the Green Belt that separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster. Development is also against advice of PPG2 and Core Strategy.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1569</a>	Walton L	Site of planned <b>Stourport Relief Road</b> - The planned road is mapped to take a route directly through the proposed site.	It was proposed that a site may be able to be developed on the back of the relief road being developed and therefore it would not prejudice the implementation of the road.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1570</a>	Walton L	<b>Business and small enterprise</b> on the site - At present there are 3 successful small businesses based at Manor Farm with employment of 6 people. The tenants have no plans to cease these	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1571</a>	Walton L	Area of <b>ecological interest and conservation</b> - Manor Farm has a wide variation of protected wildlife as reported in an ecological survey by Worcestershire Wildlife Consultancy.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople  
Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1572</a>	Walton L	<b>Unstable</b> built up <b>land</b> - The area proposed for the potential site is sand land fill created by infill and is susceptible to subsidence	This would need to be fully considered in accordance with national planning policy should any planning application come forward for the site in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1573</a>	Walton L	<b>Access</b> concerns and <b>safety</b> issues - limited access to the site from the busy dual carriageway or from a narrow residential road creating safety issues.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1574</a>	Walton L	<b>Increased pressure on public services</b> and amenities - already pressurised over subscribed schools and increased pressure on local health services.	The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1575</a>	Walton L	<b>Listed farmhouse</b> on local list of buildings of local architectural and/or historical interest in Stourport-on-Severn - under PPG2 4 <sup>th</sup> identified purpose.	This will need to be considered when determining the exact route of the relief road and the exact position of any possible site for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS588</a>	Ward G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stourport-on-Severn already has its fair share of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople.</li> <li>It will adversely affect the countryside.</li> <li>It is a working farm and should remain</li> </ul>	Objections are noted. Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			as such.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1023</a>	Watson S	Objects to site at Manor Farm	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS242</a>	Watts J	This land remains the only 'Green Belt' area between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster on this side of the main road.	The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS243</a>	Watts J	Concerns about rubbish associated with traveller sites which would create potential health issues.	Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS244</a>	Watts J	The site is close to a well populated area, and one elderly retirement home.	These concerns are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS245</a>	Watts J	The proximity of the Stourport High School, and the Sports complex could attract crime.	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS14</a>	Whiley R	Objects to the proposed use of Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. It is not a redundant farm and offers excellent services to	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			local horse owners. The loss of these services would encourage horse owners to travel further on already congested roads.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS209</a>	Whitehouse T	Objects to proposed sites at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn and Stourport Road, Bewdley due to proximity of local schools. Considers Lea Castle is a much better location.	These comments in relation to the suitability of sites are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS397</a>	Whitmore M	Object to travellers using site due to mess left behind, whereas gypsies are tidy.	Objection is noted. The sites are intended to be for Gypsies.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1159</a>	Williams CL	Object on following grounds:  Would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt which separates Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster; Manor Farm is home to the Barnes family and their businesses; site forms attractive gateway to Stourport-on-Severn; development would prejudice highway safety; development would have detrimental effect on biodiversity.	Objections are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.  The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.  The concerns relating to Highway Safety are noted and views have been requested from the Highway Authority as part of the consultation process.  The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity of facilities re noted and will be considered alongside the views of statutory consultees including the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers.</p> <p>The site would come forward as part of the development of the Stourport Relief Road and not jeopardise its delivery.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS11</a>	Williams D	Objects to the potential use of land at Manor Farm for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. The farm isn't redundant and questions the type of assessment undertaken by Baker Associates in the original report. The farm supports several businesses and has done for many years.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS12</a>	Williams D	Objects to the proposed use of land at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. It is earmarked for the relief road, is Green Belt land and provides an important buffer between Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>With reference to the relief road, the exact line of this has not yet been developed however, it is considered that there is sufficient space for both the relief road and a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS13</a>	Williams D	Concerned about the access from the site at Manor Farm, Stourport-on-Severn from one of the main roads into town. There are also flooding issues.	These concerns are noted. As part of the detailed consultation process the District Council has also consulted Worcestershire County Council as the Local Highway Authority for site specific comments relating to accessibility and the Environment Agency in relation to flooding and water quality

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS409</a>	Williams M	There are a number of unused or derelict sites within Wyre Forest rather than proposing a site which is an ongoing business, and where the land is already put to good use.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS613</a>	Williams Susan	Objects to the Manor Farm site as it is Green Belt and a business which employs people.	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS98</a>	Wilson D	Opposes further gypsy and traveller site provision in Stourport-on-Severn. Feels that a site at St Johns Road would impact on potential investment into the area. Could slow down economic growth.	These concerns are noted. The retention of the open nature of the Green Belt between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster and its impact on regeneration is a key factor in assessing the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision in the future.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS303</a>	Wormington R	There are very few specialist neuro physiotherapists and none that I know of in the Midlands who have there own space set up as she does ready to help her patients. It just does not make sense to remove this valuable service from people who are already so greatly in need. I appreciate that Travellers need land but don't use land that is already being put to specialist use.	Objection is noted as are the comments relating to the specialist nature of the business operating here. The existence of businesses within this area will need to be carefully considered when decisions are made on the potential allocation of sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS957</a>	Worton L	This site is inappropriate - It is not redundant; it supports active businesses and jobs  The location is poor, being close to a very busy	Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>main road causing problems of access for caravans and show equipment. The close location of Stourport-on-Severn's main school, which already has traffic problems, will cause severe traffic problems if access is required to the site by large vehicles when pupils are arriving at or leaving school.</p> <p>I would suggest that the Lea Castle site would overcome these objections and be much more suitable.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The support for the Lea Castle Site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1179</a>	Wright I	<p>Objects to the Manor Farm site because Manor Farm is an existing working farm, the land is in the Green Belt which separates Kidderminster from Stourport-on-Severn, it is the gateway to Stourport-on-Severn and is prominent within the landscape, it is home to wildlife and protected species, the development would increase the strain on local services, St Johns Road has no footpath and is a designated cycleway.</p> <p>Expresses criticism towards the District Council for using the Baker Report which is flawed.</p> <p>Pleased that the public were able to have their say at the meeting in Stourport-on-Severn.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPf reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS793</a>	Wright N	1) The town already has its share of traveller families; 2) The town borders with Kidderminster would be further blundered. 3) Destruction of Green Belt. Why not use National Standard old site; 4) Destruction of working farm; 5) Large highway infrastructure.	<p>Noted. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.</p> <p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Manor Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS822</a>	Wright S	Objects to the Manor Farm site because Stourport-on-Severn already has a higher proportion of pitches than the rest of the Country and the families living there are not Travellers they choose to live in caravans rather than houses.	Objections are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. This is what is currently being undertaken.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS87</a>	Blount R	Support for site at St Johns Road for Gypsy and Traveller provision.	Support is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1594</a>	Anonymous	My opinion is that you should look at existing caravan/holiday sites in the area. There are many in the area that are run down or the owners are struggling to make a business out of. They are already set up and do not impose on residents because they have always been there. I think people would be far more accepting of the Council taking over these quiet caravan sites rather than taking over other land.	These comments are noted. Sites would need to be in conformity with CP06 in the Adopted Core Strategy, located in closer proximity to Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn and with good access to local services. Many of the existing caravan parks are located in remote rural areas.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS426</a>	Aston P	Suggests Duke House, former Tomkinson carpet site.	The alternative site suggestion is noted. However this site forms part of the Churchfields Area Master Plan which proposes comprehensive housing led redevelopment as a key component of the Kidderminster Regeneration Strategy.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1603</a>	Barnes T	Suggests a number of alternative sites, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land off Habberley Road, Bewdley</li> <li>• Former British Sugar Site, Kidderminster</li> <li>• Brown Westhead Park, Wolverley</li> <li>• Former Stone Depot Site</li> <li>• Land on Burlish Top off Birchen Coppice, Kidderminster</li> <li>• Land off Kingsway, Burlish Top, Stourport-on-Severn</li> <li>• Former British Sugar Settling Ponds, Kidderminster</li> <li>• Land off Birmingham Road, Kidderminster</li> <li>• Land off Sandy Lane, Stourport-on-Severn</li> </ul>	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land off Wilden Lane, Stourport-on-Severn</li> </ul>	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1279</a>	Barnett J	<p>Following additional sites on Sandy Lane Industrial Estate put forward:</p> <p>land opposite The Gatehouse, Nelson Road - 8 caravans</p> <p>28-29 Sandy Lane - 6 caravans</p> <p>1A Broach Road - additional 1-2 caravans</p>	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS626</a>	Bendall K	The Sugar Beet site would appear to be ideal and capable of accommodating all the 43 or 38 or 28 or whatever number of sites are required.	Noted. Baker Associates looked into the availability of this site for potential gypsy & traveller site provision. However, the landowners were not willing to consider this use and are currently consulting on a masterplan for comprehensive redevelopment of the site.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1605</a>	Bennett D	<p>2 sites that would be right would be the former national Standard site on a road that large vehicles will not become a problem, shops close to hand, in the middle of schools and doctors and close to council so they could make sure it's run right and lead by example.</p> <p>The second site is Potter's scrap yard at top of Sandy Lane. The man wants to sell due to ill health. The site has house and static caravans already on the site will</p>	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			be put up for sale for affordable houses so would be ideal site with a warden with the house already there and it would be close to their community already there.	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS185</a>	Broome Parish Council	In respect of the 7 sites, the Parish Council has no view to express either in favour or against specific sites selected.	Noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1270</a>	Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	Considers that the Baker Report is flawed because it included incorrect information about the availability and suitability of the Blakedown site as a result of incorrect assumptions. Questions why these assumptions were not checked. With the knowledge that this part of the report was incorrect there is obvious doubt that the remainder of the report is flawed. The longer the process goes on without the report being sully checked the longer it will take to resolve the matter of site allocation. With revised policy emerging from Central Government, the Parish Council considers WFDC should withdraw its current consultation and rethink its strategy for the provision of these sites.	<p>Comments are noted. The Council does not consider that the Baker Report was flawed. In relation to the availability of the Blakedown site, this was ascertained through an agent of the land owner who identified it would be available.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement. However, it is considered that there is already a need to identify sites in line with Core Strategy policy CP06 and as the Government are proposing to retain the requirement for Councils to have to identify sites, it is not considered that a change in strategy is required at this point.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1606</a>	Coole-Green S	<p>Suggest look at British Sugar site - plans could incorporate gypsy pitches and affordable housing. Those buying at site would have choice as to whether they lived near gypsy site.</p> <p>Also look at National Standard site - has hardstanding, electricity and sanitation.</p> <p>Potters scrap yard has become available and would be more suitable site.</p> <p>Sites work well when they are sited away from the settled community.</p> <p>Gypsies have stated that they wish to be on Worcester side of Kidderminster or near their families in Stourport-on-Severn.</p>	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS701</a>	Core11	Need to cater for 2 separate groups of people - gypsies	These comments are useful and are

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			need semi permanent sites whereas Travelling Showpeople sites are non-permanent. Out-of-season sites for Showpeople need space for equipment plus mobile homes. All such sites need to be readily accessible for monitoring purposes. Site rules should be published prior to any allocation.	noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS622</a>	Davies A	I suggest a very good site for the Gypsy and Travelling community would be on the land adjoining the new Council head offices being built on the Stourport Road, Kidderminster.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1326</a>	Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council	<p>Acknowledges that WFDC has an Adopted Core Strategy, which sets out pitch requirements for Gypsy and Travellers. The 2008 Worcestershire GTAA forms the evidence base for this policy and identifies a need for 30 pitches until 2013. Dudley MBC consider this to be robust evidence base.</p> <p>Post 2013 the evidence base is less clear, the consultation document requires 20 pitches between 2013 and 2022 with the source of this information being the RSS3 Interim Policy Statement. This was never adopted and as such we would question the weight afforded to it. It is considered that post 2013 pitch requirement should be based on robust and credible evidence base and that this will result in the inclusion of robust site allocations in relation to accommodation needs.</p>	<p>Comments relating to the pitch requirements are noted.</p> <p>The District Council has revisited the information that was used to inform the RSS Interim Policy Statement and is therefore not basing the requirements on the Statement itself but the work that was undertaken to inform the Statement. It is considered that this evidence base is robust and provides a sound figure in which to work towards through the Site Allocations process. The numbers post 2017 are indicative and this reflects the fact that further studies of need will be required. However, the policy framework provided through the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations will help to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				guide any new development.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1138</a>	Environment Agency	<p>Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 25 'Development and Flood Risk' classes caravans, mobile homes and 'park homes' intended to be permanently occupied as 'highly vulnerable' development. The instability of such structures places their occupants at special risk and they are likely to be occupied during periods when flood risk is likely to be higher (paragraph D19). In line with PPS25 (Table D.3.), 'Highly vulnerable' development should not be permitted within Flood Zone 3 and within Flood Zone 2 requires the Exception Test to be passed.</p> <p>The selection of sites should follow the Sequential Test set out within PPS25, policy CP02 and policy CP06 (criteria 5) of your Council's adopted Core Strategy (December 2010). The draft National Planning Policy Framework would appear to support this approach. We note that the information pack refers to the Sequential Test requirement and that you are currently undertaking Sequential Testing (flooding) to inform your draft Site Allocations and Policies DPD. This would be informed by your Council's Level 1 and 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment by Royal Haskoning.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above requirement, a site specific Flood Risk Assessment would need to be undertaken as part of any planning application for sites within Flood Zone 2 and 3, which focuses on safe development requirements.</p>	The comments from the Environment Agency in relation to flood risk will be carefully considered by the District Council. We acknowledge the need for site specific Flood Risk Assessments should any sites be brought forward for allocation within Zones 2 and 3 through the Development Plan process.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1139</a>	Environment Agency	<p>All the other sites lie within SPZ3, which is the total catchment area. We note that an 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan' is currently being produced to inform the allocation and phasing of sites within your draft Site Allocations and Policies DPD. As mentioned previously we would expect it to include environmental infrastructure, linked to your Council's Water Cycle Strategy (WCS) Final Report (dated March 2010) undertaken by Royal Haskoning. The WCS should be referred to in identifying infrastructure and environment capacity constraints. The infrastructure delivery plan should be produced in consultation with Severn Trent Water Ltd, to fully inform the phasing of sites for development.</p> <p>With reference to Planning Circular 3/99 'Planning Requirement in Respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage in New Development', in the first instance developers should look to connect to the mains foul sewer as the preferred most sustainable option. Only where it has been demonstrated that it is not practicable or feasible to connect to the mains foul sewer should developers consider the use of non-mains drainage. Circular 3/99 lists an order of preference for non-mains drainage in the absence of a connection to mains, which details a package treatment plant as the next most sustainable option followed by a septic tank.</p>	The comments in relation to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan are noted and this is being developed as part of the Evidence Base to support the emerging Site Allocations DPD. The Council will fully consider the findings of the Water Cycle Strategy to help inform this.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1140</a>	Environment Agency	Some of the proposed locations are brownfield sites and may be contaminated. A desk study and site	These comments in relation to potential contamination are noted and will be

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>investigation may need to be undertaken to assess the potential contamination, and a remedial strategy to deal with any identified contamination, in line with PPS23 'Planning and Pollution Control' and Policy CP01 of your Council's adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Note - the above comments relate to the protection of controlled waters. We would recommend that you consult with you Contaminated Land Officer/ Public Protection Team in relation to Human Health matters.</p>	discussed with Environmental Health Officers should any of the sites be proposed through the Development Plan process.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS597</a>	Farmer N	<p>Suggests alternative site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 acres of unused land at Finepoint, adjoining Zortech Avenue and Walter Nash Road.</li> <li>• It is flat, solid, sheltered, has good drainage, immediate access to utilities, good road access, limited residential community impact, good proximity to schools and no particular aesthetic value.</li> <li>• It is currently listed as "employment land" but changing that designation on a brownfield site must surely be easier than changing Manor Farm from Green Belt?</li> <li>• In fact, it never has been employment land as it was originally farmland then a sports field.</li> <li>• Has been disused for many years so clearly no business interest.</li> </ul>	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS123</a>	Glover S	Clear that sites must be found for this community.	The comments relating to the need for

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			History has shown that allocated pitches are open to abuse and the environment sometimes suffers badly. Must be clear that the inclusion of a traveller site must blend into the place and community around it. Therefore quite clear a stand alone site is perfect.	a stand alone site are noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS879</a>	Green G	<p>There are currently many more suitable sites for such an exercise, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ex-Yeildingtree packing site near Blakedown, already large brown field site with all existing services</li> <li>• The ex-National Standard site on the Stourport Road</li> <li>• The ex-sugar beet factory site on the Stourport Road</li> <li>• The industrial area on Wilden lane</li> </ul> <p>All of these sites are in a greater state of readiness, at a greatly reduced cost and with less social impact than trying to fit a site at the Sion Hill Middle school location.</p>	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research the availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS313</a>	Greenhow F	Please consider the ideal site at the old National Standard site.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS9</a>	Hadwell P	Considers that the empty National Standard site at Stourport Road could provide a site for provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. It has all the services needed on site and is easily available.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS7</a>	Hadwell V	Proposes the old National Standard site on Stourport Road for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. It is ideal as there are all the services provided and proximity to the new Council Offices for administering and generally overseeing the site.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1118</a>	Higbee E	Suggests 3 further sites for consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossway Green, DY13 9SH, 0.64a currently in use as a caravan store with one residential caravan. For sale with Phipps and Pritchard, £250,000</li> <li>• Rear of household waste site, Minster Road, DY13 8AS, rejected in the Baker Report because it is in the Green Belt however it should be considered because it would not impact on the settled community and has no toxic substances to be removed.</li> <li>• Former British Standard Site, 10acre site with hardstanding. For Sale/To Let with Harris Lamb</li> </ul>	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.  Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS149</a>	Highways Agency	Concludes that the proposed sites are unlikely to have any significant impact on the operation of the road network. As we have no concerns in this respect, wish to make no comment in response to this consultation.	It is noted that the Highways Agency has no particular concerns relating to the operation of the road network in relation to any of the sites.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1196</a>	Hill G	Asks that the demand for sites is re-examined as the neighbouring authorities are not rushing to provide	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>sites.</p> <p>Suggests three alternative sites for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossway Green DY13 9SH, 0.64acre site currently used for caravan storage with one residential caravan. For sale for £250,000. All services available, no asbestos and it is not close to houses.</li> <li>• Rear of household waste site, Minster Road, DY13 8AS, partially wooded area, close to the recycling centre, dismissed through the Baker Report because it is in the Green Belt; however, some of the 7 shortlisted sites are in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Former National Standard site, all services available, conveniently located on a service road off the A451, hardstandings, no demolition needed.</li> <li>• Numerous areas on the Kidderminster to Stourport Road that are vacant lots, demolished or need to be demolished buildings, open spaces etc which should be investigated further.</li> </ul>	<p>traveller pitch provision. However, it should be noted that the Crossway Green site falls outside the District boundary and therefore should provision be made there it would not be to address Wyre Forest District's need.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1097</a>	Hinksman J	Suggests the former British Sugar site which has better access to schools, shops, doctors etc and is closer to the existing settled traveller community.	Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Also the land behind the household waste site would also be more suitable.	consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS679</a>	Hinton J	Objects to the provision of additional Gypsy sites.	Objection is noted. However it should be noted that gypsies and travellers who reside on authorised sites pay their Council Taxes like all other local residents.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1282</a>	Hull A	<p>Asks that the demand for sites is re-examined as the neighbouring authorities are not rushing to provide sites.</p> <p>Suggests three alternative sites for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossway Green DY13 9SH, 0.64acre site currently used for caravan storage with one residential caravan. For sale for £250,000. All services available, no asbestos and it is not close to houses.</li> <li>• Rear of household waste site, Minster Road, DY13 8AS, partially wooded area, close to the recycling centre, dismissed through the Baker Report because it is in the Green Belt however, some of the 7 shortlisted sites are in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Former National Standard site, all services available, conveniently located on a service</li> </ul>	<p>The alternative site suggestions are noted. Officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p> <p>In terms of the Crossway Green Site, this lies outside of Wyre Forest District boundary and so its suitability can not be commented on.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>road off the A451, hardstandings, no demolition needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerous areas on the Kidderminster to Stourport Road that are vacant lots, demolished or need to be demolished buildings, open spaces etc which should be investigated further.</li> </ul>	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1286</a>	Hunter G	Suggests that suitable sites would be those already ruined by former use which have no visual amenity, not those which are visible from A roads. Suggests an intense search of the Wilden Lane area is carried out by the planning department.	Alternative site search areas are noted. However, it should also be noted that concerns about visibility could be equally levelled at sites along Wilden Lane.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS379</a>	Jackson D	Suggests National Standard site on Stourport Road.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1247</a>	Jennings N	I would like you to look at HABBERLEY ROAD BEWDLEY again for the following reasons. This land can be purchased by ourselves from the owner. Could be screened quite easily. Is not overlooked by many. Near 30 mph zone and understand this may be extended to entire road shortly. Hotel entrance opposite has heavy traffic use. We would be on road for 6 months of a year. Would appear that there are no suitable sites outside of Green Belt. Family have lived and worked in area for 6 generations.	Comments are noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1248</a>	Jennings N	Land off Kingsway Stourport-on-Severn - this land could be suitable and was not brought forward at all.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1249</a>	Jennings N	Depot at Stone. I think site is suitable and should be looked at again.	Comment is noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1250</a>	Jennings N	Land at rear of Stourport Road refuse tip - this site has good access and is not overlooked by houses.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1251</a>	Jennings N	Land opposite VOSA testing station - this land could be screened and bunded.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1252</a>	Jennings N	Wolverley Camp Brown Westhead Road - this site has good access and little impact on very few houses. I think this is a good site for us.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS967</a>	Jennings R	Suggests other sites to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site adjacent to Fountain Court, Low Habberley</li> <li>• Habberley Road, Bewdley</li> <li>• Bone Mill, adj. to Waste Site, Kidderminster</li> <li>• Westhead Park, Wolverley</li> </ul>	The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research availability and suitability for Travelling Showpeople provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS725</a>	Jones P	Alternative Site: Former British Sugar site, Stourport Road, Kidderminster.	Noted. Baker Associates originally investigated the potential of this site for pitch provision. However, the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				landowners are not prepared to consider these land uses and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for the redevelopment of the site.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS727</a>	Jones P	Alternative site: Former Romwire Site, Stourport Road, Kidderminster.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1192</a>	L C	Suggests the former British Sugar site as a suitable location. It has existing hardstanding, adequate road and path networks, a local refuse site, local schools and is more visible to Council staff as they are within walking distance.  Have WFDC tendered suitable locations from private landowners? Are there any available acres in the Dudmaston 3000+ acre estate?	Alternative site suggestions are noted.  The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.  The Dudmaston estate does not fall within the District boundary.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS501</a>	Lloyd R	Suggests that the old National Standard Factory on the Stourport Road be used as an alternative proposal.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1078</a>	Longville G	All sites should have a mandatory maximum stay, e.g. 7 nights then the 'Travellers' should be forced to move on. If they are genuine Travellers, Gypsies or Travelling	The Government's recent consultation on Planning for Travellers reiterates that gypsies and travellers are

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Showpeople they should have no problem. All too often these people stay put for years. Surely, sites (if they must be provided), should be for short term stays only.</p>	<p>recognised as having a protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010. Case law has also established that the Government has a duty to "facilitate the gypsy way of life" for ethnic Gypsies and Travellers under the Human Rights Act (para. 2.5) Furthermore, Annex A of the Government's Draft Planning Policy Statement on Planning for Travellers provides a definition of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1586</a>	Mark Garnier MP	<p>Questions overall number of pitches required. Analysis of January 2011 gypsy count data shows that WFDC has highest number of caravans after Wychavon. GTAA states that county has more than its fair share. Core Strategy proposes 4,000 new dwellings - an increase of about 9% however the number of gypsy pitches proposed would equate to an increase of 156%. DCLG consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites 2011 asked 'Do you think that Local Planning Authorities should plan for local need in the context of historical demand?' WFDC assumed that historical demand might under-estimate future demand. Other authorities did not share this view. Consider that future demand can be met from formalising existing provision at Sandy Lane.</p> <p>Voices public concerns over the process of consultation. Publishing of Baker Report caused</p>	<p>The detailed comments from the MP are welcomed. The analysis of the overall number of pitches required is noted and it is appreciated that the comments are made with regard to the requirement across the district as a whole.</p> <p>Firstly, the comments in relation to the level of pitch provision in both Wychavon and Wyre Forest Districts are noted. With regard to the reference to the levels of pitch provision within the other Worcestershire Districts, in comparison, Malvern Hills and Worcester City are currently required to provide 43 and 30 additional pitches respectively between 2011 and 2022</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>distress to many communities. Some people have incurred high costs. Suggest in future that WFDC provide independent legal advice to affected parties. WFDC has not made it clear to the public the terms under which gypsies occupy pitches - pitch rental fees, water rates, council tax etc. Also consider that gypsy sites in neighbouring districts should be taken into account.</p> <p>Voices public concerns over the Baker Associates report - errors and mistakes in final report - need to look at procurement processes and ensure value for money.</p> <p>Requests that WFDC should consider a renewal of Core Strategy to take into account soon to published guidance regarding gypsy and traveller provision.</p>	<p>through the emerging South Worcestershire Development Plan. It should be noted that between 2007 and 2011 permission has been granted for only 2 pitches in Malvern Hills and 0 in Worcester City. Wychavon has had permission granted for 48 pitches during this time period and as a result now only has to find a further 9 pitches in the period to 2022. Wyre Forest District has provided an additional 7 pitches during 2007-11, leaving an outstanding figure of 43 pitches to be found by 2022. This demonstrates that all Local Planning Authorities are required under national planning policy to plan effectively for pitch provision through their Local Development Frameworks.</p> <p>Wyre Forest District is the first authority within Worcestershire to adopt its Core Strategy and bring forward its Site Allocations. Consequently, this has necessitated earlier consultation on potential site options for pitch provision in the future, ahead of the other Worcestershire Authorities.</p> <p>The draft National Planning Policy</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Framework retains the Government's emphasis on the timely progression of Development Plans. The District Council considers that through adopting the Core Strategy and progressing the Site Allocations and Kidderminster Central Area Development Plan Documents, it is following this guidance and is proactively planning for the District's future sustainable development. It is considered that this will help to avoid the sporadic development of gypsy and traveller sites, that are allowed on appeal. This can so often be the outcome where sufficient allocated sites are not available to address the identified needs.</p> <p>During April 2011, the Government published its draft Planning Policy Statement "Planning for Traveller Sites," which is expected to come into force by the end of 2011. To help achieve the Government's objectives for planning in respect of traveller sites, the Draft PPS proposes that local planning authorities should:</p> <p>- Use a robust evidence base to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>establish need to inform the preparation of the development plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set pitch and plot targets to address the likely site accommodation needs of travellers in the light of historic demand.</li> <li>- Identify specific sites in their development plan that will enable the continuous delivery of sites for at least 15 years from the date of its adoption.</li> <li>- Identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to deliver site need in the first five years of the adoption of the relevant policy.</li> </ul> <p>Further, the draft PPS advises that if a local planning authority cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, it should consider favourably applications for the grant of temporary planning permission for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. The District Council therefore considers that it is acting with consistent regard to both current and emerging national planning policy.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>To confirm, where recent planning permissions have been granted for pitch provision during 2007-11 then these pitches will be taken off the overall target of 43 pitches to 2022 as suggested in the response.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the consultation process are noted with concern. It is acknowledged that the Baker Report wrongly listed the Manor Farm site as being redundant and Officers of the Council have apologised for this error on behalf of the consultants.</p> <p>The suggestions in relation to the future consultation on gypsy and traveller pitch provision and the comparison with practice taking place within the South Worcestershire authorities are noted. Both Malvern Hills and Worcester City Councils have recently consulted on the Preferred Options for the South Worcestershire Development Plan. However, they did not include in this consultation any specific potential site allocations for gypsy and traveller pitch provision (other than to accommodate 20 pitches</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>to meet Worcester City's needs within the proposed urban extensions). It is anticipated that both Malvern Hills and Worcester City Councils will need to go out to an additional 6 week consultation following the identification of potential sites to meet national planning policy requirements. This work will need to be undertaken prior to the submission of their Development Plan for Independent Examination later in 2012.</p> <p>For clarification, the officer appointed referred to in the representations is progressing gypsy and traveller site identification for Malvern Hills District, through the South Worcestershire Development Plan in order that this additional consultation can be undertaken on potentially suitable sites for pitch provision.</p> <p>Finally, to reiterate, the Draft National Planning Policy Framework continues to place emphasis on up-to-date and timely progression of Development Plans. Wyre Forest has followed this advice and the Core Strategy was recently adopted by the Council</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>following a comprehensive Examination in Public.</p> <p>The new PPS on Planning for Travellers will still retain an emphasis on planned pitch provision to meet identified local needs. Indeed it actually serves to further exacerbate the need to provide for a 5 year supply of gypsy and traveller sites through bringing this policy in line with current housing policy requirements as set out within Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing).</p> <p>On balance, it is therefore not considered to be an effective use of public resources to renew the Core Strategy at this very early stage in its lifetime, when it has so recently been independently verified as being a sound and up-to-date strategy which is based upon local evidence.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1383</a>	Moss K	Makes representations on behalf of the owners of the Clows Top Garage site, part of which was identified in the Baker Report as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople or Romany Gypsies together with the adjacent site of a former public house now referred to as The Terrace. The site was initially selected as one of 5 shortlisted sites and was on the list for further	<p>The comments in relation to the Clows Top Garage site and its availability for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision are noted.</p> <p>The District Council would have a number of concerns in relation to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>consultation.</p> <p>The current owner's aspiration to renew a lapsed residential consent has been recognised; however the certainty and viability of this proposal is not known at this stage - therefore this representation suggests that the site is allocated as a reserve site in case the sites selected as potential G, T &amp; TS provision in the plan period are not delivered and the Clows Top Garage site is not developed for residential purposes.</p> <p>The bulk of the site is currently operated as a transport depot, vehicle storage and repair yard, whilst the former petrol station forecourt is used as a second hand car sales lot. The front portion of the site, which gives direct access from the A456 was excluded from the study and the suggestion was that the rear of the site would require a new access from the south west. The existing access is used by a range of heavy goods vehicles and is established in highway use terms. The availability of this access would potentially eliminate one of the constraints identified in the Baker Report and heavy vehicle movement would be reduced.</p> <p>The Baker Report reflected the fact that the entire site has been marketed although there is currently no interest. Should the site not be developed for residential use, the site could potentially be purchased on the open market by Travellers or Showpeople and used for vehicle storage and maintenance without any further</p>	<p>drainage issues and this would need to be fully discussed with the Environment Agency and Severn Trent, in consultation with information set out in the Wyre Forest Water Cycle Strategy (2010). It should be noted that the Environment Agency has previously submitted comments to the District Council during consultation on the Core Strategy specifying that they do not support temporary connections from caravans and that this has previously been a problem with holiday caravan parks to the West of the District.</p> <p>The site's location is also relatively remote and although there is a bus stop, the bus service is fairly infrequent given recent bus service cut backs from Worcestershire County Council. Therefore access to local services such as primary schools and GPs is fairly limited.</p> <p>The site's remote location may mean that it is not consistent with the principles set out under Policy CP06 of the Council's Adopted Core Strategy.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>planning approvals based on the site's existing use. The site will be available for such uses in the event that the proposed residential allocation is not forthcoming or the site is unviable to develop due to economic factors such as the off-site drainage works required for a permanent residential development.</p> <p>The Baker Report confirms, given the current use of the site, that in policy terms the use of the site for Gypsy and Traveller use would be suitable, despite the restrictions on Landscape Character (CPI2) given the current brownfield use of the site and the fact that the existing use already has an impact on the landscape.</p> <p>The-Baker-report-suggests that-the redevelopment-of the site could significantly-reduce the current impact on the landscape through sensitive-planting and-careful management.</p> <p>The issue of possible contamination has been raised recent investigations have identified some areas of contamination, but not to the extent that the site would fall into the category of being unsuitable on environmental grounds for use as a Gypsy or Traveller site.</p> <p>Recognises that the site is not connected to mains drainage; however, given the level of potential occupancy this could be dealt with from a central access pit collection point which could allow temporary</p>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>connections from caravans which could be emptied regularly.</p> <p>The site has access to local shops and a bus stop to access GP services and Primary schools. An increased population in Clows Top could help sustain these valuable local services.</p> <p>In terms of capacity, with an enlarged site boundary, there could be potential for the site's use for static caravans as well as providing storage for Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Para 8.11 of the Baker Report recommends <i>"that it would be prudent for the Council to identify a potential reserve of land as part of the Site Allocations and Policies DPD which could be brought forward in the future if required, rather than wait for the need to be established and then start a review of the development plan at that time"</i>.</p> <p>We consider that it would be appropriate, notwithstanding the site's potential for residential development, that the site is allocated as a suitable Gypsy and Traveller site as part of a reserve allocation, which could meet a need in the period to 2017, or earlier if it is determined that the site is not likely to come forward for residential development in the plan period.</p>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Only two of the consultation sites are considered suitable for Travelling Showpeople, Stourport Road and Lea Castle Hospital. Both of these sites have considerable constraints to their delivery to the extent that neither could come forward in the timescales required.	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1389</a>	Moss K	There is an immediate requirement for 23 pitches to be provided by 2013, and for further plots within the next 5 years. If either of the sites suitable for Travelling Showpeople does not come forward, or is used exclusively for Showpeople, there would be a loss in capacity from the list of potential sites of 30 pitches - we would question whether the potential of the remaining sites (35 plots) gives the necessary potential capacity given the recommendations.	Comments are noted. The Council will seek to allocate sufficient sites to meet the demand of both the Gypsies/Travellers and the Travelling Showpeople.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1333</a>	Natural England	Sets out background to Natural England. Trusts that the Council has taken into account available baseline information in relation to statutory and non-statutory nature conservation designations, the Worcestershire Habitat Inventory, BAP Priority Habitats, species records, the County Council's Landscape Character Assessment and Historic Environment datasets and maps of the floodplain. The Council should prioritise sites which would result in least harm and most gain to the environment, including taking GI principles into account.	Comments are noted. When a decision on potential allocation of sites is made, the comments identified will need to be considered carefully to ensure that all factors are taken into account and a balanced decision is made. The Council are committed to ensuring the protection of the natural environment and will need to take Green Infrastructure principles into account.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1591</a>	Oborski F	Puts forward suggestions for alternative sites for provision for Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling	The proposals for alternative sites are welcomed. These will be assessed for

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Showpeople. 2 possible sites off Worcester Road, Kidderminster and the haulage yard off Wilden Lane Stourport-on-Severn.	any potential by Officers and Members using the same methodology as set out in the Baker Report.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS10</a>	Pearson Mr R	Challenges the reasoning behind undertaking the consultation on site provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople in the first place. Raises the need for local authorities to challenge Central Government.	Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS910</a>	Perrin P	Questions why the former British Sugar site has been discounted and outlines why this would be a suitable site.  Also suggests that the former Lea Castle site offers the opportunity to provide a traveller site as part of wider redevelopment.	The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Support for the Lea Castle site as part of a wider redevelopment is noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS884</a>	Perrin R	Suggests the former British Sugar site is considered as part of a mixed development of social housing, light industry and warehousing.	The site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1174</a>	Rock Parish Council	Believe urban sites would be more appropriate - have good access to services. Rural sites are inappropriate as they lack public services and amenities.	Comments are noted. In general, traveller sites should be located in areas where there is easy access to local services. However, the Draft National Planning Policy Statement does specify that Local Planning Authorities are also able to use a rural exception site policy to enable small sites to be used specifically for affordable traveller sites in small rural communities that would not normally be used for traveller sites. Such a policy could be used to manage future applications. (Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites: Policy D: rural exceptions sites (April 2011))
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1032</a>	Sheppard D	Should consider the former Sugar Beet Site.	Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1028</a>	Sherrey S	<p>Suggests two further sites for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• former British Sugar site</li> <li>• former industrial area, Wilden Lane</li> </ul>	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS870</a>	Simmonds R W	<p>There is a difference between Travellers and Showpeople - therefore two sites could be the options for this problem.</p> <p>For a Circus or Fair one would think of a centralised position for customers to be able to attend and for the travellers possibly from further afield - The Sugar Beet site would be good as this is a very large site and could</p>	<p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>still accommodate industry.</p> <p>Whichever site[s] are eventually decided on they must be self financing as with any caravan site and not a drain on the people of Wyre Forest - the rate payers.</p>	<p>privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer.</p> <p>Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS182</a>	Smith Mrs P	<p>Not sure of case for increasing the number of pitches in Wyre Forest - if there is a need brownfield sites should be the priority. Development of greenfield sites is contrary to the Local Development Framework.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1313</a>	Smith P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congratulates Wyre Forest DC on tackling this issue.</li> <li>• Commends the Baker Report.</li> <li>• Feels that all 15 sites should have been consulted on.</li> <li>• Suggests that it would be a travesty if housing were to be allowed on any of the 8 sites which were excluded from the consultation.</li> <li>• Feels that the MPs behaviour is inappropriate as if he was trying to limit the numbers of any other race people would not support his approach.</li> <li>• The numbers show that Wyre Forest has its fair share of pitches now but more are needed to provide for Gypsy and Traveller children who want to live locally - why should they be forced to go elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>Strongly supports the proposal to allocate more pitches and the number proposed.</p>	<p>Support for the consultation approach is noted.</p> <p>The reasons for the selection of the short-listed sites can be seen by viewing the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 20th September.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1317</a>	Smith P	<p>Suggests alternative sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Former British Sugar site (If the owners want to make millions of pounds in developing those places, they should pay something back in the shape of some small sites for gypsy and travelling people)</li> <li>• Churchfields</li> <li>• the fenced yard on Hillary Road between Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster.</li> </ul>	<p>The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p> <p>In terms of the former British Sugar Site - it was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1204</a>	Smith R	Suggest Sugar Beet Factory as alternative site.	The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1268</a>	Smith T	Seeks allocation of land at Shatterford for 1 pitch. Recent application refused on landscape grounds. Another site in the settlement was investigated as a potential gypsy site.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. However, it should be noted that the recent planning application would be a key consideration regarding the suitability or otherwise of the site in question.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1329</a>	South	Officer response on behalf of the South Worcestershire	The comments from the South

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
		Worcestershire Development Plan	<p>Authorities. The South Worcestershire Authorities welcome the approach taken by WFDC to identifying pitches.</p> <p>Notes that the need to 2017 is based on the 2008 South Housing Market Area GTAA (30 pitches), plus an additional 5 pitches for the period 2013-2017 based on the RSS Phase 3 Options Generation. This is not entirely consistent with the Regional Interim Policy Statement (March 2010) which indicated the need for 2007-2017 was 42 pitches, not 35. We would be concerned if a shortfall in provision in Wyre Forest led to an increase in neighbouring local authorities.</p> <p>The approach to assessing potential sites by Baker Associates was considered to be clear and helpful. However, only 1 of the 5 "potentially suitable sites for Gypsies and Travellers" - that was identified in Table 3 of the Baker Associates assessment - is being consulted upon, and there is no explanation of why the other 4 sites have been excluded from the consultation.</p> <p>We note that all of the potential sites that are being consulted upon have significant planning constraints (e.g. they are in Flood Zones or the Green Belt). We would be grateful if you could advise on whether there are alternative potential sites without significant planning constraints.</p> <p>In relation to the 7 potential sites that are included in</p>	<p>Worcestershire Authorities are welcomed. Emerging national guidance removes the requirement to meet regional top down targets set out in the Regional Interim Policy Statement. The District Council considers that the provision of 30 pitches for the 2007-12 period, with a further 5 from 2013-17 and an indicative target of a further 15 post 2017 is a realistic assessment of need and takes into account the significant planning constraints within the District. It is not considered that this would lead to an increase in the neighbouring South Worcestershire Districts as this is no longer deciphered at the regional level and it will be for the individual Districts to set out their target pitch levels for delivery through the South Worcestershire Development Plan based on the need levels within their Districts.</p> <p>The Cabinet minutes from the September meeting set out the reasoning behind the selection of potential sites for consultation. The comments in relation to the 7 potential sites identified in the consultation papers are noted, particularly their</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response															
			<p>your consultation, 4 (listed below) are less than a mile from the boundaries of, and thus potentially have an impact on, Wychavon and Malvern Hills.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="792 475 1514 1038"> <thead> <tr> <th>Potential Site</th> <th>Distance from Malvern Hills boundary (miles)</th> <th>Distance from Wychavon boundary(miles)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Nunn's Corner, Stourport-on-Severn</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Saiwen, Stourport-on-Severn</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>almost on boundary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The Gables Yard, Stourport-on-Severn</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>almost on boundary</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>0.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Our observations in relation to the above sites are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is already a concentration of Gypsy and Traveller sites in Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>• The South Housing Market Area GTAA stated that the <i>"Wyre Forest (Stourport) sites are likely to generate very little need, which could be</i></li> </ul>	Potential Site	Distance from Malvern Hills boundary (miles)	Distance from Wychavon boundary(miles)	Nunn's Corner, Stourport-on-Severn	0.2	0.1	Saiwen, Stourport-on-Severn	0.3	almost on boundary	The Gables Yard, Stourport-on-Severn	0.3	almost on boundary	Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn	1.3	0.6	<p>proximity to the District boundaries. It should be noted that the additional pitch numbers proposed for these sites are small, ranging from 3-10 pitches. As with the existing sites in this vicinity it is entirely realistic that should any of these sites go ahead in the future, then their residents will be reliant upon Stourport-on-Severn for its service provision.</p> <p>The Baker Report undertook a detailed assessment into site alternatives. Much of the District falls into Green Belt and flood zones so the availability of sites without existing planning constraints is very low.</p> <p>The District Council is fully aware of the comments set out in the GTAA and these have been used to inform the identification of any potential sites. In addition they have helped to shape Policy CPO6, relating to Gypsy and Traveller Provision within our Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>The comments in relation to clarity over the total number of pitches for each site are noted and this information will</p>
Potential Site	Distance from Malvern Hills boundary (miles)	Distance from Wychavon boundary(miles)																	
Nunn's Corner, Stourport-on-Severn	0.2	0.1																	
Saiwen, Stourport-on-Severn	0.3	almost on boundary																	
The Gables Yard, Stourport-on-Severn	0.3	almost on boundary																	
Farm, St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn	1.3	0.6																	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p><i>balanced by potential vacancies, as 6 of the 15 families interviewed expressed a preference for housing."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle, limited extensions to existing Gypsy and Traveller sites would be preferred in Stourport-on-Severn, rather than the development of new sites. It is considered that this would assist in preventing a proliferation of sites in the Stourport-on-Severn area and help promote a peaceful and integrated co-existence between the Gypsy and Traveller community and the settled community.</li> <li>• Pitch provision on the farm in St Johns Road would not appear to be suitable because (a) new gypsy and traveller sites in the Green Belt are normally considered inappropriate development, as defined in Planning Policy Guidance 2: 'Green Belts' (PPG2), (b) it could appear as an isolated development and is likely to be visually prominent and (c) development would appear to be dependent on development of the Stourport Relief Road. In principle, we consider that sites within the Green Belt should only be considered in the event that suitable sites outside the Green Belt cannot be delivered.</li> <li>• Whilst Nunn's Corner, Saiwen and Gables Yard are all currently in Gypsy and Traveller use, they are all within the Flood Zone. In particular, Nunn's Corner is located within Flood Zone 3</li> </ul>	<p>be set out in the Topic Paper for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision to inform the Submission Site Allocations &amp; Policies DPD.</p> <p>The District Council notes that the South Worcestershire Development Plan has recently undergone its Revised Preferred Options consultation and that no site specific areas were identified to accommodate the 43 additional pitches to be allocated by 2022 within Malvern Hills District, 9 pitches to be allocated within Wychavon and 30 within Worcester City (with the exception of 20 in the proposed urban extensions). We look forward to receiving further details on specific sites to accommodate these needs in accordance with national guidance, in the near future, prior to the DPD's submission. This will also enable us the opportunity to comment on any potential sites, particularly those in close proximity to the District boundaries.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>and therefore at a serious risk of flooding. Government policy states that sites should not be located in areas at high risk of flooding given the vulnerability of caravans and mobile homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that some of the sites currently have planning permission (or are tolerated) but that the remainder are either unauthorised (e.g. Saiwen) or tolerated (e.g. Nunn's Corner). If they are unauthorised then presumably by allocating them they would count as new supply, but if they are currently tolerated then they would not count towards new supply. Further clarity over the total number of pitches for each site would be welcomed - i.e. current (with planning consent and/or tolerated) plus new supply in order to help assess the overall impact of each gypsy and traveller site.</li> </ul> <p>The South Worcestershire Authorities will watch progress and appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed draft 'Site Allocations and Policies' Development Plan Document when it becomes available and any future planning applications relating to potential Gypsy and Traveller sites in close proximity to our boundaries.</p>	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1036</a>	The Theatres Trust	Sets out background to the Theatres Trust, thanks the Council for the consultation material but has no specific comments on this issue. Looks forward to being consulted on the next stages of the LDF.	These comments are noted.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1006</a>	Tweeddale Mr J S	<p>Believes that if any of the sites are Green Belt they should be withdrawn, only brownfield sites should be considered, if not enough brownfield sites in Wyre Forest then look across Worcestershire. Refers to the Core Strategy para. 9.14 and 9.22 and policy CP13 and the approach to Green Belt set out there.</p> <p>Planners should have done an evaluation of issues raised i.e. flooding, traffic etc to make sure sites are actually suitable before consultation.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para.143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS493</a>	Underhill M	There is a vacant site opposite the new Council building with hard standings for caravans, also this site has already got sewerage etc in place.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1604</a>	Wagstaff J	<p>Suggests alternative sites at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sugar Beet complex</li> <li>• Under-used parts on the old 25 M.U. area at Hartlebury and</li> <li>• land adjacent to the former quarry workings on</li> </ul>	<p>The alternative site suggestions are noted.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Clee Hill	discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.  The other two sites fall outside of the Wyre Forest District Boundary and so can not be considered.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1607</a>	Whittall J	Gypsy site should be between Wyre Forest District Council (Civic Centre) and grassed area to the river. Then all Councillors can watch the Gypsies and will know first hand if they are complying with regulations.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1507</a>	Worcestershire County Council, Schools Information and Planning Section	<p><b>Kidderminster sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sion Hill School site Kidderminster - 10 pitches</li> <li>• Lea Castle Cookley - 15 pitches</li> </ul> <p>There are increasing numbers of known children in Kidderminster and in addition significant housing growth proposed on the Churchfields site. Whilst it is true to say that the Sion Hill site is close to an existing school, the school would not have the capacity to take additional pupils.</p>	Information relating to school place availability is welcomed and will be used to inform any further decisions relating to the allocation of sites.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1509</a>	Worcestershire County Council, Schools Information and Planning Section	<p><b>Stourport-on-Severn sites</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nunn's Corner, Stourport-on-Severn 4 pitches</li> <li>• Saiwen, Stourport-on-Severn 4 pitches</li> <li>• The Gables, Stourport-on-Severn 3 pitches</li> </ul>	Information relating to school place availability is welcomed and will be used to inform any further decisions relating to the allocation of sites.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>St Johns Road, Stourport-on-Severn 15 pitches</li> </ul> <p>In Stourport-on-Severn there are surplus places at two of the primary schools and forecast numbers indicate that there will be sufficient places for children from these sites as well as children from other proposed housing developments. The forecast table below is based on current pupils at school with areas highlighted pink indicating a forecast of significant surplus places. Not all pre school children register with maintained schools; some will access education at Independent schools or be home educated.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1599</a>	Anonymous	Objects to provision of sites for gypsies.	Objection noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1049</a>	Bayton Parish Council	Concerned to see land at Clows Top put forward as potential gypsy site. Local community feels that site should be developed for affordable housing for local people and this should take priority over any other proposal. Site description is inaccurate re footpath. Access is dangerous. No mains sewerage in village; water supply is pumped up from Bayton Common; few bus services; any development should be for smaller 2/3 bed houses - mix of rented, part buy/rent and some to buy at reasonable cost.	These comments are noted. The site at Clows Top was not put forward for consultation purposes.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1221</a>	Burnell C	Objects to a site in Shatterford which has recently been the subject of a planning application which was refused by the District Council.	Comments are noted however, this objection relates to a planning application which was refused by the District Council at November's

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Planning Committee.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS148</a>	Carreras J	Stourport-on-Severn already heavily subsidises the lifestyle of the itinerants and has often had to spend out large sums of money on cleaning up after them when they move on. I object to my Council Tax being used for this purpose.	It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost to the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax. They would also be subject to stringent planning conditions through consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS92</a>	Carroll P	Raises concerns relating to Stourport-on-Severn and the level of provision for Gypsies and Travellers as there are already 3 sites. Manor Farm is not redundant. Raises some concerns relating to travellers in general.	The comments in relation to the current level of provision in Stourport-on-Severn are noted and reflect the views of many Stourport-on-Severn residents and the Town Council itself has registered an objection to further provision within the town. The District Council acknowledges that the land at Manor Farm, St Johns Road is not redundant and apologises for its listing as such.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS986</a>	Coal Authority	No specific comments to make on any of the sites as they are all located off the defined coalfield.	Comments are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS555</a>	Cope L	We already have more sites than surrounding Districts and the whole of Worcestershire - plans should be put on hold until other Districts have decided what they are	Objections are noted. The District Council is at a more advanced stage of planning policy compared to the rest of Worcestershire. The Government's

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>doing.</p> <p>A new site has been proposed by another District near Ombersley golf course, right at the edge of their District and right next to ours.</p> <p>How will this be funded? How much will the Council receive from the company who are appointed to manage the sites?</p> <p>How much of the grant funding will WFDC receive?</p> <p>Why were the other shortlisted sites removed?</p>	<p>recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>Wyre Forest District Council has no control over decisions made in adjoining authorities</p> <p>The management of sites would be either through a private individual/company or the County Council.</p> <p>Wyre Forest District Council would be able to bid for funding from the £60 million Government Money that has been outlined for use in developing or delivering such facilities. It is uncertain as to how much of this funding would be available for any potential site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1588</a>	Martyn Smith M	Objects to possible travellers site at Clows Top. Concerned that proposal would increase village population by up to 40% or even double it when children are taken into account. Local schools and doctors are at capacity. Concerned about impact on village hub with requirements for parking and storage. Site is very central to community. Surprised that site has even been considered.	Objection is noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS502</a>	McGilvray I	Positive discrimination, I would like a piece of free land too.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS848</a>	Morton C	<p>Objects to anymore sites being allocated within the District. The District already has a generous provision of sites so no further sites should be provided until other Council's put facilities in place.</p> <p>The MP does not believe we need to provide any more sites and WFDC has not quoted a single piece of legislation which requires WFDC to provide further facilities.</p> <p>There are other groups that have needs and these are not responded to. The argument that identifying sites will be a persuasive argument when dealing with sites that turn up where we do not want them is dangerous and will backfire. By identifying sites it will appear that there is an undeclared policy to locate sites in one</p>	Objection is noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>district which may add weight to further sites.</p> <p>WFDC is giving undue assistance to the Travelling Showpeople, if they can not remain on their existing site it is a matter for them and their landlord not the Council.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS649</a>	Simmonds R W	<p>Questions why so many sites are being earmarked for travellers in the area.</p> <p>Suggests a centralised site run like a caravan park and financed by the people who use it. Suggests that the former British Sugar site could be used for this.</p>	The former British Sugar Site was examined for potential by Baker Associates. However, it was not deemed available as the landowners were not prepared to put it forward for this use. They are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for the redevelopment of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS184</a>	Smith Mrs P	The Council's main duty is to support local businesses to improve the job market. Spending time and money on this consultation is bonkers - its way down the planning list for Wyre Forest.	These comments are noted. The Council is committed to a comprehensive regeneration strategy for the area through its Local Development Framework. It is a national government requirement that provision for gypsies and travellers should be set out in site allocations within Development Plan Documents.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS384</a>	Stanton R	What legislation is being used? How can you ensure only local gypsies use facilities and what incentives are available?	Various legislation is being used to inform the consultation. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS681</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the new Gypsy sites as they will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS888</a>	Stourport on Severn Town Council	<p>Thanks the District Council for consulting the Town Council on this issue.</p> <p>Refers to the holding objection submitted by the Town Council to the Site Allocations and Policies Preferred Options Paper.</p> <p>Refers to the Baker Report which sets out existing provision within the District and makes an observation that Stourport-on-Severn is the only area of the District with any provision.</p> <p>Refers to the fact that the Romany Gypsy community prefer further provision to be made within the Sandy</p>	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District. However, there is a recognition that a number of Gypsy families would prefer to live in close proximity to each other. The potential impact on the character of the area is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Lane area of Stourport-on-Severn but argues that this is a "snapshot" of the preference today and should not be used to bind or direct Gypsies to this location until 2026.</p> <p>Argues that intensifying this use within Stourport-on-Severn will change the character of the town. The town already has a number of caravan sites and it is felt that further development of this type will detract from the town's Georgian character and heritage.</p>	environment and this will need to be taken into account in any decision on allocation of sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS594</a>	Voysey Mr	Why has Stourport-on-Severn got far more potential locations than Kidderminster or Bewdley - this isn't democratic.	Objection is noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS639</a>	Walley R	Highlights bad experience relating to gypsies and travellers moving on to their land.	These comments are noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS88</a>	Blount R	Suggests former Sladen School site could be used for gypsy and traveller provision.	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS89</a>	Blount R	Suggests former British Sugar Site for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.	Noted. The Baker Report assessed the suitability of this site for gypsy and traveller provision. However, it is not considered to be deliverable as the landowners were not willing to put it forward for such a use. It is subject to a comprehensive mixed use masterplan which is currently out to public

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consultation.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS869</a>	Fauset C	<p>It is essential that Wyre Forest District Council fulfils its obligations to providing sites for Gypsies and Travellers. There is a major national shortage of sites and these people's way of life has been effectively criminalised by legislation forcing them off the road and into settled sites which do not exist in large enough numbers to accommodate the need.</p> <p>Travellers have the option of buying their own land and seeking planning permission, but since 90% of their planning applications are turned down (see Commission for Racial Equality Report) this is an incredibly risky proposition.</p> <p>While there are, as will always be the case, merits and issues with each of the potential sites Wyre Forest District Council has put forward, relating to practical issues such as providing sufficient local amenities and services so that existing local services are not stretched etc, there are no substantive reasons why the council should not pursue it's duty to create new sites. Much of the media hype and local opposition to these proposals are using practical issues as a mask for their underlying prejudice against this group, based on myth and misinformation.</p> <p>Many Travellers want their children to be educated in schools. Many would like the opportunity to attend adult</p>	Comments are noted as is the support for the Council's approach.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>learning classes and gain literacy skills themselves. They want to be able to access health services. Many cannot register with a GP as they do not have a permanent address and as they are constantly moved on so can have no consistency in accessing services. Providing sites enables this.</p> <p>It is also, as well as moral and legal obligation, much less costly to provide sites than to be in antagonism with the community by constantly moving people on or going down the road of forced evictions.</p> <p>As someone who grew up near to Stourport Road in Bewdley I would be proud to see the area offer accommodation to Travellers and welcome them into the community. It is saddening to see the response from some has been based on prejudice and racial stereotyping in a manner that would be completely unacceptable if it related to any other racial or ethnic minority in this country.</p>	
Support	<a href="#">GTTS581</a>	Rose K	<p>Suggests land facing new Council Offices as potential site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No need to demolish anything -base foundations already done.</li> <li>2. Water and mains already on site.</li> <li>3. Council wont have to travel far to collect rents/rates.</li> <li>4. Land can be leased from owners and cost</li> </ol>	The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Not Site Specific**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			covered in the rent charged.	
Support	<a href="#">GTTS1314</a>	Smith P	Suggests that there are several locations within Sandy Lane which are currently tolerated sites or have temporary permissions and that all of these sites should be formally allocated as they are deliverable.	Comments are noted and allocation of sites will be considered following the close of the consultation.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1134</a>	Environment Agency	Site 4 (Nunn's Corner) is located within Flood Zone 3 (1%, 'high probability'), based on our Flood Zone Map. However we understand that your Council has recently granted planning permission for the development proposed for this site.	Comment is noted. Planning permission has recently been granted.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1275</a>	Hall R	The current sites in Stourport-on-Severn are already used as traveller sites and therefore it seems more appropriate to expand these as they have an already existing community with amenities. If the existing community had to move this would have a social and economic impact on their lives and could also affect their health as well as their livelihood.	Comments are noted as is the support for the allocation of the site.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1335</a>	Natural England	We note that several of the sites are in close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 4: Nunn's Corner The Lower Heath industrial estate is adjacent to Hartlebury Common &amp; Hillditch Coppice 5551 to the north east and to the River Severn local wildlife site to the south west.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The impacts on any adjacent features would need to be fully considered through a planning application. This is, however, an existing site and therefore it is considered the impact would be minimised.
Land	Object	<a href="#">GTTS829</a>	Bowkett H	Stourport-on-Severn already has one gypsy	Objections are noted. As part of this

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
adjacent Nunn's Corner				site. I feel in a small town as we are we cannot support another. I believe Bewdley or Kidderminster does not have a site at all.	consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1227</a>	Duggan D	Objects to further Gypsy provision in Stourport-on-Severn and feels the town has made enough provision.	Objection is noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1064</a>	Fletcher N	<p>Objects to the Stourport-on-Severn sites and the fact that over 50% of the proposed sites are in Stourport-on-Severn. Feels Stourport-on-Severn needs investment to re-establish its Georgian splendour and remind visitors of its historical importance. Stourport-on-Severn can not sustain further increases in population.</p> <p>If Gypsy provision is necessary, small increases in the Sandy Lane area are preferred as it has little impact on visitors to the town. We need to encourage people to visit Stourport.</p>	Objection is noted and the comments in relation to Stourport-on-Severn's capacity are also noted.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS631</a>	Green S	Objects to the Land adjacent Nunn's Corner site. Raises concerns relating to travellers not paying Council Tax and the impact of sites on local businesses.	The concerns relating to impact on local businesses are noted. However, it should be noted that gypsies and travellers residing on authorised pitches pay Council Tax in the same way all other local residents do.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS766</a>	Jennings S	Stourport-on-Severn already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
					assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1019</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to land at Nunn's corner.	Objection is noted.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS781</a>	Pagett I	Objects on the basis that there are already enough Gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn, dentists, doctors and schools already struggle to accommodate residents, should not build on Green Belt or by nature reserves. Land should be used for affordable housing.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS576</a>	Rose K	Objects to land adjacent to Nunn's Corner.	Objection is noted.
Land adjacent	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1027</a>	Sheppard D	Site is on Sandy Lane and is one of the major remaining areas for employment for	These comments are noted. The regeneration and economic prosperity of

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Nunn's Corner				Stourport-on-Severn and the wider community. WFDC should recognise that there are major problems and should hold meaningful talks with both the gypsies and travellers and the business people down there before legalising the existing Tolerated Sites.	the area are very important.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS676</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the land adjacent Nunn's Corner site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Object	<a href="#">GTTS752</a>	Thomas M	Stourport-on-Severn has enough gypsy sites already.	Objection is noted.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Support	<a href="#">GTTS84</a>	Blount R	Support for site at Nunn's Corner for Gypsy, Traveller provision.	Support is noted.
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Support	<a href="#">GTTS1042</a>	Colley J	Supports the site at land adjacent Nunn's Corner.	Support is noted.
Land	Support	<a href="#">GTTS551</a>	Hayden L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing settled Gypsy areas.</li> </ul>	Support for site is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
adjacent Nunn's Corner				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No damage to existing business or residential areas.</li> <li>Not visible from main road.</li> <li>Has been known area for many years - established areas - home to settled travellers - thus providing an environment they can know is safe for them.</li> </ul>	
Land adjacent Nunn's Corner	Support	<a href="#">GTTS721</a>	Jones P	Existing/tolerated site.	Support is noted.
Saiwen	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1136</a>	Environment Agency	Site 5 (Saiwen) is located within Flood Zone 2, based on our Flood Zone Map, where there is a medium probability of flooding.	The comments in relation to Flood Zone 2 are noted.
Saiwen	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1336</a>	Natural England	<p>We note that several of the sites are in close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 5: Saiwen The Lower Heath industrial estate is adjacent to Hartlebury Common &amp; Hillditch Coppice SSSI to the north east and to the River Severn local wildlife site to the south west.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The impacts on any adjacent features would need to be fully considered through a planning application. This is, however, an existing site and therefore it is considered the impact would be minimised.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS788</a>	Arnold P	I feel that Stourport-on-Severn does not have the size and amenities to take any large influx of people - affecting as below - i.e. schools, roads, etc. Stourport-on-Severn already has a great percentage of site basis than is required.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS693</a>	Blewett J	Objects to the Saiwen site as there is enough provision within Stourport-on-Severn and new sites will not attract new businesses to the area or provide jobs.	The comments in relation to the regeneration of Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS830</a>	Bowkett H	Stourport-on-Severn already has one gypsy site. I feel in a small town as we are we cannot support another. I believe Bewdley or Kidderminster does not have a site at all.	Objections are noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1228</a>	Duggan D	Objects to further Gypsy provision in Stourport-on-Severn and feels the town has made enough provision.	Objection is noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1066</a>	Fletcher N	Objects to the Stourport-on-Severn sites and the fact that over 50% of the proposed sites are in Stourport-on-Severn. Feels Stourport-on-Severn needs investment to re-establish its Georgian splendour and remind visitors of its historical importance. Stourport-on-Severn	Objection is noted as are the concerns in relation to Stourport-on-Severn's capacity.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>can not sustain a further increase in population.</p> <p>If Gypsy provision is necessary, small increases in the Sandy Lane area are preferred as it has little impact on visitors to the town. We need to encourage people to visit Stourport.</p>	
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS632</a>	Green S	Objects to the Saiwen site.	The concerns relating to impact on local businesses are noted. However, it should be noted that gypsies and travellers residing on authorised pitches pay Council Tax in the same way all other local residents do.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1276</a>	Hall R	The current sites in Stourport-on-Severn are already used as traveller sites and therefore seem more appropriate to expand these as they have an already existing community with amenities. If the existing community had to move this would have a social and economic impact on their lives and could also affect their health as well as their livelihood.	Comments are noted as is the support for the allocation of the site.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS768</a>	Jennings S	Stourport-on-Severn already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region,

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
					<p>which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
					Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1020</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to site at Saiwen.	Objection is noted.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS689</a>	Orbell H	Objects to the Saiwen site as Stourport-on-Severn already has provision for Gypsies and Travellers.	The comments in relation to regenerating Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS783</a>	Pagett I	Objects on the basis that there are already enough Gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn, dentists, doctors and schools already struggle to accommodate residents, should not build on Green Belt or by nature reserves. Land should be used for affordable housing.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS578</a>	Rose K	Objects to Saiwen, Stourport-on-Severn.	Objection is noted.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1029</a>	Sheppard D	Site is on Sandy Lane and is one of the major remaining areas for employment for Stourport-on-Severn and the wider community. WFDC should recognise that there are major problems and should hold meaningful talks with both the gypsies and travellers and the business people down there before legalising the existing Tolerated	These comments are noted. The regeneration and economic prosperity of the area are very important.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Sites.	
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS677</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the Saiwen site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Saiwen	Object	<a href="#">GTTS753</a>	Thomas M	Stourport-on-Severn has enough gypsy sites already.	Objection is noted.
Saiwen	Support	<a href="#">GTTS85</a>	Blount R	Support for site at Saiwen for Gypsy, Traveller provision.	Support is noted.
Saiwen	Support	<a href="#">GTTS1044</a>	Colley J	Supports the site at Saiwen.	Support is noted.
Saiwen	Support	<a href="#">GTTS553</a>	Hayden L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing settled Gypsy areas.</li> <li>No damage to existing business or residential areas.</li> <li>Not visible from main road.</li> <li>Has been known area for many years - established areas - home to settled travellers - thus providing an environment they can know is safe for them.</li> </ul>	Support for site is noted.
Saiwen	Support	<a href="#">GTTS722</a>	Jones P	Existing/tolerated sites	Support is noted.
The Gables	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1137</a>	Environment Agency	Site 6 (The Gables Yard) is located within Flood Zone 2, based on our Flood Zone	The comments in relation to Flood Zone 2 are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Yard				Map, where there is a medium probability of flooding.	
The Gables Yard	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1277</a>	Hall R	The current sites in Stourport-on-Severn are already used as traveller sites and therefore seem more appropriate to expand these as they have an already existing community with amenities. If the existing community had to move this would have a social and economic impact on their lives and could also affect their health as well as their livelihood.	Comments are noted as is the support for the allocation of the site.
The Gables Yard	Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1337</a>	Natural England	We note that several of the sites are in close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site 6: The Gables Yard The Lower Heath industrial estate is adjacent to Hartlebury Common &amp; Hilditch Coppice SSSI to the north east and to the River Severn local wildlife site to the south west.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. The impacts on any adjacent features would need to be fully considered through a planning application. This is, however, an existing site and therefore it is considered the impact would be minimised.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS789</a>	Arnold P	I feel that Stourport-on-Severn does not have the size and amenities to take any large influx of people - affecting as below - i.e. schools, roads, etc. Stourport-on-Severn already has a great percentage of site basis	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				than is required.	Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS694</a>	Blewett J	Objects to The Gables Yard site as there is enough provision within Stourport-on-Severn and new sites will not attract new businesses to the area or provide jobs.	The comments in relation to the regeneration of Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS831</a>	Bowkett H	Stourport-on-Severn already has one gypsy site. I feel in a small town as we are we cannot support another. I believe Bewdley or Kidderminster does not have a site at all.	Objections are noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1229</a>	Duggan D	Objects to further Gypsy provision in Stourport-on-Severn and feels the town has made enough provision.	Objection is noted. As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1067</a>	Fletcher N	Objects to the Stourport-on-Severn sites and the fact that over 50% of the proposed sites are in Stourport-on-Severn. Feels Stourport-on-Severn needs investment to re-establish its Georgian splendour and remind visitors of its historical importance. Stourport-on-Severn can not sustain a further increase in population.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to Stourport-on-Severn's capacity.
The Gables	Object	<a href="#">GTTS633</a>	Green S	Objects to The Gables Yard site.	The concerns relating to impact on local businesses are noted. However, it should

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Yard					be noted that gypsies and travellers residing on authorised pitches pay Council Tax in the same way all other local residents do.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS769</a>	Jennings S	Stourport-on-Severn already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp;</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
					Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS723</a>	Jones P	Existing/tolerated site.	Support is noted.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1021</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to site at The Gables.	Objection is noted.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS690</a>	Orbell H	Objects to The Gables Yard site as there is already enough provision in Stourport-on-Severn.	The comments in relation to the regeneration of Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS784</a>	Pagett I	Objects on the basis that there are already enough Gypsy sites in Stourport, dentists, doctors and schools already struggle to	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				accommodate residents, should not build on Green Belt or by nature reserves. Land should be used for affordable housing.	views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS579</a>	Rose K	Objects to the Gables Yard, Stourport-on-Severn.	Objection is noted.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS1030</a>	Sheppard D	Site is on Sandy Lane and is one of the major remaining areas for employment for Stourport-on-Severn and the wider community. WFDC should recognise that there are major problems and should hold meaningful talks with both the gypsies and travellers and the business people down there before legalising the existing Tolerated Sites.	These comments are noted. The regeneration and economic prosperity of the area are very important.
The Gables Yard	Object	<a href="#">GTTS678</a>	Stewart P	Objects to The Gables Yard site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
The Gables Yard	Support	<a href="#">GTTS86</a>	Blount R	Support for site at Gables Yard for Gypsy, Traveller provision.	Support is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation –Other Stourport Sites – Nunn’s Corner, Saiwen and The Gables Yard**

Site	Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
The Gables Yard	Support	<a href="#">GTTS1045</a>	Colley J	Supports the site at The Gables Yard.	Support is noted.
The Gables Yard	Support	<a href="#">GTTS554</a>	Hayden L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing settled Gypsy areas.</li> <li>• No damage to existing business or residential areas.</li> <li>• Not visible from main road.</li> <li>• Has been known area for many years - established areas - home to settled travellers - thus providing an environment they can know is safe for them.</li> </ul>	Support for site is noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS388</a>	Clark J	Demolition costs surely make site unviable. Don't gypsies prefer a rural location?	Objection is noted. The viability of developing any site will need to be considered in any decision taken.  Sites are being considered in a number of locations and our existing families are based in Stourport-on-Severn.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS138</a>	Collins S	Further exploration should be given to utilising site for educational needs. Council faces a school place shortfall following change to a two tier educational system. Local primary school has been asked if it could accept an additional 60 children. Perhaps site could be developed to meet current educational shortfall before investigating a perceived need?	The suggestions for alternative uses for the site are noted. The District Council liaises very closely with Worcestershire County Council as the Local Education Authority and landowners of the site. They are statutory consultees in this consultation and we await their views.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS145</a>	Collins Z	Further exploration should be given to utilising site for educational needs. Council faces a school place shortfall following change to a two tier educational system. Local primary school has been asked if it could accept an additional 60 children. Perhaps site could be developed to meet current educational shortfall before investigating a perceived need?	The suggestions for alternative uses for the site are noted. The District Council liaises very closely with Worcestershire County Council as the Local Education Authority and landowners of the site. They are statutory consultees in this consultation and we await their views.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS506</a>	Davies D	Objects to this use of the Former Sion Hill School Site - it could be developed for other uses such as help and support centre, job training, workshop, own business for mums i.e. keep fit, healthy eating, cooking and gardening. Young people and young at heart drop in centre.	Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			The money needed for clearance means it should be used for the local community - a good opportunity to make the area better for all	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1273</a>	Hall R	The Sion Hill site is a possible site but is rather out of town and so not so close to amenities.	Comments are noted as are the concerns about access to amenities
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS871</a>	Wagstaff J	<p>It makes no sense whatsoever to subject people living in an already deprived area to such a development.</p> <p>The site could be far better utilised. Playing fields have already been buried under bricks and mortar. In its present state, the site is much used and is of real benefit. The building itself, once earmarked for use by the county for administration use, could well be used as either a much needed community centre or, in the long term, a replacement for Wolverley Primary School's overcrowding. How anyone could even contemplate placing a travellers site cheek-by-jowl to the nearby established primary school beggars belief.</p> <p>Concerned that allowing a site to be developed in this location would jeopardise the chances of Springfield Park gaining Country Park status.</p> <p>Concerned that the county/local council would not have resources to administer such sites. This is because a lack of resources means we can't even control such mundane things as litter, dog fouling, illegal parking, etc</p>	<p>Objection to the former Sion Hill School site is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site. Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. However, it should be noted that two of the proposed sites appear to fall outside of Wyre Forest District and therefore it would not be appropriate for us to comment on them.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Other sites that could be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sugar Beet complex</li> <li>• Under-used parts on the old 25 M.U. area at Hartlebury and</li> <li>• land adjacent to the former quarry workings on Clee Hill</li> </ul>	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1123</a>	Worcestershire County Council Property Services	<p>Provides the following comments on the Sion Hill site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is owned by Worcestershire County Council and there are no restrictive covenants on it that could impact on this proposal.</li> <li>• The main block has planning consent for conversion to a professional development centre. There are no plans to implement this at present; however it is possible that it could come forward at a later stage.</li> <li>• The buildings on the site are largely empty. The former Rural Science block at the north of the site is currently used as a base for special education support teams operating in the Wyre Forest area.</li> <li>• The playing fields are used by St. Oswald's School and in addition to this it is possible that St. Oswald's School could expand at some time in the future therefore sufficient land will need to be excluded for this purpose.</li> <li>• There are still some drainage issues associated</li> </ul>	<p>These comments from the landowner are very helpful in determining a potential future use for the site. It is noted that there is a continued emphasis on educational, community and training uses which is supported by the local community.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			with the site and the foul system is pumped. The existing system is at the end of its designed life and would need to be replaced. This would be a significant abnormal development cost which could be uneconomic for a small scale domestic development to carry.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1592</a>	Anonymous	Site not suitable. Would be better used as a community centre. Vehicle access on a busy road. Children going to and from school.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1593</a>	Anonymous	Sion Hill School is in a beautiful location and it could be put to better use. A sports centre would be useful or something for the local youth. House prices are going to dip, so why should we have a gypsy site there?	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS772</a>	Abraham J	Objects to site because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is surrounded by houses, therefore if the playing fields are encroached on there would be no access at the field site.</li> <li>Area is one of the 10% most deprived in the Country but the community are working hard to</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>improve it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests that all new pitches are accommodated on the former British Sugar site.</li> </ul>	<p>for young people is also noted.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS925</a>	Allen D	Too close to Primary School on Sion Avenue. Too close to the residential area.	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area and the Primary School.</p> <p>Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS374</a>	Andrews L	Not appropriate location adjacent primary school.	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS419</a>	Aston P	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site on the basis that the site should be used to the benefit of the whole community, suggests a sports centre or an old people's home.</p> <p>Accepts the need for sites but argues that they should</p>	Objection is noted and the comments in relation to the future use of the site are helpful. These will be considered alongside Worcestershire County

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			be located closer to town where the infrastructure is better.	Council's as the landowners.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS357</a>	Bache S	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>Concerned about property devaluation.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS513</a>	Bache S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be better used for the local community or starter homes.</li> <li>• Too close to residential area.</li> <li>• Cost too much to demolish school.</li> <li>• Money better used to refurbish school for local community use.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site. The concerns related to the impact on the residential area are also noted.</p> <p>The cost for delivering any redevelopment of the site will need to be carefully considered when a decision on allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS259</a>	Baldwin K	The amount of vehicles which this type of site undoubtedly must by its very nature attract, will create congestion and noise for the residents of the area.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Feels that the size of vehicles these families utilise will create hazards to those living in the area especially with the number of schools in the immediate vicinity.	Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS893</a>	Barker T	Fears additional traffic impacting on nearby primary school and increased crime in area	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.  The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS482</a>	Barnes A	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concerns about traffic congestion, anti-social behaviour and devaluation of properties.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1072</a>	Barratt B	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is in the Green Belt and has a covenant restricting its use to educational.</li> <li>• Sites should be small with clear boundaries to prevent illegal expansion.</li> <li>• It will be visible from the 'A' road network.</li> <li>• Costly to clear existing buildings.</li> <li>• The playing fields are used by St. Oswald's School.</li> <li>• Site should be used to enhance the deprived Broadwaters community.</li> <li>• It is a residential site on a steep hill not suitable for caravans and it would jeopardise the safety of children walking to school.</li> <li>• The site is surrounded by fields and historical buildings areas and is less than half a mile from Heathfield Independent School.</li> <li>• In deciding where to locate Gypsy sites local planning authorities should consider sites near to or within existing settlements. There is no history of gypsies living in Sion Hill or surrounding areas.</li> <li>• There are no school or doctors places available.</li> <li>• The site should be used for employment opportunities or provide a sports development</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			facility or community centre.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1124</a>	Barratt J	Site is in Green Belt; covenant restricts uses for site; no limiting boundaries to prevent illegal expansion; elevated aspect would make it visually intrusive; existing buildings contain asbestos; playing fields used by primary school; should use to enhance facilities for local community; at top of very steep hill in residential area - safety issue for school children; historical listed buildings opposite; site remote from existing gypsy community and thus contrary to guidance; no places available in local schools or doctors; need to protect needs of local community - suggest sports facility or community centre; site was not shortlisted in top 5 sites by consultants	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for the local community is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS744</a>	Baxter C	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS745</a>	Baxter M	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS791</a>	Baxter W	School offers ideal opportunity to supply leisure and educational access for all ages. Site is unsuitable for gypsy use due to strain this would put on existing services	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS484</a>	Bayes B	Objects to the Sion Hill site as St Oswald's school is not big enough.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS867</a>	Bell J	Too near existing residential area; schools and doctors full; different lifestyle; property devalued; deprived area already.	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS742</a>	Bell P	I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.</p> <p>Surely pitches could be provided on already cleared former factory sites which have roads and utilities in place and limited numbers of dwellings close by.</p>	<p>of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS730</a>	Benbow P	<p>I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.</p> <p>I agree that they should use the site for a youth centre for the children on this estate or more houses.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS624</a>	Bendall K	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site as it will be detrimental to the regeneration of the area. Considers that more facts should be known before decisions are made, for example costs of demolition and capacity of schools.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS682</a>	Bennett D	<p>Local schools are full. House next to site will not be able to be sold.</p> <p>Alternative sites - old National Standard site on Stourport Road - good road access and close to facilities or Potter's scrap yard at top of Sandy Lane - owner looking to sell - site has house and static</p>	<p>The alternative site suggestions are noted and officers will research their availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			caravans - near existing gypsy community.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS583</a>	Bennett P	Broadwaters area was not a particularly 'sought after area', but over the years, the 'powers that be' have encouraged residents in the Sion Hill area to work at improving it. I feel it would be totally destructive to the local residents to take away all of the effort which has been put into improving this part of Kidderminster.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS418</a>	Bennion N	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High impact on many adjacent properties.</li> <li>• Site currently used by local youth sports teams and local children for recreation.</li> <li>• The required "set-up" of the site would create a disruption to local community. This is not the case for Lea Castle.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS288</a>	Bettis R	It will take the estate backwards to where no one will want to live here anymore. Empty houses lead to crime and bad behaviour. In my opinion the site isn't suitable.	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS953</a>	Biggs K	Feels that sites should be developed where travellers want to live as they have expressed a preference for staying near their existing communities rather than	As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District. Gypsy

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>relocating to Sion Hill or Lea Castle.</p> <p>Feels that Lea Castle and Sion Hill sites should only be redeveloped to increase employment and education in the area.</p>	<p>families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p> <p>The alternative suggestions for uses of the sites are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS603</a>	Biggs M	<p>Questions the requirement for 43 pitches as it is not clear in the Baker Report where this number comes from. Feels that more clarification is required on this matter, particularly as the MP has said the area already has more pitches than it needs to have. Quotes the Baker Report which suggests it may be worthwhile revisiting the technical evidence underpinning the pitch requirements and suggests that this is done.</p> <p>Refers to recent planning applications and argues that this should bring down the number of pitches required but this has not been made clear at the public meetings.</p> <p>Refers to the Government review on policy for Gypsies and Travellers and argues that this should be used as a basis to reduce pitch numbers. Questions where the evidence is for the additional pitches. Questions why Green Belt sites are being considered when this is contrary to guidance. Questions why the Baker report dismissed some Green Belt sites and not others.</p>	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Questions why Lea Castle is being considered when the Local Plan allocates it for employment use. The Local Development Framework should build upon previous decisions.</p> <p>Suggests the Council wait until the Localism Bill is adopted to make their decision.</p>	<p>Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement. Furthermore, Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS262</a>	Biggs Y	<p>In summary my objections are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Change of use within the local plan, directly against local opinion and therefore undemocratic.</li> <li>2. Loss of much needed employment and potential +14 yrs education opportunities,</li> <li>3. Green Belt</li> <li>4. Inadequate road infrastructure</li> <li>5. The travellers themselves wish to live within their own established communities</li> <li>6. Unsuitability of sites taking into account the requirements of the travelling community e.g. shops, schools (Cookley School &amp; St Oswald's Primary Schools are full and operating within small First School sites).</li> </ol>	The concerns relating to the Sion Hill site are noted. The District Council has received comments from the current landowners the County Council which highlight continuing interests and uses relating to educational and training purposes.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS423</a>	Billingham A J	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the basis that the local	Objection is noted as are the comments

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			residents are firmly opposed to it and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go or as a teacher training centre or offices to create jobs and save on the massive demolition costs.	in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS382</a>	Billingham J	Wrong location - high cost, traffic, impact on house prices. Should be used as community centre for local children.	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggestions for alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS860</a>	Billingsley G	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS508</a>	Billingsley L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why did Councillors have the choice where the sites were going.</li> <li>• Why all the trouble when they don't pay taxes.</li> <li>• They don't want houses because they can be</li> </ul>	The allocation of sites is one of the duties that the District Council has to undertake.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>traced, with caravans they can move anywhere with no fixed abode.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devaluation of property.</li> <li>• Road Access.</li> <li>• Cost for the tax payers.</li> </ul>	<p>Residents on existing sites pay Council Tax.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS387</a>	Bishop S	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS889</a>	Boden L	Broadwaters is a deprived area but has had many improvements in recent years. The site should be used to benefit the local area.	Objection is noted as are the comments that the site should be used for the benefit of the local area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS62</a>	Boden M	Objects to Sion Hill School being considered for a travellers site. Not seen any trouble or bother here, feel this would change if the go ahead was given to put travellers on this site.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS63</a>	Boden M	Traffic problems would add more congestion on Sion Hill.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS64</a>	Boden M	Many residents in Sion Avenue just do not want a travellers site on our doorsteps. It would devalue our properties enormously.	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS65</a>	Boden M	Sion Hill School could be put to better use such as a sports centre.	The comments relating to the future use of the Sion Hill School site are very



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				helpful to the future planning of the area and in particular the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS341</a>	Boden M	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS906</a>	Boden M	<p>The proposal would bring severe deprivation to the area. Property has already been devalued. The primary school playing field is next to the proposed site - parents will be wary of letting their children play there.</p> <p>The site should be put to better use as a sports centre or learning centre for local residents. The local community centre has been closed. Also concerned about traffic issues.</p> <p>Propose that Sugar Beet factory would be prime site for gypsies.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concern relating to traffic issues are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>The suggested alternative uses for the site are noted.</p> <p>In terms of the Sugar Beet Site - The site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates; however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS814</a>	Bonnett J	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site Criteria - "views of the settled community" - this did NOT take place in this case</li> <li>• Reports states northern boundary adjoins "open countryside" - this is not the case</li> <li>• On the eastern side there are seven properties at Sion Hill Court - all command a high Council Tax band</li> <li>• We received no contact from anyone regarding the proposals and no visual inspection of the site from our boundary was undertaken, although we would be one of the properties mostly affected by the proposed Site. Did the Consultants actually visit all the sites ?</li> </ul> <p>Alternative uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sports centre to benefit the local area and sport</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to the use of this site are noted.</p> <p>The consultants undertaken the work on behalf of Wyre Forest did visit the sites and managed to view them from the public highway.</p> <p>The proposed suggested alternative uses for the site are noted. However, it should also be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>clubs - the playing fields are already in place, and the cost of maintenance of these is an ongoing expense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheltered accommodation/Day centre</li> <li>• Residential development would be more in keeping with this area</li> </ul> <p>Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If Traveller/Gypsy families are Irish, they may want Catholic schools for their children.</li> <li>• Is it practical to expect local schools to take on children as and when required? Traveller children will need the provision of extra resources like special needs teachers. Where is the funding coming from?</li> <li>• St. Oswald's already over stretched so how are they going to cope with extra numbers??</li> </ul> <p>Traffic Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Transport Development control estimate potential increase in traffic movement to be quite significant.</li> <li>• Noise and disturbance - movement of vehicles to and from the site</li> <li>• Sion Hill already problematic with traffic and junctions at either end causing long delays</li> </ul>	<p>the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Other Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Containment of site - how will this be ensured</li> <li>• Cost of demolishing school building that contains asbestos - surely a misuse of tax payers money - could be sold off to develop housing privately and get the best deal for Council Tax payers in disposing of the site</li> <li>• Travelling Showpeople - concern about noise, disturbance, maintenance of equipment. Would not fit in with this residential area</li> <li>• The report states sites should not be detrimental to the community already in place</li> <li>• The report states on Worcester side of Kidderminster - how does Sion Hill fit in?</li> </ul> <p>House sale has fallen through as a result of this consultation - need to move on the grounds of age and deterioration in health. Concerned that the house devaluation is at least 30%.</p> <p>Any Councillor would be welcome to discuss the matter with Mr and Mrs Bonnett on a personal basis</p> <p>Due to these proposed sites - we have incurred costs of £580.00.</p>	<p>into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>It should be noted that this particular site was not identified as being suitable for the Travelling Showpeople</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS976</a>	Bonnett J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to Mark Garnier, Wyre Forest has a higher number of pitches compared with other parts of Worcestershire, which seems very</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The number of pitches across Worcestershire does vary. However, this reflects historical</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>unfair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sion Hill could help to provide some of the 4,000 homes required, which would be more in keeping with this area</li> </ul>	<p>patterns of movement followed by Travellers.</p> <p>The alternative suggestion for the use of the Sion Hill site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS813</a>	Bonnett T & J	<p>Object to the Sion Hill site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Surely the Council would benefit financially by allowing residential development here - due to the elevated position and uninterrupted views</li> <li>How will the Council ensure that a site does not encroach onto the playing fields and become a possible nuisance to the local school and sports clubs</li> <li>The cost of demolishing the school buildings, the cost of providing pitches and the future maintenance and upkeep of them - waste of taxpayers money</li> <li>Any sale of Council owned assets should be for the benefit of the wider community</li> <li>Sion Hill is a 'disadvantaged area', local residents have tried to improve this. The Consultation states that Travellers/Gypsies should not be placed in deprived areas, development should not be to the detriment of the community</li> <li>Question about mains sewerage - has this been checked and clarified?</li> <li>Concerned about noise and disturbance - movement of vehicles from site, often all hours</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to the site are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site. However, it should be noted that the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In terms of concerns regarding encroachment - sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - and further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The level of deprivation in any area is an important consideration that will need to be taken into account when a decision on possible future allocation is made.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road network completely unsuitable</li> <li>St Oswald's already overstretched so how are they going to cope with extra numbers - where will extra funding come from?</li> </ul> <p>House sale has fallen through as a result of this consultation - need to move on the grounds of age and deterioration in health. Concerned that the house devaluation is at least 30%.</p> <p>Any Councillor would be welcome to discuss the matter with Mr and Mrs Bonnett on a personal basis.</p>	<p>consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1144</a>	Bordewich V	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because the access is unsuitable and the school is full. Suggests the site should be used for a community centre or youth centre or possibly elderly person's flats.</p>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Alternative use suggestions are also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1254</a>	Bosbury J	<p>Not appropriate as adjacent primary school and on narrow road used by secondary school children. Also pensioners live nearby.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. Proximity to facilities are a key consideration for the allocation of sites.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1065</a>	Bowley P	<p>Local area is already overstretched in terms of schools and doctors. Area is deprived and site would be better used as community facility - drop-in day centre for elderly, access to sports fields plus evening youth club.</p> <p>Suggest old sugar beet site would be more suitable - would not affect existing area.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS439</a>	Bray E	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. and also the children from St. Oswald's use it for sports.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS492</a>	Broadhead J	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St. Oswald's Primary School and close to where children</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			get the school bus.	the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS353</a>	Brodie K	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.  Lea Castle hospital is much more suitable site.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.  Comments regarding Lea Castle are noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1207</a>	Brookes D	Site should be used to generate income and employment for local people and council. Why not put site on open market to bring in income. Council should put needs of residents first.	Objections are noted as are the proposed alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS386</a>	Brookes J	Site should be used for sports facility. Local schools and doctors are over subscribed. Already traffic issues on Sion Hill.	Objection and suggested alternative use are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1193</a>	Brookes K	Schools, roads and doctors would not be able to cope. Why do gypsies get 12 month residency when other caravan parks do not? Site should be used for employment.	Objection is noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS352</a>	Brooks S	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS309</a>	Brown J	I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.  House prices around here are already depressed with the threat of this site they will reduce still further. Will the Council be compensating residents for any loss incurred? Theft will also increase beyond the present	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.  We recognise that the impact on

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			level.	property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.  The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS941</a>	Brown J	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the grounds that demolition will be expensive and house prices will fall.	Objections are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS431</a>	Bullock S	Objects to the Sion Hill site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St. Oswald's school is not big enough and currently uses the Sion Hill playing fields which would not be appropriate if travellers were there.</li> <li>• Sion Hill and Wolverley Road can not cope with the extra traffic.</li> <li>• Local health services and schools are already full.</li> <li>• The sewerage can not cope with additional development.</li> </ul> <p>Feels the site should be used for:</p>	The comments in relation to the future use of the site are helpful and will be considered alongside those of Worcestershire County Council as the landowner.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education as specified by the Badland covenant.</li> <li>• Sports activities.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS642</a>	Bunyan D	Objects to the Sion Hill site and argues that jobs must be provided before anything else.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area and ability to attract employment into the area.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS414</a>	Burgess J	Objects to the Sion Hill site because the access is poor and suffers from traffic congestion, additional lorries will put children walking to Wolverley in danger and there are not enough doctors, dentists and school places in the area. The area is already deprived. Raises the issue of the Badland covenant.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues. Worcestershire County Council as landowners have advised the Council that there is no restrictive covenant on the land.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS494</a>	Calder L	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St. Oswald's Primary School and close to where children get the school bus.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1225</a>	Chance A	Site is too near schools and housing; money should be spent on improving area; traffic issues; use site as	Objections are noted as the suggested

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>community and sports centre.</p> <p>Alternative sites - Sugar Beet, Romwire or Wilden Lane Industrial Area</p>	<p>alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The former Sugar Beet site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>In terms of the other suggested sites, officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. However, more detail will be required about where on Wilden Lane.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1222</a>	Chance G	<p>Should use site as school or community activity/sports centre; no sewer connection; poor roads; too close to school and housing.</p> <p>Suggest alternatives - Sugar Beet or Wilden Lane or</p>	<p>Objections are noted as the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Romwire	<p>consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The former site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>In terms of the other suggested sites, officers will research availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision. However, more detail will be required about where on Wilden Lane.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS99</a>	Charnock M	<p>Objects to the potential use of the Sion Hill site for gypsy and traveller pitches; in a depressed area, St Oswald's school is full as are medical practices; cost of site clearance; access issues, hazardous in winter. Questions whether Wyre Forest has the need/obligation to provide further sites in the area. Have travellers opinions been sought?; loss of sport &amp; leisure facilities for residents. School is needed for its original purpose to accommodate overspill from Wolverley.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues. The Baker Report also included consultation with representatives from the local travelling</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				community and representative groups have been consulted as part of this consultation process on potential sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1290</a>	Charnock M	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is within a deprived area, the schools and medical facilities are over-subscribed, a lot of work has been put into improving the area, the proposal would result in a loss of sports facilities the roads in the area are steep and busy.</p> <p>The recent Tonight programme showed a successful Gypsy site which was accepted by locals because it was in an industrial area so did not impact on local house prices.</p> <p>The Sion Hill site has a covenant restricting its use to educational, the cost of clearing the site would be high, it is likely to spread beyond the existing footprint, and the school is needed to accommodate overspill from Wolverley High.</p>	<p>Objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted. The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>There is no covenant restricting the use of the Sion Hill Site.</p> <p>The alternative use of the site to meet educational needs from Wolverley are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS529</a>	Clarke F	<p>Very concerned about Sion Hill Middle - do the travellers want to live in such a built up area?</p> <p>Lots of children in this area have no where for activities and Sion Hill Middle would be better for education! Also provide employment for the area.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS544</a>	Cole L	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS121</a>	Collins S	Believes proposal is inappropriate and ill conceived. The basis the Cabinet has used to shortlist potential sites is undemocratic and deeply flawed. Appears to be extremely limited consultation with the travelling community to establish their need and preferred option for sites.	The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS132</a>	Collins S	Site has a restricted covenant attached to it that prohibits any use except educational. Therefore it appears that this proposed site is in contravention to this and thus not permissible. The site is also on current green-belt land and therefore severely restricts expansion for a residential purpose. The site itself therefore would be restricted in the area that could be utilised in such a way.	Noted. The District Council has sought Worcestershire County Council's views in relation to the restricted covenant as part of the consultation process and their response will be carefully considered as to the availability of the site for alternative uses. The site is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and therefore any development would need to be within the footprint of the existing

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				buildings.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS133</a>	Collins S	Deeply concerned that the proposed site is next to a primary school. Playing field regularly used by the school and community sporting facilities. How would the proposal resolve security issues as it is also used by the primary school?	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS134</a>	Collins S	Raises issues relating to the cost of developing this site. Estimated as between £1.5 - £2 million. Where will the financial resources come from? Council has not indicated what additional services they propose to reduce to raise the additional finances. As a ratepayer should be entitled to such information. Object that it is spent on inappropriate site.	Noted, the presence of buildings on the site is certainly a factor in its viable deliverability. Should any pitch provision go ahead at this site, it is likely that the site would be privately run. Therefore the resources would not come from the tax payer. Grants may be sought from the Homes and Communities Agency towards traveller sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS135</a>	Collins S	Site is at the top of a hill and a very busy residential area. Continual use of this site on a permanent 24 hour basis will have major traffic ramifications. Could compromise health and safety of the school children.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS136</a>	Collins S	There is not good access to a primary school. Does not have sufficient spaces to accommodate the proposed	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			10-12 families that could be housed on the site. Local community centre closed further restricting access to local services. Provision and regularity if bus routes are extremely limited.	will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS137</a>	Collins S	Appalled that the Council appears to want to decide the use of this site against the strong opposition and large voice of the existing community. There appears a unanimous opinion that this proposal is inappropriate for this site for the above reasons	These comments are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS122</a>	Collins Z	Believes proposal is inappropriate and ill conceived. The basis the Cabinet has used to shortlist potential sites is undemocratic and deeply flawed. Appears to be extremely limited consultation with the travelling community to establish their need and preferred option for sites.	The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS139</a>	Collins Z	The current site has a restricted covenant attached to it that prohibits any use except educational. Therefore it appears that this proposed site is in contravention to this and thus not permissible. The site is also on current	Noted. The District Council has sought Worcestershire County Council's views in relation to the restricted covenant as part of the consultation process and their

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			green-belt land and therefore severely restricts expansion for a residential purpose. The site itself therefore would be restricted in the area that could be utilised in such a way.	response will be carefully considered as to the availability of the site for alternative uses. The site is classed as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and therefore any development would need to be within the footprint of the existing buildings.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS140</a>	Collins Z	Deeply concerned that the proposed site is next to a primary school. Playing field regularly used by the school and community sporting facilities. How would the proposal resolve security issues as it is also used by the primary school?	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS141</a>	Collins Z	Raises issues relating to the cost of developing this site. Estimated as between £1.5 - £2 million. Where will the financial resources come from? Council has not indicated what additional services they propose to reduce to raise the additional finances. As a ratepayer should be entitled to such information. Object that it is spent on inappropriate site.	Noted, the presence of buildings on the site is certainly a factor in its viable deliverability. Should any pitch provision go ahead at this site, it is likely that the site would be privately run. Therefore the resources would not come from the tax payer. Grants may be sought from the Homes and Communities Agency towards traveller sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS142</a>	Collins Z	Site is at the top of a hill and a very busy residential area. Continual use of this site on a permanent 24 hour basis will have major traffic ramifications. Could compromise health and safety of the school children.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS143</a>	Collins Z	There is not good access to a primary school. Does not have sufficient spaces to accommodate the proposed 10-12 families that could be housed on the site. Local community centre closed further restricting access to local services. Provision and regularity if bus routes are extremely limited.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS144</a>	Collins Z	Appalled that the Council appears to want to decide the use of this site against the strong opposition and large voice of the existing community. There appears a unanimous opinion that this proposal is inappropriate for this site for the above reasons	These comments are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1109</a>	Connolly M	Objects to the Sion Hill site due to the impact on local services, traffic impact and the increased risk of accidents. Proposes the former British Sugar site as an alternative.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>issues.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1113</a>	Connolly P	Objects to the Sion Hill site due to the impact on local services, traffic impact and the increased risk of accidents. Proposes the former British Sugar site as an alternative.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				employment uses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1153</a>	Coole-Green S	<p>Deprived area; local primary school has twice national average of pupils with learning difficulties or disabilities and is already over capacity as is the local GP surgery; costs of developing site would outweigh any benefits; playing field is Green Belt - how can you ensure it is not encroached upon and is safe for children which use it; no room for primary school to expand without using play area or part of field; existing covenant on Sion Hill site.</p> <p>Suggest look at British Sugar site - plans could incorporate gypsy pitches and affordable housing. Those buying at site would have choice as to whether they lived near gypsy site.</p> <p>Also look at National Standard site - has hardstanding, electricity and sanitation.</p> <p>Potters scrap yard has become available and would be more suitable site.</p> <p>Sites work well when they are sited away from the settled community.</p> <p>Gypsies have stated that they wish to be on Worcester side of Kidderminster or near their families in Stourport-on-Severn.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The level of deprivation in any area is an important consideration that will need to be taken into account when a decision on possible future allocation is made.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates; however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestions of the National Standard site and Potters scrap yard are noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				and traveller pitch provision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS777</a>	Cooper T	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it should be re-opened for the good of the local community and because the existing schools are over-subscribed. It WFDC wish to clear the site it should be for affordable housing. The Baker Report identifies that the Gypsy families would rather be in Stourport-on-Severn close to the existing sites some of which are outside of the Green Belt.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS467</a>	Couch D	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS52</a>	Crosher M	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers at Sion Hill. It is Green Belt land and will require a lot of money to clear. Property values will decrease. Parking is a nightmare and the road system will not support it.	Objections are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS395</a>	Crosher M	Green Belt site left to local community by Badland sisters. Gypsy site would cause property prices to fall. Would not be able to contain the site easily. Traffic issues at bottom of hill will get worse.	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS750</a>	Darlington G	<p>Objects to the site at Sion Hill as it is expensive to clear and the site would be better used for a project that would benefit the whole community, for example, educational use.</p> <p>Suggests the former British Sugar site as an alternative site.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Baker Associates did research the availability of the former British Sugar site for pitch provision, however the current landowners are not prepared to consider this land use on the site and they are currently undertaking public consultation on a comprehensive masterplan for the redevelopment of the site. It is therefore considered that the site is not deliverable for this type of use.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS305</a>	Dickens I	<p>I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. The school site should be used for local residents.</p> <p>The college in Kidderminster is too small use the middle school. The Primary school again is too small - utilise part of the middle school. Now the Council want new offices. Why build new offices when this building can be put to good use?</p>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people/schools/offices is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS585</a>	Dickens M	The suggested site too near to existing houses.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS932</a>	Edwards S	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site and suggests that it should be used for a sports facility, residential development, sheltered accommodation or a day centre.</p> <p>Raises concern about the level of traffic that a gypsy</p>	Objections to the use of Sion Hill are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses. However, it should be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			site would bring.	potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers, i.e. concerns about traffic.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS827</a>	Eeles H	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is too close to a primary school and is in the Green Belt.	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1331</a>	Elcock I	Totally unsuitable site and not near to where the gypsies seem to want to be.	Objection is noted. Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1330</a>	Elcock V	Area has worked hard to be attractive place to live	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS485</a>	Elliot Mr	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concerns about property prices falling.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS739</a>	Eyre H	I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.  Surely pitches could be provided on already cleared former factory sites which have roads and utilities in place and limited numbers of dwellings close by.	of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1062</a>	Fletcher N	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is greenfield and it is important to keep the area around the towns and villages green.	Objection and concerns in relation to Greenfield site are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS348</a>	French P	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.  It would cause intimidation for the local residents and bad feelings could erupt.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1039</a>	Fuller E	Objects to the Sion Hill site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS545</a>	Gilbert L	Strongly opposed.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS327</a>	Gilder C	I feel it is totally inappropriate to have this proposal sited so close to a residential area which will naturally have an effect on property values, and the only people who will suffer are good honest middle class tax payers due to no fault of their own.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS284</a>	Goodman M	Not only am I against the siting because of the residents, but also the close proximity of St Oswald's School.	Objection is noted and the comments relating to the future use of the site are also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS834</a>	Gould H	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area with limited resources. Raises concerns about school and doctors capacity. Feels that the site would be better used for leisure use.	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The suggested alternative use for the site is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS683</a>	Grazier P	Major traffic issues at bottom of Sion Hill - would like to see traffic lights there.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS472</a>	Green G	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Additionally, it is expensive to demolish, there is no sewerage connection, the area is deprived, schools are over-subscribed, nearest school has double the national average of special needs children, the playing fields are regularly used, it is in the Green Belt. Also questions the impact on surrounding residents.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS540</a>	Green G	The work required to turn this wholly unsuitable site into the required pitches is considerable, excluding the costs involved, the site itself is not even on mains drainage.	Objections are noted. Ongoing discussions will be held with the site owners to consider the future use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS464</a>	Green I	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concerns about property prices falling.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS629</a>	Green S	Objects to the former Sion Hill site.	The concerns relating to impact on local businesses are noted. However, it should be noted that gypsies and travellers residing on authorised pitches pay Council Tax in the same way all other local residents do.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS337</a>	Groves A	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS333</a>	Groves D	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS286</a>	Guest C	Unfortunately gypsies do not have a good reputation and with Sion Hill estate not being one of the best I feel the two mixed can only mean trouble.	The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS381</a>	Guest K	<p>Inappropriate for gypsy use - would be better used for recreation and education for local community. Bad traffic and adjacent primary school - not suitable.</p>	<p>Objections are noted as are proposed alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1165</a>	Hadley R	<p>I wish to object to this site as I believe it is totally inappropriate due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within Green Belt land and if it should be developed should be used to allow for employment within the local area. I believe the site is earmarked for adult education and this should be retained for such development.</li> <li>• The community are already using part of this site for sports activities. I understand that if the site is developed access will be blocked to the playing fields.</li> <li>• I believe the schools are already very full close by.</li> <li>• The site is isolated with poor public transport.</li> <li>• I believe the Stourport-on-Severn sites are more suitable particularly as other gypsy communities live there.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school and highway safety are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and the Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS670</a>	Hall V	Objects to the Sion Hill site, questions the need to provide sites and the impact on house prices. Questions why we need more sites when there is already provision in Worcestershire. Questions what provision is being made for young people who use the pitches at the moment.	The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS436</a>	Harper J	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS774</a>	Harper J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions where the Harriers will train and</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>where the schoolchildren will do games.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• St. Oswald's school is not big enough.</li> <li>• Why has the caretaker's bungalow become overgrown if more houses need to be built.</li> <li>• Why have WCC spent money doing the school up and are now going to spend more money knocking it down.</li> </ul>	relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1033</a>	Harris L	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is too close to a major residential area and backs onto a primary school which will be hazardous for children. The site could be used more effectively. There are few Day centres or youth centres. Traffic is already difficult in Sion Hill.</p> <p>Raises concern about property prices falling and police resources already being stretched.</p>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS519</a>	Harris N	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>The site is too close to a junior school.</p> <p>The site at Lea Castle is much more suitable.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Support for the Lea Castle site is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS80</a>	Hart C	Doesn't consider the Sion Hill site is a suitable place to put gypsies. Have had enough trouble with bad neighbours. The field is used by St Oswald's School.	The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS731</a>	Hart J	<p>Objects to the possible site at Sion Hill school on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly unlikely that the County Council will relinquish the site for this use.</li> <li>• Cost of demolition.</li> <li>• Green Belt site - no very special circumstances.</li> <li>• Would affect the use of the playing fields by school children and local clubs.</li> <li>• No school places or GP places in the area.</li> <li>• Contrary to Core Strategy landscape policy.</li> <li>• Baker Report states that the site will not adversely impact on neighbouring residential amenities but this is impossible given the</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The District Council has received a response from Worcestershire County Council as the landowners, which sets</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>proximity and strength of feeling.</p> <p>Accepts the need to provide facilities for Gypsies and Travellers however, this site is unsuitable.</p>	<p>out the importance of the site for continued educational and training purposes.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS523</a>	Hart P	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>I understand that these people need some where to go but this site is not suitable.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS335</a>	Hatton C	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS338</a>	Hatton H	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS290</a>	Hatton R	The area around Sion Hill school has slowly improved over the years with more people owning their own houses and taking more care of the area. It will be a great pity to take a step back!	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS571</a>	Hatton R	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The public footpath that runs down the side of the school will mean that the Gypsy site will have no privacy.</li> <li>2. St Oswald's Primary School and Wolverley Primary School are short of spaces for new pupils.</li> <li>3. There is no hedgerow or tree shelter to give the site privacy.</li> <li>4. Sion Hill has become a busy road. The entrance to the school is opposite Sion Hill House drive and near Badland Avenue, there will be more traffic pulling out on to Sion Hill.</li> <li>5. Because they are short of space, St Oswald's Primary School use the field for sports days etc.</li> <li>6. What is there to stop the site overspreading</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted. Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns regarding service capacity are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>onto the Green Belt land?</p> <p>7. Because the site will be on the playground it will be very close to the houses which over look Sion Hill School.</p>	service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1074</a>	Hayward J	<p>Costs of clearing existing buildings estimated at £100k to £2m. This could be better spent on options that would improve area and bring in revenue e.g. community centre, sports facility or youth club.</p> <p>Council have duty to provide low cost housing - why not build houses on site?</p> <p>Covenant on land - to be used for educational purposes - existing primary schools are at capacity.</p> <p>Access - Sion Hill is busy commuter route.</p> <p>Understand there are no sewers on site.</p> <p>Proposal is to house Romany gypsies - but only Irish Travellers known to be in area.</p> <p>informed by Councillors that low cost housing has been considered.</p> <p>Recommend former sugar beet site be considered for gypsy use.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1061</a>	Hayward M	<p>Site could be put to better use - a community facility for youth and elderly.</p> <p>Suggest site - land behind and partially on old sugar beet site - mixed use area and on side of town favoured by gypsy community.</p>	Objection is noted. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people and the elderly is also noted. Baker Associates did research the possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1054</a>	Hazlewood B	Site should be used for purpose it was built for.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS978</a>	Hazlewood M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better used for the 'settled' community</li> <li>• Need for more housing and employment within these areas</li> <li>• Should not be a burden on local resources</li> </ul>	Objections are noted as are the comments relating to the proposed alternative use of the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS779</a>	Heatcote G	School should be used for local community. Site is too near housing.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS815</a>	Hedges M	This site should be kept / mothballed for possible future educational / training / recreational purposes. Once it's gone, it's gone.	Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS428</a>	Henderson P	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the basis that the local residents are firmly opposed to it and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS590</a>	Higbee E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is an area of deprivation and the site should be used to bring employment and leisure facilities in.</li> <li>• The site is surrounded by houses overlooking it.</li> <li>• There is no proof that Sion Hill is a traditional stopping place for travelling people.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggestions for alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS475</a>	Hill A	I'm concerned about the noise because of my elderly mother's failing health.	Objection is noted as are the concerns about the potential noise impact. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS759</a>	Hind C	Why not use the old British Sugar Site as that is not	Baker Associates did research the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			near any houses.	possibility of the former British Sugar site to provide pitch provision, however the landowners were not prepared to consider this use and are currently consulting on a comprehensive masterplan for redevelopment of the site which focuses on housing and employment uses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS757</a>	Hind E	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will spread beyond the boundary.</li> <li>• Schools and doctors will not be able to cope.</li> <li>• They are not Travellers if the intent is to stay permanently.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS958</a>	Hoare K	<p>Objects to both the Sion Hill and Lea Castle sites because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no recognised facilities in the area, there are no sports facilities in the area and the area already lacks community spirit as there is no central point. Both sites would be better used for community uses.</li> <li>• The roads in the area are congested.</li> <li>• There have been tremendous efforts to improve</li> </ul>	Objections to the use of Sion Hill are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses. However, it should be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers (i.e. road congestion).

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>the area by local people on a voluntary basis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council tax payments should be used to promote much needed community facilities.</li> <li>• Concern about house prices falling.</li> <li>• Investment in the community will trigger further investment and new homeowners will benefit from the uplift in value.</li> </ul>	<p>The concerns relating to traffic and highways issues are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1234</a>	Hobby A	Use the old Sion Hill School, as somewhere, children of all ages, the elderly, and other adults, can go and do activities.	Objection is noted as are the alternative suggestions for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1211</a>	Hobby L	I think money should go on doing up Sion Hill School, to use as a school, youth centre or offices. This would help the community and bring us together.	Objections are noted as are the proposed alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1255</a>	Hobby S	Should spend money reopening site as a school.	Objection to the use of the site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS962</a>	Holford J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be used for educational/sports/recreational services to benefit the local community</li> <li>• Or, need for local housing, which would fit in with the immediate neighbourhood</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are also noted.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not fair to the local community or to Gypsy Travellers to be in the middle of a residential area, both like independence</li> </ul>	Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS461</a>	Holland L	Raises concerns about the provision of schooling in the area and expresses disappointment at the closure of Sion Hill school.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS442</a>	Holland L	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. Raises concerns about property prices declining as a result of the proposal.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1186</a>	Homer B	Objects to the Sion Hill site for reasons discussed at the consultation meetings including cost of demolition, capacity of local schools and healthcare facilities. Believes the site should be used to develop and enrich the local community, argues that a gypsy site would be detrimental to children using the playing fields, argues that it is more important to encourage community spirit within the area.	Objection is noted.  The concerns about capacity at the school and healthcare facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and healthcare providers who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1311</a>	Homer L	Site not suitable due to cost and location	Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted as are the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Site far more useful for community development to boost local community which is in need of regeneration.	suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1285</a>	Hunter G	Refers to the high level of public opposition to this site. Feels the school should be restored to relieve pressure on Wolverley High School. Feels that the additional traffic will be problematic and will result in the Lock car park being used excessively. There are largely unproductive fields adjoining the Sion Hill site which could be acquired, these fields would be vulnerable to trespass and unauthorised use by travellers, and the site is in the Green Belt.	<p>Objections to the use of the site for Gypsies/Travellers are noted.</p> <p>The alternative use for the Sion Hill School site, to relieve pressure on Wolverley School, is noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways concerns are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS399</a>	Hurlston G	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS377</a>	Jackson D	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1104</a>	James A	Site should be used for local community as sports centre. Proposal is totally inappropriate - would be detrimental to area - reduce house values. Need to consider rights of existing community.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS281</a>	Jarvis A	I wonder how this suggestion will affect property values and perhaps rateable value?	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS770</a>	Jarvis A	School land was given to the local community and should be kept for community use. Local youth could make use of existing facilities on site - sports uses and potential community centre. Sion Hill suffers from heavy traffic cutting through.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1223</a>	Jarvis B	Both sites should be for the benefit of Wyre Forest residents - Sion Hill affordable houses.	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative use for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS283</a>	Jarvis L	I wonder how this suggestion will affect property values and perhaps rateable value?	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS763</a>	Jennings S	Stourport already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS380</a>	Jones K	Suggest school site should be a sports complex to benefit whole town.	Objection for the site being used for Gypsies and Travellers is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS719</a>	Jones P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of amenity for neighbouring residential.</li> <li>• Green Belt.</li> <li>• Contamination/reclamation costs.</li> </ul>	It should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS514</a>	Josling K	<p>Strongly object to the proposal of this gypsy site, rightly or wrongly thinking it might lessen our quality of life.</p> <p>The proposed site is in a residential area, next to the local school. St Oswald's school is already overstretched as portacabins have been erected as classrooms for the education of local children.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the capacity of the school are also noted - we will carefully consider these alongside the views of the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1014</a>	Kendrick A	Objects to the former Sion Hill School Site	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1010</a>	Kendrick B	Objects to the former Sion Hill School site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS416</a>	Kent D	Objects to the Sion Hill site and suggests that Travellers wishing to settle should do so in houses, the proposals were not mentioned during house purchase a year ago, the money could be better spent moving St Oswald's to Sion Hill, the parking is already a nightmare, there should be compensation for loss in house value, the school and doctors are already full.	The concerns relating to the site are noted. Gypsies and Travellers are recognised as having a protected characteristic under the Equalities Act 2010. Case Law has also established that the Government has a duty to facilitate the gypsy way of life for ethnic Gypsies and Travellers under the Human Rights Act.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS794</a>	L'Enfant	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are septic tanks under school which are not connected to sewers.</li> <li>2. Badland sisters covenanted school land for local use.</li> <li>3. Roads are below standard</li> <li>4. Site is too close to pensioners.</li> </ol>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>The District Council will consider these views alongside those of the landowner's - Worcestershire County Council.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS318</a>	L'Enfant J	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sion Hill school site is unsuitable for the Gypsies as there is no connection to the sewers.</li> <li>2. The roads are already very busy and getting out of the bottom of Sion Hill at times is unbelievable.</li> <li>3. The local schools are full.</li> <li>4. The area has lots of elderly people who fear that the crime rate will rise.</li> <li>5. The area is very deprived of "things" for the youngsters to do; there is a golden opportunity with the school which will be pulled down.</li> </ol>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted</p> <p>Alternative options for the use of the site are also noted and will need to be considered as part of the decision</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1007</a>	Lane K	Objects to Sion Hill Site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS375</a>	Lawley J	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS347</a>	Law M	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposals would have a negative impact on the area and cause depreciation in house prices.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS844</a>	Law M	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill School site on the basis that local children use the playing fields and this should not be taken away from them, the site could accommodate more than 10 houses which would help improve the area, the proposed use is not appropriate immediately adjacent to a school, impact on house prices in the area.</p> <p>Questions whether people will be compensated for loss of property values.</p>	<p>Objections to the use of Sion Hill are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses. Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS343</a>	Leaning K	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>The site (playing fields) is currently being used in a productive manner - this will be lost.</p> <p>Concerned about property devaluation.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS903</a>	Lees P	<p>School is a brownfield site with limited access. Fear that playing fields to rear would be vulnerable to trespass from other travellers. As local schools are full, the traveller children would be denied an education locally</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS564</a>	Legister W	<p>Objects to the former Sion Hill School site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the site is limited and could cause traffic problems. Sion Hill already experiences problems and this could cause more difficulties.</li> <li>2. School buildings contain asbestos. It has been quoted that it will cost £2million to demolish - where will this money come from? Without clearance the site is a health risk to any potential resident.</li> <li>3. The local primary school is currently using mobile classrooms - any additional families would place more strain on the resources. The school also currently uses the Sion Hill playing fields and if this site was lost it would mean they would have no sports facilities.</li> <li>4. Local residents currently use the site as a sports field for football. If the site was taken away from them they would have nowhere to play.</li> <li>5. The local area is one of the most deprived in Kidderminster. In recent years the park has lost its children's playground, the post office has</li> </ol>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>We will carefully consider the views about service capacity alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>closed, the community centre has been lost, and most recently even the post-box has been removed. The site would be better suited to providing either employment or education for local people. A proper sports club would give local youngsters a focus improving self esteem and future prospects.</p> <p>6. The Broadwaters/Wolverley area is not a traditional stopping place for travelling people so may not prove popular with potential inhabitants</p> <p>7. Very few local amenities for potential residents - also concerned about accessing any facilities via the steep Sion Hill.</p> <p>8. Bordered by residential properties and a development could blight their views and infringe the privacy of both the current householders and potential site residents.</p> <p>9. Travelling people have a more outdoor lifestyle than the majority of house dwellers which could lead to an increased level of noise and smoke pollution to neighbours.</p> <p>10. The current planning permission for the site restricts use to educational purposes and I believe this should remain in place. The Broadwaters area needs help to lift it from its current deprived status - a Gypsy/Traveller site would not help.</p>	<p>allocations of sites.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The deprived nature of the area will need to be considered when a decision on sites is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS887</a>	Lloyd Perks I	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it would reduce property values and cause friction in the community. Feels the	Objection is noted as is the alternative suggestion about private housing or

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			site would be better used for private housing or for educational purposes.	educational development.  We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS983</a>	Lockwood J	Object	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1003</a>	Lockwood M	Considers this proposal will in no way enhance the deprived nature of this area. The likely costs will be prohibitive and any such monies would be far better spent on the re-generation of this part of Kidderminster. Additional complication of this site being subject to a restrictive covenant prohibiting any development other than that associated with furthering the educational needs of the local community.	Objection is noted as are the concerns related to the impact on the area. As part of the consultation process the District Council has consulted WCC as the landowner and they have provided comments in relation to any potential restrictive covenant.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS405</a>	Loughran K	Objects to the Sion Hill and Lea Castle on the basis that the proposals would reduce property values.	We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1189</a>	L P	Objects to the Sion Hill site and feels the site would be better used for affordable housing or future business development.  Identifies the following negative impacts:	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impact on local area</li> <li>Negative impact for future development of adjacent land</li> <li>Harder for local people to sell their property</li> <li>Negative impact on local house prices</li> <li>Visual intrusion</li> <li>Fly tipping</li> <li>Constant stream of complaints from local residents</li> <li>Illegal expansion of site</li> </ul>	<p>forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1017</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to the former Sion Hill School site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS447</a>	Mansell D	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. Raises concern about the site being too close to St. Oswald's Primary School and the school being over crowded.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1116</a>	Mansell D	Raises concerns over Sion Hill site in relation to school capacity, traffic impact, cost of site clearance and the need to provide facilities for the local community.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the local area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the building to be retained to provide facilities for the community is

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS448</a>	Mansell J	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. Also raises concern that the site is within the Green Belt and too close to St. Oswald's school which is full.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS311</a>	Mansfield M	<p>I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.</p> <p>Want compensation for loss of value on our homes and state of the art burglar alarms fitted. School land was made for education! Dangerous vehicles on our roads used by school pupils, Sion Hill always congested anyway. Unhygienic for schools and health with the mess.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				There is no covenant on the site restricting its use for educational purposes
Object	<a href="#">GTTS429</a>	Marsden Terence	<p>Objects most strongly to the Sion Hill site. The exit of the site is situated on a very sharp bend. The site is situated within private dwelling complex of Sion Hill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who pays to maintain the site?</li> <li>• Who is responsible for rubbish removal?</li> <li>• how much will be charged for each pitch and how much will the travellers be paying toward the rates of Wyre Forest District Council?</li> <li>• If they are travellers then why do they need a permanent site?</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. Should a permanent Gypsy site be established here in the future, its residents would pay Council Tax and an annual site fee towards maintenance costs.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS438</a>	Marsden Trina	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is on a busy road, doctors and schools are full and there is too much traffic around Kidderminster.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS349</a>	Martin A	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>This is already a deprived area and is too close to a primary school site.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS977</a>	Martin H	<p>Responds on behalf of Broadwaters Members Cllr Howard Martin, Cllr Mumshad Ahmed and Cllr Adrian Sewell. Comments are drawn from the public meetings on 17th October at St. Oswald's Church and at Wolverley memorial Hall.</p> <p>Sets out the following reasons why the site should be rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt and the use could escalate beyond the brownfield area.</li> <li>• High cost of demolition of school buildings (up to £2 million)</li> <li>• Missed opportunity for regeneration which could create jobs.</li> <li>• Other development opportunities are favoured for brownfield footprint including affordable housing, community centre, community sports. Fear that sports opportunities may be lost if Gypsy site goes ahead as it is likely that the space will be used for grazing horses.</li> <li>• The site should remain in educational use if</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The cost of developing any site needs to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.</p> <p>The proposed suggested alternative uses for the site are noted. However, it should also be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>possible. St. Oswald's school have expressed an interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Badland sisters' educational covenant on the site needs to be investigated.</li> <li>• Schools and GPs are oversubscribed.</li> <li>• There are fears that a travellers site would undermine the on-going regeneration of the area.</li> <li>• The Baker Report highlights that travellers would prefer to stay near to the existing community in Stourport-on-Severn.</li> <li>• Concern about overlooking.</li> <li>• Concern about devaluation of properties, suggests a fall of 40% would occur.</li> <li>• Concern about the steep hills to access the site and concern about impact on the A449/B4189 accident blackspot.</li> <li>• It is in the centre of an already heavily populated street which has seen many accidents and is used by commuters and children travelling to school. It is narrow and unsuitable for turning caravans.</li> <li>• Travellers have human rights and legislation states that they should not be overlooked. As residential houses overlook the site it is most unsuitable.</li> <li>• Concerns about asbestos in the school buildings.</li> <li>• Baker Report did not take into account the impact on the surrounding area, no consultation</li> </ul>	<p>of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>There is no covenant on the site restricting its use.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>As part of this consultation process sites have been considered in a number of locations throughout the District.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>took place with the community or elected members.</p> <p>Highlights the fact that comments are based on those issues set out above and not negative comments towards the Travelling community. Requests that the site is removed from the shortlist.</p>	<p>on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS468</a>	Matthews G	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site as the roads are busy and there have been many accidents, the cost of demolition is high and the site would be better used as a training facility.</p> <p>Suggests the other sites are more worthy of consideration.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS430</a>	McSorley T	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS709</a>	Meusz G	<p>I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS334</a>	Millington D	Same arguments apply as to those sites ruled out. Is totally inappropriate use.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS516</a>	Millington D	This is a most unsuitable site with houses backing on to it, plus a school.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area and school. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1215</a>	Millington E	Objects to the Sion Hill site and feels that the site could be used for affordable housing, a Travellers site would devalue local properties and there would be security and health and safety problem and there is strong opposition to the proposals.	Objection is noted as is the suggested alternative option for the development of the site.  Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Officers.  We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS525</a>	Moore R	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.  I understand that these people need some where to go but this site is not suitable.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS734</a>	Moraity G	I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. I agree that the space would be better put to use for local children to have a play area.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS704</a>	Moraity N	I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1360</a>	Morton K	Proposal is causing extreme stress to residents in vicinity, their houses have already gone down in value. Please put needs of existing community first. Schools and doctors are overstretched. Don't force travellers into areas where they do not want to be.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1358</a>	Morton M	Insufficient infrastructure and services to support them; schools and doctors' do not have enough room; roads congested; fear that pitches will spread onto playing fields to rear; will be costly to clear site and provide	Objections are noted.  The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>utilities.</p> <p>Why not allocate areas near industrial estates or perhaps on the Old Sugar Beet Factory ground?</p>	<p>the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The cost of developing any site will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS518</a>	Morton R	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS435</a>	Mudge Mr	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS499</a>	Muller A	Sion Hill site should not be considered for a Gypsy site because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Money it will cost to knock down school.</li> <li>2. Access in and out of the site. Traffic already bad.</li> <li>3. Privacy to Gypsies - houses overlook the site.</li> <li>4. Better use of building for education - St Oswald's is too small.</li> <li>5. No places for Gypsy children to attend schools.</li> <li>6. No places at doctors surgery for Gypsies.</li> <li>7. Land was left to be used for education by the Badland sisters.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1083</a>	Neil J	Sion Hill site too close to existing housing. Would devalue property in vicinity.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS408</a>	Neville A	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the basis that the area desperately needs affordable housing and that St. Oswald's school does not have enough space. The land should be split for these purposes.	Objection is noted and the comments relating to the future use of the site are helpful - they will be considered alongside those of Worcestershire County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS401</a>	Neville L	Objects to the Sion Hill site and argues that the site should have remained as a school or could be used for affordable housing.	Objection is noted. The views in relation to the future use of the site are useful and will be considered alongside the response from the landowners.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS424</a>	Neville L	Objects to the Sion Hill site and feels that the site should be used for affordable housing.	The concerns in relation to the provision of affordable housing are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS392</a>	Neville M	Site should be used to benefit existing Wyre Forest residents. Suggest provide quality affordable housing, improved access and parking and also allow primary school to extend onto site with new classrooms so that playground can be reinstated.	Objection to proposed use is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS390</a>	Neville P	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS346</a>	Noden J	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Concerned that the proposals would have a negative impact on the area and cause a depreciation in house prices.	<p>should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS618</a>	Noden J	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is too close to residential properties, it will reduce property values, and it is too close to St. Oswald's Primary school.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS476</a>	Oakes L	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Does not consider that the use is appropriate next to a first school.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS496</a>	Obrien R	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St. Oswald's Primary School and close to where children get the school bus.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS495</a>	Obrien S	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St. Oswald's Primary School and close to where children get the school bus.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS780</a>	Pagett I	Objects on the basis that there are already enough Gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn, dentists, doctors and schools already struggle to accommodate residents, should not build on Green Belt or by nature reserves. Land should be used for affordable housing.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1001</a>	Parish S	Site is within the Green Belt, an open site and would have an adverse impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the area. Leisure, educational and sports uses are acceptable development within the Green Belt. Interest in their use from local sports clubs, and the use as a travellers site could blight the potential for re-use of the existing building which is obviously a	These comments in relation to the suitability of Green Belt sites are useful and are noted.  The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>valuable resource in this particular location.</p> <p>Considers Stourport Road, Bewdley site would be a better alternative to other Green Belt sites.</p> <p>Given the size of the Lea Castle site, it may be possible to accommodate a travellers' site on a small part of Lea Castle with the remainder of the site left unaffected.</p> <p>Manor Farm - The appropriateness of this site undoubtedly hangs on the likelihood of the relief road being constructed, and is therefore most likely to contribute towards longer term future provision.</p>	<p>Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. The objection to the Sion Hill site is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS541</a>	Payne J	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS247</a>	Perks H	Surely this site could be of benefit to ALL as a Community Centre or Sports Centre? We feel that it is in too close proximity to St Oswald's School to be used for the proposed purpose.	These comments in relation to the future use of the site are informative and noted by the Council.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS908</a>	Perrin P	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is within the Green Belt, it is close to residential properties, the building should be preserved and re-used, the Badland covenant requires the site to remain in educational use, it is expensive to remove the asbestos, it is a difficult site to screen and secure and it will be difficult to ensure that the use does not spread, the schools are already oversubscribed.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Questions why we are not giving the same priority to providing affordable housing.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>There is no covenant on the Sion Hill School site.</p> <p>The comments relating to keeping the site in its existing use are also noted.</p> <p>The Council are giving priority to affordable housing and has made provisions in the Site Allocations and Policies Document and the Core Strategy.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS882</a>	Perrin R	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The consultation process is flawed - the process for calculating the requirement is skewed which gives a disproportionate requirement in Wyre Forest compared to Bromsgrove and Worcester, the Baker report is over-simplified and in parts inaccurate for example the Sion Hill site is mis-described, the Cabinet accepted the flaws but</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted. The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment was undertaken for the whole of the region and as such provided requirements for all areas, albeit some areas were identified as having the requirement for more pitches given the historical demand within an area. This is therefore the same approach used</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>then selected the 7 sites in an arbitrary manner dismissing some sites but including others where the same arguments could be made.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Previous Planning History - the Sion Hill school can still be used for educational purposes and is subject to a covenant limiting its use to education and the school playing fields are currently used, this use could be prejudiced by potential 'spillage' from a traveller site.</li> <li>3. Cost of clearance - this has been estimated at £1.5 million, together with development costs this would be unviable even with government grants.</li> <li>4. Residential/Green Belt area - the services are full, buses are irregular and there is no post box, satisfactory co-existence is unlikely with both parties preferring alternatives.</li> <li>5. Alternative uses for the site - if it can not remain in educational use it should be recycled for social, recreational purposes or social housing some of which could be used to settle ex-travellers looking for permanent bricks and mortar housing.</li> </ol>	<p>across the region. The reasons for the selection of the short-listed sites can be seen by viewing the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 20th September.</p> <p>The School site does not have a covenant limiting its use for educational purposes</p> <p>The cost of developing any site will need to be fully considered when deciding on any potential future allocations</p> <p>The concern about Green Belt and residential area is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. However, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Potential alternative uses of the site are noted.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS480</a>	Pinder R	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Also raises concern that as no new development has been allowed in Wolverley for 17 years there will be a need for the building in the future.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS322</a>	Piper C	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is an ideal community centre which could be used for a variety of activities including sports, there will be an increase in traffic, the local school can not cope with the increase in population and access to transport and facilities such as doctors is difficult from the site.	<p>Objections to the use of Sion Hill are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS453</a>	Pollitt T	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential	Objection is noted as are the comments

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. Wishes to see the sports pitches continue to be used by Kidderminster Harriers and St. Oswald's School.	in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1259</a>	Pope K	Object	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS292</a>	Powell N	We have only had our house 2 years, bought because it was in a quiet residential street, if this site goes ahead it will break us financially as our house will lose its value and the area will lose its appeal to families like ourselves.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS420</a>	Poxon K	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the basis that the local residents are firmly opposed to it and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go or as a teacher training centre or offices to create jobs and save on the massive demolition costs.	The comments in relation to the future use of the site are helpful and will be considered alongside those of Worcestershire County Council's as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS294</a>	Preece G	We've only had our house two years, bought because it was on a quiet residential street, if this site goes ahead it will break us financially as our house will lose its value	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			and the area will lose its appeal to families like ourselves.	that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS803</a>	Preece J	Strongly object - realise these people have to live somewhere but Lea Castle and Sion Hill are not suitable. Sion Hill is too near housing and an area where children pass daily and Lea Castle too near housing estates. On any area it would need to be carefully looked at and numbers strictly controlled to allocation.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions and numbers tightly defined.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS293</a>	Preece K	We've only had our house two years, bought because it was on a quiet residential street, if this site goes ahead it will break us financially as our house will lose its value and the area will lose its appeal to families like ourselves.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS738</a>	Preece R	Objects to the former Sion Hill School Site being used for Gypsy & Traveller provision.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS497</a>	Price J	It will be an absolute eyesore on a well used road, the traffic will become a nightmare. The value of properties will immediately drop. I also thought it was Green Belt.	Objection is noted. The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS862</a>	Pyke C	School should be retained for educational use at a future date.	Objection is noted as is support for the continuation of educational uses in this location.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1258</a>	Quinton E	Unsuitable due to location in residential area. Site should be used for education or housing to benefit community. Fear that crime will increase. Do not want more gypsy sites in our area.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.  Alternative suggested uses for the site are also noted.  The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS411</a>	Raxter C	Objects to the Sion Hill site and suggests alternative	The comments relating to the future

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>uses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Relief Road and drop off point for St. Oswald's School (as the roads in the area are already under too much pressure from existing school drop-offs).</li> <li>2. Any future expansion of St. Oswald's School.</li> <li>3. Affordable housing.</li> </ol>	<p>educational use of the site are noted and will be considered alongside those of Worcestershire County Council as the landowner.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS471</a>	Richardson A	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. The site should be used for community housing projects or should charge a fee for staying and employ local people to keep it in order.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS826</a>	Richardson A	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site on the grounds of traffic congestion.</p> <p>Suggests the Lea Castle site would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Support for the Lea Castle site is noted</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS954</a>	Ricketts B	<p>Should be developed to benefit the residents of the local area.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS918</a>	Ricketts I	Object	Objection is noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS323</a>	Roberts J	<p>Sion Hill School Site: Objections:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. High cost of demolition of existing buildings and preparation of the site.</li> <li>2. Proximity of Sion Hill Estate which houses families who would be in conflict with the travellers.</li> <li>3. Traveller site will be adjacent to a Primary School and a right of way footpath.</li> <li>4. Local school full, no other local school within easy reach.</li> <li>5. If site not properly monitored to contain appropriate number of residents then, I fear, numbers could spill over onto adjacent field, adding to the Council's problems, e.g. Dale Farm.</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted. The cost of the site preparation will need to be factored in when a decision on potential allocations is made.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the immediate area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS498</a>	Rook S	Part of Sion Hill lies within the 10% most deprived	These comments are noted and are

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			areas in the country. We need employment and regeneration of the right kind.	helpful in determining potential future uses for the site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS489</a>	Roper S	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St. Oswald's Primary School and close to where children get the school bus.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS575</a>	Rose K	Objects to former Sion Hill School Site	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS542</a>	Rouse T	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS460</a>	Rowe J A	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. Raises concerns about the use of mobile classrooms at St. Oswald's School and the lack of space for travelling children at the school.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS469</a>	Salus D	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS773</a>	Sayer D	Fear for safety of local community and negative impact on people's homes in area.	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS189</a>	Sheen N	Is a busy residential area, borders on well used playing fields. What guarantees that the playing fields would remain intact? Council has a moral duty to uphold and support covenant. Site is within the Green Belt and special circumstances would be required to justify allocation. Associated costs with redevelopment would be significant.	The concerns in relation to the site are noted. As part of the consultation process the District Council has sought the views of Worcestershire County Council as the landowner. They have made specific comments relating to the covenant and the continued use of some of the site for educational/training purposes.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS515</a>	Sheen N	The Sion Hill Site is totally unsuitable as it borders on playing fields that are utilised by junior football teams and this recreational use would be threatened by the presence of a travellers site.	Objection is noted as is the concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS457</a>	Shergold A	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go. Raises concerns about property prices falling.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1026</a>	Sherrey S	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it represents a missed opportunity for regeneration, it could be used for affordable housing, a community centre or community sports, the high cost of demolition makes no sense in the current climate, it is in the Green Belt, it provides a safe environment for children to play, the Badland covenant needs to be investigated, there has been a lack of proper consultation, local schools and health services are oversubscribed and any redevelopment of the site should be to further improve the Sion Hill area.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.  WCC has been consulted as the landowner and it is hoped that they will provide information in relation to any restrictive covenant that is in place.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS998</a>	Sherrey V	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it represents a missed opportunity for regeneration, it could be used for affordable housing, a community centre or community sports, the high cost of demolition makes no sense in the current climate, it is in the Green Belt, it provides a safe environment for children to play, the Badland covenant needs to be investigated, there has been a lack of proper consultation, local schools and health services are oversubscribed and any redevelopment of the site should be to further improve the Sion Hill area.	Objections to the use of Sion Hill are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses. However, it should be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>There is no covenant on the site restricting its use.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS999</a>	Sherrey V	<p>Suggests two further sites for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• former British Sugar site</li> <li>• former industrial area, Wilden Lane</li> </ul>	<p>Sites are noted.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>More detail will be required about what site on Wilden Lane is being identified.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1167</a>	Shurmer H	<p>I wish to object to this site as I believe it is totally inappropriate due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is within Green Belt land and if it should be developed should be used to allow for employment within the local area. I believe the site is earmarked for adult education and this should be retained for such development.</li> <li>• The community are already using part of this site for sports activities. I understand that if the site is developed access will be blocked to the playing fields.</li> <li>• I believe the schools are already very full close by.</li> <li>• The site is isolated with poor public transport.</li> <li>• I believe the Stourport-on-Severn sites are more suitable particularly as other gypsy communities</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NPPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			live there.	<p>need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school and highway safety are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority and the Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS491</a>	Simpson J	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Oswald's Primary School and close to where children get the school bus.	alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS54</a>	Sion Hill Court Residents	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies and Travellers at Sion Hill. Lists a number of reasons as to why the site is unsuitable including: Narrow and busy road with many accidents; Green Belt; All ward councillors not informed; Devalue property prices in the area by at least 40%; Site can be put to better use for local community; The other sites are more suitable for Gypsy & Traveller pitch provision; Regeneration of the site for educational purposes has always been promised by the Council; Not logical to use taxpayers money to demolish the school; Should be used to aid St Oswald's school; Residential houses overlook the site; Travellers would like improvements to the sites they are on or to be placed somewhere with more privacy and less tension (such as Lea Castle); Oversubscribed local community services; Tensions between travellers and settled communities.	Objections are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right. The suggestions in relation to the site's future use for community purposes are a very helpful gauge of the local community's opinion and will help to inform future policies in relation to this site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS285</a>	Smith D	I do think that the old middle school would be better used for something for our community. Not just the young but all ages. It is big enough to accommodate all cross sections of the community.	Objection is noted and the comments relating to the future use of the site are also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1203</a>	Smith G	Object for following reasons:  flanked by private homes on edge of Sion Hill Estate; estate has worked hard to upgrade local environment in recent years; school and GP surgery is full; site has	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>capacity for expansion - fear illegal siting of caravans; more suitable sites exist e.g. British Sugar site</p>	<p>of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS711</a>	Smith M	I agree wholeheartedly that this site should not be considered as suitable or appropriate given the level of residential housing in the area and I firmly believe that the site could be better used and developed to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS437</a>	Smith Mrs	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go or to relocate St. Oswald's or Wolverley school.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1246</a>	Smith P	<p>Is disappointed that the policy to provide pitches was not opposed at a higher level. It is not acceptable to say that a 30-40% reduction in property values is not a planning consideration and will not therefore be taken into account. Considers if sites are inevitable then they should be placed well away from established communities preferably on brownfield sites but maybe even greenfield ones.</p> <p>Objects specifically to the Sion Hill site because it will be expensive to create with demolition and asbestos issues, the schools and doctors surgeries are full, the building should be used for start-up enterprises or community use, the area is already well developed and this would be a sociological disaster both for the Gypsies and local residents.</p>	<p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The alternative suggested uses for the site are also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1143</a>	Smith R	Unsuitable for following reasons - in deprived residential area; school should be used for social activities - perhaps for those with learning difficulties or a youth club. Fear gypsies will not respect the area.	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>The level of deprivation in any area is an important consideration that will need to be taken into account when a decision on possible future allocation is made.</p> <p>Alternative use suggestions are noted.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1205</a>	Smith R	<p>Site is inappropriate - within residential area which has seen local environment much improved; pressure on already overstretched services; schools at capacity; pressure on medical practices; fearful of further expansion of pitches if site goes ahead.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS543</a>	Southan D	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS483</a>	Stammer T	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concerns about house prices within the area falling.	Concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS546</a>	Stanton R	Strongly opposed.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS385</a>	Stanton R	Site should be used for education - move primary school onto site. Should not allow a business use in existing residential area. Gypsy sites elsewhere in country are mostly on industrial estates.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS673</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the Sion Hill site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			devalue property.	values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS415</a>	Stockley S	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss in house value</li> <li>• Criminal damage</li> <li>• Theft</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Litter</li> </ul>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS854</a>	Street A	Site would be better used as community centre, especially for youngsters. Fears drop in house prices if used as gypsy site.	<p>Options for alternative uses for the site are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS853</a>	Street E	Site would better used to benefit local community e.g.	Options for alternative uses for the site

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			learning centre, youth club, sports facility.	are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS432</a>	Street SP	Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS851</a>	Street SP	Fears that house prices would plummet and would expect reduction in Council Tax as compensation.	Objection is noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS291</a>	Swift I	There is a lot of potential for things to be done with the school for sport and anything else. Please leave the school as it is.	Objection is noted and the comments relating to the future use of the site are also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS383</a>	Swift I	Will add to traffic congestion in area; property devaluation.	The concerns relating to traffic congestion are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.  We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS530</a>	Tait G	<p>Very concerned about Sion Hill Middle - do the travellers want to live in such a built up area?</p> <p>Lots of children in this area have no where for activities and Sion Hill Middle would be better for education! Also provide employment for the area.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1060</a>	Talbot S	Object to school being demolished due to cost and building could be reused. Also understand there are no sewers on site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS369</a>	Taylor A	Residents of Sion Hill have worked hard to improve area. Many people have bought their homes and a gypsy site will devalue homes. Very costly to demolish school. Do gypsy families really want to come to Sion Hill? Would like to see money used for local youth projects and indoor sports facilities and social events. Why can't affordable housing be built on site?	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Considerations for alternative uses of the site are also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS520</a>	Taylor D	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>Not suitable being so close to a Junior School.</p>	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Lea Castle site is much more suitable.	of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.  Support for the Lea Castle site is also noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS376</a>	Thould T	Site should be used for market housing. Not suitable for gypsy site due to access issues and surrounding housing which is mostly owner occupied.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS425</a>	Tischenko L	Objects to the Sion Hill site on the basis that the local residents are firmly opposed to it and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1197</a>	Udy A	Building could be used to help local people, not itinerants.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS115</a>	Wagstaff J	Groundswell of opinion against any such site. The further away from residential areas they are sited the better. Homeowners within a 5 mile radius will see the values of their property fall sharply. The residents have	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			a case and it is our duty to support them. Sheer lunacy to think of placing such a site next to the primary school. Originally the former Sion Hill School was earmarked as a training centre - a much welcomed project.	should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS490</a>	Walker J	Objects to the Sion Hill site as it is in a residential area and the site could be better used to provide a youth centre. Raises concern about the site being close to St. Oswald's Primary School and close to where children get the school bus.	Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS821</a>	Ward G	Objects to Sion Hill site because the schools and doctors are currently over subscribed.  Concerned that the Gypsy community is aware of the discussions taking place and that this will mean illegal sites springing up in order to be first in the queue.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS249</a>	Ward L	My objections are in relation to road traffic and access, and to its position next to a Primary School which is	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>already cramped on its present site.</p> <p>An excellent use of the space on the Sion Hill Middle School site would be to divide it between St Oswald's Primary School and a second project which would be of benefit to the community.</p>	<p>requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The comments relating to the future use of the site are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS507</a>	Warrington D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want to feel safe at night.</li> <li>• We want to live without the worry of bolting down everything we own.</li> <li>• We would move home if this goes ahead as we live in a quiet lane with already a busy road.</li> <li>• Not happy.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS356</a>	Welding J	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS287</a>	Whatmore M	<p>It is a Green Belt area it is used for many purposes,</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			school sports day, harriers, joggers and many more. I do not wish to look at travellers from my bedroom window.	relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS389</a>	Whiston R	Not compatible use with surrounding land uses. Location has no connection with gypsy community.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS561</a>	Whiston S	This site is inappropriate development within the Green Belt.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS406</a>	Whitehouse E	We would use the site of Sion Hill Middle School for all kids in St. Oswald's Primary School and then use the primary school site for a new Wyre Forest Special School.	The comments in relation to the future use of the site are useful and will be considered alongside Worcestershire County Council's as the landowner.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS340</a>	White M	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead</p> <p>Sadly the reputation of travellers and traveller sites comes before them and I think it would be a retrograde step for the area.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS841</a>	White M	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is in a residential area, the road junctions around the site are already very busy, the cost of demolition and development of site is unknown, there is no capacity at school, doctors or dentist.</p> <p>Raises concern that site could spread to adjacent playing fields which are used by the school and the community. Suggests that the school is developed into a training centre to help address deprivation within the area.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>In terms of site encroachment - sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The proposed suggested alternative use for the site is noted. However, it should also be noted that the suggested alternative would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS391</a>	Whittall J	Sion Hill should be developed to enhance area.	Noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS398</a>	Wilcox V	The former Sion Hill site should only be used for educational purposes or to create jobs in local community. No one in the local community wants this proposal to go ahead. Area is already deprived - this would worsen situation.	Objection is noted as are the suggested alternative uses.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS528</a>	Wilcox V	<p>Very concerned about Sion Hill Middle - do the travellers want to live in such a built up area?</p> <p>Lots of children in this area have no where for activities and Sion Hill Middle would be better for education! Also provide employment for the area.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the suggested alternative uses for the site.</p> <p>Gypsy families have been consulted as part of this process and this will help to inform any decision made on possible allocations of sites.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS817</a>	Willins D	Objects to the former Sion Hill School site	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS592</a>	Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	<p>Whilst Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council accept the consideration of local sites on which Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople can legally stay, we do not agree the Sion Hill Site is an appropriate location.</p> <p>The Parish Council have sought the views of locally affected residents and we set out below reasons why this site should be rejected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be used for regeneration in a deprived area creating jobs and increasing well-being.</li> <li>• Other development opportunities - Affordable Housing, Community Centre, Community Sports.</li> <li>• High cost of clearance and development makes no economic sense - supported by Baker report.</li> <li>• Is Green Belt - although footprint of site is brownfield - concern of escalation of any site beyond brownfield boundaries.</li> <li>• Currently safe environment for children to play</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to the use of Sion Hill are noted as are the proposed suggested alternative uses. However, it should be noted that many of the suggested alternatives would have the same potential issues or constraints as outlined as objections to the use of part of the site for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>There is no covenant on the site that restricts the potential future use of the</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>and imperative it remains so.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understand that there is a Covenant on the site and this requires investigation prior to any redevelopment.</li> <li>• Lack of proper consultation - wider consultation should have taken place with affected residents, local sporting group users and Worcestershire County Council.</li> <li>• Local schools and GP practices are currently oversubscribed and by 2013 the situation will have deteriorated further.</li> <li>• Sion Hill area has achieved great enhancement over recent years and any redevelopment of the Sion Hill site should be designed to further improve the area.</li> <li>• Travellers have a preference to live in small sites close to existing family sites - as identified by the Baker Report (3.29) and the article in the Shuttle dated 20th October.</li> <li>• Site overlooks residential area causing privacy issues on both sides.</li> <li>• Devaluation of properties - this is already apparent due to uncertainty over future use of the site and the lengthy decision making process only exacerbates this.</li> <li>• Highways and access - there is an accident blackspot at the bottom of Sion Hill with its junction with the A449 and the B4189 Wolverley Road has seen 17 accidents in the last 2 years with at least 2 fatalities; therefore any increase</li> </ul>	<p>land.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity issues are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			in traffic will cause further safety issues.	that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.  The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS607</a>	Wood D	Objects to Sion Hill site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS526</a>	Woods J	Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.  I understand that these people need some where to go but this site is not suitable.	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS527</a>	Wood T	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>I understand that these people need some where to go but this site is not suitable.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1130</a>	Wridgway N	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because the roads are unsuitable for the increase in traffic particularly large, heavy vehicles, the school run parking is already a headache, and the added congestion and noise will bring further disadvantages to the residents of the area.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS458</a>	Wright D	<p>Objects to the Sion Hill site because it is a residential area and the site should be used to give the youth of Broadwaters somewhere to go.</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the comments in relation to the potential future use of the site, which will be considered alongside those of the County Council as the landowner.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS339</a>	Wright M	<p>Site is not suitable or appropriate with housing nearby. Site should be developed for youth provision instead.</p> <p>I don't understand why Sion Hill School wasn't considered for use as a replacement for the Council's site in Stourport-on-Severn?</p>	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The option for the site to provide facilities for young people is also noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS82</a>	Blount R	Support for site at Sion Hill, Kidderminster for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS573</a>	Greed A	Support for Sion Hill School Site	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS586</a>	Layton M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local communities should not have the right to decide who will be their neighbours if they base their decisions on racial stereotypes.</li> <li>2. It is inappropriate for local councillors to use the fears and prejudices of local communities to score cheap political points.</li> <li>3. The local media and local councillors have a responsibility to provide objective information regarding the impact of a local authority ran gypsy/traveller site on a local community. Again, fears and prejudices have been pandered to instead.</li> <li>4. The needs of the gypsy/traveller community should come first. Adequate provision for health and education needs should be a priority. Secondly, proximity to established Gypsy/Traveller communities should be considered.</li> <li>5. The consultation process should be fair, open and informed by reasoned debate. All those with an interest to declare should be barred from</li> </ol>	Support and comments are noted. With reference to the provision of education and healthcare facilities, any comments received from the Local Education Authority and healthcare bodies will be considered when determining any allocations.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation – Former Sion Hill School, Kidderminster**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>participating.</p> <p>6. The creation of a Local Authority Gypsy/Traveller site should be viewed in the same way as all social housing; as an opportunity rather than a necessary evil.</p> <p>7. Cost implications for social housing should not be the over-riding factor, rather the provision of adequate, affordable homes for a vulnerable community.</p> <p>8. Intelligent "dual usage" of Sion Hill site could serve both settled and gypsy traveller communities, e.g. health centre or community centre. Both are much needed.</p>	

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1135</a>	Environment Agency	<p>Site 1 (Stourport Road, Bewdley) is located within Flood Zone 3 and 2 based on our Flood Zone Map, where there is a medium probability of flooding.</p> <p>Site 1 also lies within the Source Protection Zone 1 of a public supply source. The site is located 168m from the borehole and is therefore highly vulnerable to the risk of pollution from site drainage and other potential on-site activities. Activities such as the dismantling of vehicles and metal recyclers would not be permitted within this zone. For residential caravan sites within this zone the discharge of foul drainage effluent to ground would not be permitted and a connection should be made to the mains foul sewer. For surface water drainage, the discharge of clean roof water to ground may be acceptable provided all down pipes are properly sealed to prevent pollutants from entering the system.</p>	The Environment Agency's comments in relation to this site are noted. In particular the comment in relation to the Source Protection Zone is noted and will be carefully considered by the Council with regard to the suitability of this site for future pitch provision.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1297</a>	Fauset	Lives near to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site and is disheartened and disturbed by the level of prejudice shown by many people in Wyre Forest towards Travellers. Travellers are an ethnic group who live according to their own culture, whilst still within the communities of non-travellers. They prefer to live on the outskirts of settlements so as not to disturb those living there. They should be offered space which is enough for their groups to settle together. There are sometimes problems with sanitary facilities and this could result in severe river pollution, this would have to be negotiated were the	Comments are noted as is the support for the proposals that have been outlined by the Council.

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			travellers to have the site at Blackstone. Prejudice against travellers is another form of racism, they need to be supported in their desire to maintain centuries old traditions whilst being accepted by and enriching the wider community.	
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1272</a>	Hall R	I would like to respond to the following consultation for potential sites. The site at Stourport Road, Bewdley although on a flood plan would enable travellers to be close to the school and is commutable to the town by foot as well as car.	Comment is noted.  Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS562</a>	Hartwell G	Objects to Stourport Road, Bewdley for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Station - concerned about impact and potential contamination on the station that serves all of Bewdley, which is adjacent to the site.</li> <li>• Green Belt - inappropriate to develop on Green Belt - other site in Bewdley was dismissed because of this reason.</li> <li>• Location near to the poppy field and concerned about the associated impact on tourism within this important gateway. Bewdley relies on Tourism and will impact on the whole town.</li> <li>• Located on the flood plain so should not be</li> </ul>	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>considered as it is at risk of flood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site will potentially home 100+ people. The is likely to be a significant increase in traffic on that junction and could pose a threat to school children.</li> <li>• Lack of resources in Bewdley to accommodate a site - very little policing and facilities for young people.</li> <li>• There are not enough school places for the families the site will house, families from Far Forest and Arley are likely to be displaced.</li> </ul>	<p>to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS257</a>	Jarvis L	Wonders if the detrimental effect to local businesses has been taken into consideration. People will be very reluctant to leave their vehicles immediately adjacent to a travellers' site. What is at the present time an attractive facility, encouraging people into our town, will become in effect unusable.	The impact on local businesses and the economy is a key issues for the District Council and emphasis continues to be placed on comprehensive regeneration within the area. However, it should be noted that some of the concerns listed may be based on opinion and perception rather than actual facts. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1241</a>	Jennings N	This site is perfect for our showman's depot but the land is owned by gypsies.	Comment is noted.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS76</a>	Madden P	Questions fair representation of consultation and impartial discussion.	The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1387</a>	Moss K	Stourport Road is Green Belt; is currently pasture with no hardstanding. It requires extensive planting to mitigate landscape impact and would have to pass the sequential test in relation to flooding. Arguably it could fail the sequential test if there are other sites available outside the zone that may be suitable such as Clows Top Garage.	Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions to mitigate against this.  Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1334</a>	Natural England	We note that several of the sites are in close proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Local Wildlife Sites, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site 1: Stourport Road, Bewdley Devil's Spittleful SSSI location 0.5km north east and adjacent to River Severn local wildlife site.</li> </ul>	Comments are noted. If considered worthy of allocation, site specific policies would need to ensure that the impact on adjacent features were fully considered as part of any subsequent planning application. It should be noted that it is not considered any development at this site would have a harmful effect on Devil's Spittleful SSSI.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS818</a>	Whartons Park	Encloses images of the rubbish left by travellers who stayed at this site recently and argues that this is not an appropriate use adjacent to a picnic area.	Objection to the site is noted as is the concern about the potential impact on the environment. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.  The photographs submitted are noted and thanks is given for there submission.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS331</a>	Wolfe R	<p>Neither objects to or supports the Stourport Road, Bewdley site but questions the suitability of it when there are brownfield sites within the District.</p> <p>The site is in the Green Belt, there are parking problems associated with the school and recreational facilities, local people have experienced difficulty in getting planning permission for small developments, it is in flood zone 2, there would be problems with sewage, drainage and run-off, schools are full to capacity, and Bewdley relies on tourism - will this proposal give the right first impression to visitors?</p>	<p>Comments on this site are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies,</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1504</a>	Worcestershire County Council, Schools Information and Planning Section	<p><b>Bewdley</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stourport Road Bewdley - 15 pitches</li> </ul> <p>In Bewdley forecast numbers indicate that there will be sufficient places for children from these sites as well as children from other proposed housing developments. The forecast table below is based on current pupils at school with areas highlighted pink indicating a forecast of significant surplus places. Not all pre school children register with maintained schools; some will access education at Independent schools or be home educated.</p> <p>Whilst some years are showing as full to capacity a number of pupils at the schools are coming from outside of the Bewdley catchment area.</p>	Information relating to school place availability is welcomed and will be used to inform any further decisions relating to the allocation of sites.
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1141</a>	Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	Notes that limited environmental information has been provided for the sites and strongly	Comments are noted, further information on the constraints of the sites taken forward

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>recommends that this is further augmented with details on protected species/Green Infrastructure information prior to final allocation. Considers that such information is important at the allocation stage as it could well make a difference to the potential for a given site to accommodate the proposed number of pitches or even as to whether it can be developed at all.</p>	<p>will be made available within the Site Allocations and Policies Publication Document.</p>
Comment	<a href="#">GTTS1147</a>	Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<p>The Stourport Road site falls within the Green Belt and the floodplain and should not be brought forward unless it can pass the various exceptions and sequential tests needed for sites in such locations. Notwithstanding those tests it is also important to note that it falls in the green link between the River Severn and a substantial green infrastructure resource at the Blackstone, Devil's Spittleful and Rifle Range SSSI complex. We would therefore suggest that in light of wider GI aspirations in the district development in this area should be resisted. Accordingly we would recommend that this site be ruled out of the allocations process.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Comments regarding the site's role within the green infrastructure network are noted as is the recommendation that the site should be withdrawn on this basis.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1597</a>	Anonymous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern next to water station classed as Zone 1 site - if any risk of contamination - supplies water to the whole town</li> <li>• Green Belt Site we need to STOP the slow joining of the 3 Wyre Forest towns</li> <li>• Location - access to Bewdley may have affect on tourism - brings a lot of money to town</li> <li>• Road concerns - busy road - a lot more traffic</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poppy field - area of special beauty.</li> </ul>	<p>to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1598</a>	Anonymous	Object to proposal for following reasons: Green Belt site - other development not allowed; fear increased crime in area and property devaluation; fear walkers will not use nearby footpaths; scrubland should be	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>used not farmland in Green Belt.</p> <p>Suggest Sugar Beet site may be more suitable for this use. Bewdley has no existing gypsy community unlike Stourport-on-Severn and Kidderminster. People will not use picnic site if this proposal goes ahead. Travellers fly tipped on site previously.</p> <p>Understand that Habberley Road site was thrown out because it was Green Belt - so is Blackstone site.</p>	<p>be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p> <p>The reasons for the selection of the short-listed sites can be seen by viewing the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on the 20th September.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS320</a>	Anson W	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because it is too near schools and the extra traffic	Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			will make it even more dangerous for children, it will have a detrimental impact on the landscape and it is in the Green Belt.	<p>is noted.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will need to be considered when a decision on allocation is made.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS787</a>	Arnold P	I feel that Stourport-on-Severn does not have the size and amenities to take any large influx of people - affecting as below - i.e. schools, roads, etc.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Stourport-on-Severn already has a great percentage of site basis than is required.	views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS33</a>	Baker Mrs M R	Objects to the potential for site at Stourport Road, Bewdley to make provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Impact on walkers and fisherman and security of their cars in the picnic site.	Objection is noted. The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1257</a>	Banks C	Traffic situation is dreadful with schools - more development would be crazy	The traffic concerns relating to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS934</a>	Beech H	Objects to the Stourport Road site as it is very important Green Belt, it is in flood zone 2, it contains	Objections are noted.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>the water bore hole and there is a risk of this being contaminated, it is too close to the picnic area, it is an area of outstanding beauty, it is a highly visible site at the gateway to Bewdley, it would increase noise and light pollution. Questions the impact on wildlife and flowers.</p> <p>Questions the need for additional pitches when Wyre Forest already has more than Worcester.</p> <p>Suggests the land adjoining the new Council head offices on Stourport Road would be a suitable site.</p>	<p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. Other Districts in Worcestershire will also have to undertake a similar exercise.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS935</a>	Beech M	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site as it is very important Green Belt, it is in flood zone 2, it contains the water bore hole and there is a risk of this being contaminated, it is too close to the picnic area, it is an area of outstanding beauty, it is a highly visible site at the gateway to Bewdley, it would increase noise and light pollution. Questions the impact on wildlife and flowers.</p> <p>Questions the need for additional pitches when Wyre Forest already has more than Worcester.</p> <p>Suggests the land adjoining the new Council head offices on Stourport Road would be a suitable site.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. Other Districts in Worcestershire will also have to undertake a similar exercise.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1051</a>	Bent J	Site is Green Belt and on flood plain. Prohibitive costs to make site usable - e.g. drainage; already struggling to attract tourists to town - gypsy would have negative impact on local economy.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1009</a>	Bent S	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Flood Plain</li> <li>• Infrastructure costs - sewage, drainage</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative visual amenity impact in a major gateway location</li> <li>• Impact on the tourism element of the town as well as the adjacent poppy fields</li> </ul>	<p>provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS289</a>	Bewdley Civic Society	<p>Responding on behalf of Bewdley Civic Society which has 470 members, consultation has taken place with members to form the response.</p> <p>Strongly objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because of landscape character. Refers to the Adopted Local Plan and Adopted Core Strategy. Suggests that Blackstone is a special are in terms of beauty and character and is the gateway into Bewdley. Public picnic site attracts many visitors and is on two major walking routes. The poppy fields also attract many visitors and enhance the landscape. The site is in the Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area. The civic society believes that such development should take place on brownfield sites. Questions the relationship between this development and current landscape and Green Belt planning policies.</p> <p>Identifies that the site is in the floodplain and that structures which would impede the flow of water will put residents at risk. Identifies that the site is also within a Zone 1 Source Protection Zone and adjacent to Bewdley's pumping station. Waste water and sewerage would have to be pumped to a place above the site to counter the risk of</p>	<p>Objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople are noted.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>The alternative of using brownfield sites is noted. However, it should be noted that a number of these sites were considered through the report but were not suitable or available for a number of different reasons.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>contamination. This would be costly.</p> <p>Outlines potential impacts on local residents including, reduction in property values and negative impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>Does not object to occasional fairs but feels that the availability of the site because of its ownership should not be a reason for overriding fundamental planning criteria.</p>	<p>provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Any site layout/design, should the site be deemed acceptable, would need to take into account the location of sewerage infrastructure and ensure that it is safe and does not risk contamination of nearby resources.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1126</a>	Bewdley Town Council	<p>Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Believes that the Council should challenge the assumption on which the requirement for additional pitches is based and ask to what</li> </ul>	<p>The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>extent have the other Councils in Worcestershire used this methodology to assess their own need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• The site is in the floodplain.</li> <li>• The site is adjacent to the Severn Trent pumping station and the area is classed as "Source Protection Zone 1" meaning there is a risk of pollution.</li> <li>• There is no sewerage on site, if this was to be provided on-site less space would be available for pitches and if it was off-site new connections would need to be established which would be expensive.</li> <li>• The site is located on the main A456 which carries a high volume of fast moving traffic which will create difficulty for accessing the site.</li> <li>• Residents on the site will be subject to considerable noise and light pollution, the traffic noise generated from the by-pass would require protective bunds, again reducing space for pitches.</li> <li>• There are no school places, particularly at the primary schools meaning children would have to travel further afield.</li> <li>• This is a significant site in terms of environmental amenity and is a gateway to Bewdley. Developing this site would detract from the picnic area and reduce the number</li> </ul>	<p>Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43 pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			of visitors.	<p data-bbox="1476 336 1648 368">pitches/plots.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 408 2040 1182">The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement. Furthermore, Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p data-bbox="1476 1225 2022 1358">The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS963</a>	Blakiston J	Objects to the Stourport Road site as the site would not get planning permission for standard housing, it will have an adverse impact on the car-park, it will reduce the number of visitors to the town, and consideration needs to be given to the impact on a lovely part of the River.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS692</a>	Blewett J	Objects to the Stourport Road site as there is enough provision within Stourport-on-Severn and new sites will not attract new businesses to the area or provide jobs.	The comments in relation to the regeneration of Stourport-on-Severn are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1085</a>	Boddice M	Is Green Belt and in Conservation Area. Also flood risk	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>It should be noted that this site does not lie within a Conservation Area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1220</a>	Bolton P	The reason I am objecting to the Bewdley site plan is the fact that it's building on a floodplain, extra traffic on a very busy road and too near for the safety of children, and dangerous to the car park, and the extra traffic will only add to the congested school traffic then, there is the fact that it is Green Belt land.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access/traffic to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS663</a>	Bough G	Objects to the site at Stourport Road Bewdley as there are enough sites in the area. The site is a beautiful area beside the river and any site would ruin this.	Objection is noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS665</a>	Bough J	Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley as there are enough sites in the area. The site is a beautiful area beside the river and any site would ruin this.	Objection is noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS716</a>	Bowker N	Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley on the basis that access would create a highway safety issue, the risk of contamination of the water bore hole, and the risk of flooding.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS647</a>	Broom L	Objects to the Stourport Road site as it is in the flood plain, there will be a detrimental visual impact, and there will be an impact on the picnic area. Raises concerns over how the site will be contained and monitored and over the number of vehicles, horses and animals that will be allowed to be kept on the site.	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS108</a>	Buckley A	Believes that the site is unsuitable as its in the Green Belt and in Flood Zone 2.	Noted. The Draft NNPf reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. We note the comments relating to Flood Zone 2 and

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				have consulted the Environment Agency to gauge their views on the suitability of the site which we are currently awaiting.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS109</a>	Buckley A	There are no vacancies at the Bewdley School. Concerned where school places will be found for any children on the site.	Noted. As part of the comprehensive consultation process the District Council has consulted Worcestershire County Council as the Local Education Authority in relation to capacity issues at local schools. Their comments are awaited.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS110</a>	Buckley A	Site adjacent to River Severn - dangerous for children living on the site.	The concerns relating to safety are noted. It should be noted that there are other settled families living in close proximity to the river and these issues also apply to them.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS111</a>	Buckley A	Access from the A449 will be difficult as it is already a very busy road. It is an accident blackspot.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS112</a>	Buckley A	Could adversely impact on the number of visitors in the area.	Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS113</a>	Buckley A	Local residents have contacted me expressing fear of increased crime in the area.	The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS617</a>	Caffery V	Objects to the Stourport Road site because of access problems and concerns relating to increased	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			crime and reduced property values.	requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS50</a>	Carney D	Considers there are no facilities available in Bewdley - access to water, electricity, who would pay for this? What cost is there to the travellers and will they be responsible for clearing up and maintaining their site?	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues. Should this site be allocated for pitch provision through the development plan process then it may be managed privately and residents would pay an annual maintenance fee.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS51</a>	Carney D	Several sites in and around Stourport-on-Severn. Do travellers want to be displaced from sites they are already using and from their families and networks?	Noted. Stourport Town Council has issued a holding objection to the District Council stating that it considers that Stourport-on-Severn has provided more than its fair share of Gypsy and Traveller pitches over the years within the District. Currently the majority of Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision is located in this area and sites are becoming overcrowded.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS47</a>	Carney D	Objects to the proposed site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at Stourport Road, Bewdley. Specifically moved to Bewdley from Birmingham to live and be surrounded by natural beauty. Having a Gypsy site would totally evaporate the natural beauty of the area and create busy roads. Would increase traffic pollution overall. Visual and physical spaces improve and enhance human and animal welfare.	Objections are noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the area are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS600</a>	Clegg J	The site is much too near local schools and residential properties which already have parking and road problems at least twice every day when children are collected from school.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS29</a>	Clifford Gainger Will Trust	Objects to the potential for the site at Stourport Road Bewdley to make provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Acts for the Clifford Grainger Will Trust - who are appalled that this site has even been considered. Have recently sold nearby land to the County Council for playing field provision. Site is adjacent to Water Works and	The objection is noted. The comments relating to adjacent land uses are useful and will be taken into account when a decision is taken as to whether any of the sites should be allocated for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			picnic site. Vehemently object to the proposals.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS266</a>	Cole B	The site is very near a school also concerns over the mess left by travellers in the past.	Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS78</a>	Collings A	Objects to proposal to use site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for gypsy and traveller provision due to environmental impact, danger of increased traffic, policing implications, flood plain location, stretched local resources, contravention of Article 8 of the ECHR impact on family life.	<p>Comments are noted. Article 8(1) sets out that any interference must be in accordance with legitimate circumstances as set out within Article 8(2). These circumstances are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• acting in the interest of national security, public safety or the economy of the nation</li> <li>• acting for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others</li> <li>• acting for the protection of disorder or crime</li> <li>• acting for the protection of health or morals.</li> </ul> <p>A balance needs to be struck between the Human Rights of all people. Consideration needs to be given to whether or not it would</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>be proportionate to rule out any site on the basis of the provisions in Article 8(1) of the ECHR.</p> <p>It is considered that the measures being taken by the District Council in relation to planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are not in contravention of Article 8 of The European Convention on Human Rights.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS79</a>	Collings A	<p>The Human Rights Act dictates that you, being a local authority must respect and adhere to The European Convention of Human Rights (ECHR). Will directly effect value of my property which will deprive me of this fiscal asset in direct contravention of the First Protocol. WFDC will be in breach of European Law.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Article 8(1) sets out that any interference must be in accordance with legitimate circumstances as set out within Article 8(2). These circumstances are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• acting in the interest of national security, public safety or the economy of the nation</li> <li>• acting for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others</li> <li>• acting for the protection of disorder or crime</li> <li>• acting for the protection of health or morals.</li> </ul> <p>A balance needs to be struck between the Human Rights of all people. Consideration needs to be given to whether or not it would</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>be proportionate to rule out any site on the basis of the provisions in Article 8(1) of the ECHR.</p> <p>It is considered that the measures being taken by the District Council in relation to planning for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople are not in contravention of Article 8 of The European Convention on Human Rights.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS36</a>	Combes C	Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. Impact on local road network and the area falls within the Green Belt.	Objection is noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS371</a>	Connolly J	Site is at gateway to historic town - not appropriate use. Reference to rubbish left behind by illegal encampments.	Objections are noted. The impact on this gateway into the town will need to be considered. Should a permanent site be considered acceptable in this area then it will need to be managed accordingly to ensure that local amenity is protected
Object	<a href="#">GTTS956</a>	Cook J	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This potential site is part of the Green Belt and therefore should not be included. The saying is that we don't know what we have</li> </ul>	Noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>until it's gone - as far as the Green Belt locally is concerned though the many people I've spoken to value and treasure it now and want it to remain green.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For 70+ million of us to live in harmony on this tiny island we <b>all</b> need to conform to the same democratic rules (even if sometimes we do not like or agree with them). Caravans and houses should be viewed in the same way as they are of course used for the same purpose.</li> </ul>	traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS806</a>	Cotterill S	Site not suitable for Bewdley area	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS205</a>	Cullen A	The Bewdley Site is close to the Children's School therefore objects to it.	The concerns are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1102</a>	Darby R	Object	Objection noted
Object	<a href="#">GTTS712</a>	Davenport G	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because there are no school places available within Bewdley and children will have to travel to Kidderminster to attend school.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS620</a>	Davies A	Objects to the site at Stourport Road because it is an important area of Green Belt, it is in flood zone 2,	Objections to the site are noted.

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>it contains the bore hole for Bewdley's drinking water, it is too close to the picnic area, it will be visible from the by-pass, the detrimental impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Raises concerns over the number of plots needed when Worcester have no provision.</p> <p>Raises concern regarding the disruption that the children will cause in schools by attending for a short time then moving on.</p>	<p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS301</a>	Davies Mrs E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fair and equitable distribution across county should be part of the equation ensuring that financial burden is spread.</li> <li>• Highways - dangerous entrance/exist onto very busy road.</li> <li>• Environment - possible damage. Noise and light pollution.</li> <li>• Water Supply - bore hole - Town water supply.</li> <li>• Green Belt - there are no exceptional reasons for breaking into the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Education - Bewdley schools are full.</li> <li>• Economy - such a site may damage a vital</li> </ul>	<p>Objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople is noted.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>gateway to Bewdley thus damaging tourism and economic well being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding - the site is in the flood plain.</li> <li>• Sewage - no infrastructure in vicinity.</li> </ul>	<p>planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1037</a>	Davies S	Object for these reasons:	The objections to the use of this site for

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Important area of Green Belt - development should not be allowed</li> <li>2.In flood zone 2</li> <li>3.Contains bore hole for town's water supply - potential contamination</li> <li>4.Adjacent picnic site</li> <li>5.Area of outstanding beauty</li> <li>6. Impact on gateway to town - visible from bypass and Blackstone - negative impact on tourism</li> <li>7.Noise and light pollution affects site</li> <li>8.Impact on wildlife and flowers</li> <li>9.Local people do not want site to go ahead</li> <li>10.Wyre Forest already provides more sites than Worcester. Why do we need to provide still more?</li> <li>11. Impact on local schools</li> <li>12. Increase in traffic on Stourport Road</li> <li>13. Bewdley does not have resources to cope -</li> </ol>	<p>traveller pitch provision are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>minimal policing and few facilities for youth</p> <p>14. Suggest use land adjacent new council HQ on Stourport Road Kidderminster</p>	<p>of the planning process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1181</a>	Deakin G	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the requirement set out within the Core Strategy reflects current need as it is based on 2008 data.</li> <li>• The site is Green Belt and no very special circumstances exist to support the proposal.</li> <li>• The site is within the floodplain.</li> <li>• The site contains the groundwater borehole which feeds part of Bewdley.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is a groundwater holding site.</li> <li>• The sewerage requirements would overwhelm the current sewerage system.</li> <li>• The site will suffer from noise and light pollution from the adjacent by-pass.</li> <li>• The site would not get planning permission for a private dwelling so should not be considered for a Traveller site.</li> <li>• The site forms a gateway into Bewdley and is a well used parking area, the site will discourage visitors.</li> <li>• The increase in traffic on an already busy road will be detrimental to the junction.</li> <li>• It is believed the site was compulsory purchased from a farmer and sold to a local gypsy family undermining the aim of being open and transparent in consultation.</li> <li>• The site would require an ecological assessment.</li> </ul>	<p>to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>We will carefully consider objections alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk and water safety are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency and Severn Trent. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS215</a>	de Groot M	Raises questions to be addressed by Council Members. In summary:	The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>- Why does Wyre Forest need to host so many sites and how does this compare with the other Districts in the area?</p> <p>-Potential pollution on the site - it is close to a water pumping station.</p>	<p>needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>The requirement to provide additional pitches comes from the West Midlands Regional Gypsy &amp; Traveller Accommodation Assessment. The figure set out for WFD up to 2013 was for 30 pitches. Figures for the later period taken from the evidence collected to inform the preparation of the RSS (specified 43 pitches to 2017, 15 by 2022 and 15 by 2027). WFDC has revisited this work and considered that a more appropriate no to plan for is 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of 15 up to 22 given the planning constraints that exist within the District relating to flooding and Green Belt. Each of the Worcestershire Districts will be required to allocate pitch provision in the same way that the Wyre Forest District is required to. Wychavon has provided a significant number of additional pitches in recent years to meet historical demand.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS875</a>	Duffy L	Object to sites at Bewdley and Manor Farm. Ok	Comments are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			with extending other already established sites.	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1206</a>	Elliott G	Site is unsuitable - flood plain, Green Belt, use at odds with leisure/tourism/recreation/employment of a Georgian town.	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS481</a>	Farmer Mr	Raises concerns about the impact on wildlife, the impact on the water bore hole and the impact on the landscape. Suggests Redditch and Bromsgrove should have some sites as Wyre Forest already provides.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process. An assessment of need has been undertaken on a Countywide basis and targets for pitch provision established for each District. All are required under national planning policy to identify allocated sites for authorised sites. It is not just the case for the Wyre Forest District.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS596</a>	Farmer N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Blackstone Rock on the Stourport Road in Bewdley is a popular picnic site but it is also grade 2 flood plain.</li> <li>It is certainly not suited to permanent pitches for large numbers of residents. At a stretch, it might suit Travelling Showpeople storage as their equipment can be moved more effectively in times of flood, but that would be unsightly in such an exposed position.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted as is the potential to consider Travelling Showpeople within this area.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1095</a>	Felthouse A	Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site because it is a gateway to the town, it is adjacent to the picnic site, it will reduce people visiting Bewdley and contributing to the economy, it is contrary to the mission statement of the Worcestershire LEP, it is in	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>the floodplain, it is in the Green Belt, it is next to a water station and in the Source Protection Zone, there would be a significant increase in traffic at a busy road junction, and the site would increase demand for school places.</p>	<p>Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS992</a>	Felthouse J	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site because it is adjacent to the water works which supplies Bewdley's drinking water, it is Green Belt, it is in the floodplain, it is a gateway to the town and adjacent to a popular picnic area, it would make regeneration/tourism more difficult to achieve, there are no public transport links, access is directly onto the by-pass which is not suitable, the bund required to shelter the site from the by-pass traffic noise would be a blot on the landscape.</p> <p>Suggests the former National Standard site would</p>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			be more appropriate.	<p>have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers and Severn Trent.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The alternative site suggestion is noted and</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				officers will research its availability and suitability for gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS876</a>	Field M	<p>Objects to the site at Stourport Road for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate development within the Green Belt, would harm open, rural and undeveloped character of the Green Belt in this area</li> <li>• Detract from a beauty spot</li> <li>• Storage of large 'show' vehicles would be unsightly</li> <li>• On a flood plain and therefore has stability and drainage issues</li> <li>• Would create further problems in terms of highway access and safety on a very busy road, near a roundabout</li> <li>• Not being made in consultation with local schools or the Local Education Authority</li> <li>• Add to the problems of sewerage drainage currently experience by residents in the vicinity - this is a significant health and safety hazard</li> <li>• Going to have an adverse impact on tourism</li> <li>• Costly - requiring the introduction of all major services (sewerage, electricity etc)</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS914</a>	Flack H	The land is in the flood plain. It is unsuitable for any kind of development	Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS819</a>	Flegg M	This is designated as Green Belt land (as per Dale Farm) and is in close proximity to an existing car park & picnic site.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1059</a>	Fletcher N	Objects to Stourport Road site as it is in the Green Belt, it is too large for the area to sustain and is highly visible. Feels it would have a devastating impact on tourism.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS587</a>	Frow J	The site is on Green Belt and in a flood zone and	Objections are noted. Although it is

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>there is not sufficient exceptional need to enable the planning guidelines/laws to be overruled.</p> <p>Access is unsuitable.</p> <p>There will be considerable light pollution.</p> <p>There will be a risk of pollution if flooded, and it is near a water treatment works.</p>	<p>recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS713</a>	Frow J	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site on the basis that it is in the Green Belt, the access is not suitable, there would be an increase in traffic, there	Objections are noted.

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>is a risk of pollution as a result of flooding, it would cause light pollution and there are no school places. Questions whether a bat survey has been undertaken.</p>	<p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies,</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1262</a>	Gardner P	Proposal is start of losing Green Belt between Bewdley and Stourport-on-Severn; extra traffic would compound problem caused by schools; in flood plain.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The highways concerns relating to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS200</a>	Goddard S	People will not park their cars here for fear of theft. It is also on a floodplain. Raises issue of lighting. Will be extremely difficult to police. House prices will drop in the area. Residents of Bewdley paid a lot of money to live here. If I was homeless I would get put in Windermere house not a beautiful nature reserve!	Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the local environment and residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1242</a>	Golborne M	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because it would spoil a lovely area for walking, it is in the Green Belt, it is near to the river and could be liable to flooding, the site is undeveloped land, it would be expensive to install services. How would the site be financed? Surely other sites such as Sion Hill have better access to services, home prices will drop, how will the people moving onto the site find jobs?	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p> <p>Support for the Sion Hill School site is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS307</a>	Greenhow F	<p>Raises concerns regarding reduction in visitors to the picnic area and loss of trade to Bewdley. Eyesore at a gateway site which is a beautiful area.</p>	<p>Objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS504</a>	Green S	<p>Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Station - strongly recommended that</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>the site is NOT used in case of contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt - If it can't be used for buildings how can it be used for a permanent gypsy site of this size?</li> <li>• Tourism &amp; Business - The proposed site is opposite the Poppy Field and is part of an area that was designated a place of beauty. The site will directly abut the car park and picnic site used by 100's of visitors to the town throughout the year. The presence of a gypsy site "over the hedge" could detract from this. Often the visitors that park here then walk into the town along the river and boost the town's economy as a result.</li> <li>• Gateway to Bewdley - The site will be visible to all visitors as they enter Bewdley. The impact will be considerable from the by-pass, which has a stretch of elevated road leaving the site "fully exposed" to passing traffic.</li> <li>• Flood Plain - This site is part of the flood plain and as such should not be built on. The downstream implications of a flooded gypsy site and the associated "flotsam and jetsam" through the town are very worrying indeed.</li> <li>• Local Infrastructure &amp; Resources - The site will potentially accommodate over 100 people. Bewdley does not have the resources to easily accommodate such a large site. There is very little policing in</li> </ul>	<p>companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Bewdley and the lack of facilities for the young people in Bewdley is already causing problems - these issues are only likely to become more acute if the site should go ahead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are not enough school places for the families the site will house. In reality, families living in the out lying areas of Far Forest and Arley are likely to be displaced from Bewdley schools to make room for these additional families that are supposedly transient.</li> </ul> <p>I understand these sites are being created to make it easier to evict travellers from illegal sites. However, it seems a nonsense to try to solve a problem in Wyre forest that probably occurs once a year in one location, by creating a potential problem that will occur all year round in potentially seven locations!</p>	<p>Officers.</p> <p>Sites are being considered as the Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS628</a>	Green S	Objects to the Stourport Road site. Concern about the effect on businesses.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS717</a>	Guest N	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site is in the flood plain.</li> <li>Site is next to the water bore hole which presents a pollution risk.</li> <li>Increased traffic congestion.</li> <li>Negative impact on tourism.</li> </ul>	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No school places available.</li> </ul>	<p>capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS837</a>	Hadley P	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site on the basis that it is in the floodplain which will have to be protected by defences when the Council have abolished ours because they are too costly.</p> <p>Objects because the site is in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Raises concerns about the impact on tourism and the lack of school places.</p>	<p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about impact on services and facilities are noted and will be carefully considered alongside representations from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS669</a>	Hannon M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is Green Belt land.</li> <li>2. Inappropriate access to and from proposed site.</li> <li>3. House prices will be lowered leading to requests for Council Tax to be re-evaluated.</li> <li>4. Local people cannot get their children into Bewdley High School without additional children.</li> <li>5. Area could suffer flooding.</li> </ol>	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS610</a>	Harrison S	Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is in the floodplain, it is on Green Belt land, there are not enough school places, there are concerns about anti-social behaviour and limited policing in the area, there are concerns about the impact on tourism and there are concerns about increased traffic.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS696</a>	Hartwell S	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because it is very visible and will have a detrimental impact on tourism and the natural beauty of the area.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS534</a>	Hayden L	Objects to Stourport Road, Bewdley for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Station - concerned about impact and potential contamination on the station that serves all of Bewdley, which is adjacent to the site.</li> <li>• Green Belt - inappropriate to develop on Green Belt - other site in Bewdley was dismissed because of this reason.</li> <li>• Location near to the poppy field and concerned about the associated impact on</li> </ul>	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>tourism within this important gateway. Bewdley relies on Tourism and will impact on the whole town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located on the flood plain so should not be considered as it is at risk of flood.</li> <li>• The site will potentially home 100+ people. The is likely to be a significant increase in traffic on that junction and could pose a threat to school children.</li> <li>• Lack of resources in Bewdley to accommodate a site - very little policing and facilities for young people.</li> <li>• There are not enough school places for the families the site will house, families from Far Forest and Arley are likely to be displaced.</li> </ul>	<p>importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS808</a>	Hendy A	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site on the basis that it is in the floodplain which will have to be protected by defences when the Council have abolished ours because they are too costly.	Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Objects because the site is in Green Belt.</p> <p>Raises concerns about the impact on tourism and the lack of school places.</p>	<p>any possible new site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about impact on services and facilities are noted and will be carefully considered alongside representations from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1093</a>	Hill A	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is within the Green Belt, within flood zones 1 and 2, within the Source Protection Zone, the Severn Trent main water pipe runs through the site, amenity buildings will be more like houses and will dominate the hamlet of Blackstone, there will be a detrimental impact on the landscape, and there will be a reduced number of visitors.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1173</a>	Hill H	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is in the Green Belt, it is close to the Severn Trent borehole and this could lead to contamination of the drinking water supply.</p> <p>All people deserve a decent place to live, the proposed site is just metres away from the A456 and this will be unbelievably noisy, the area is also illuminated by street lights all night, and the field floods every seven years on average. It is therefore not suitable for anybody to live on.</p>	<p>Concerns about flood risk and the Severn Trent borehole are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency and Severn Trent. The potential of flood risk and groundwater contamination will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority are also a statutory consultee for this process and any</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				comments from them will be considered when determining any allocations.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1154</a>	Hill L	Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is in the Groundwater Source Protection Zone, it is in the floodplain and contrary to advice set out within PPS25, a local amenity site will be lost, It is in the Green Belt and contrary to advice set out within PPG2, it is contrary to policy CP06 of the Adopted Core Strategy, and it will incur significant on-going costs.	<p>Objections are noted. Concerns relating to the Groundwater Source Protection Zone and flooding are noted and will be considered alongside comments from the Environment Agency who are a Statutory consultee.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The Adopted Core Strategy sets out criteria to guide the determination of planning applications, and the allocations of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The policy was used to inform the Baker Report however, given the difficulty in finding suitable sites for this use, these criteria are guidelines only and can not always be met on every site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1088</a>	Hill M	<p>Object to the Stourport Road Bewdley site. Question how Baker Associates could describe the landscape as unremarkable, feels the picnic site should have been an indication that people come here to enjoy the area and this would be deterred if a Gypsy site was here.</p> <p>Raises the issue of the water pumping station and the restrictions on how land above the pipeline is used, raises the Source Protection Zone, the floodplain and the fact that it will be a sizeable development once amenity blocks are taken into</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>consideration, this would dominate the hamlet of Blackstone.</p> <p>The site is not appropriate for normal residential dwellings because it is undeveloped land within the Green Belt, it is within flood zone 2/3, and it lies within Source Protection Zone 1, therefore it should not be considered for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</p>	<p>of the planning process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS799</a>	Hill R	Unsuitable for proposed use due to flooding issues, Green Belt and access issues.	<p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS279</a>	Hipkins D	<p>Considers there are clear planning issues relating to this site: water supply issues, Green Belt - how can it be used for a permanent gypsy site? Damage to the immediate area and landscape. Site will be visible to all visitors - impact on local tourism; flood plain; significant issues relating to flooding; lack of resources to accommodate the extra population.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS269</a>	Hobson K	Raises concern over effluent disposal at the site. The amount of traffic to and from a 15 pitch site (or a Showperson's site) on and off the By-Pass would be far too excessive to be permitted and would be contrary to all the reasons for constructing the By-	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			Pass in the first place.	sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1035</a>	Hodges H	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site and feels that the issue of more travelling children needing places in school has not been sufficiently addressed; raises concern that travellers may be there short term but that they will need school places and this may mean that people living permanently in Bewdley can not attend their local school. Raises concern that there is nowhere for young people to go and questions whether there will be more policing as there will be more young people in the town centre.</p> <p>Questions why a site is being considered in Bewdley.</p> <p>Requests that views and concerns be addressed in more detail at the next meeting and that consideration is given to people who already live in Bewdley.</p>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1040</a>	Hopkins T	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is in a beautiful area and is a gateway to Bewdley. Refers to caravans staying on the site recently and leaving rubbish. Also suggests that it is not an appropriate use adjacent to the picnic area and that it would</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			have a detrimental impact on highway safety.	England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS180</a>	Howarth R	Site imposes on the Green Belt. Surely there is enough land in Wyre Forest that is not Green Belt to support such a site - plenty of brownfield sites? It would spoil a beautiful area left to wildlife and walkers.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS354</a>	Hughes A	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Green Belt.</li> <li>2. Flood plain.</li> <li>3. Borehole on site (fear of contamination).</li> <li>4. Pumping station adjacent.</li> <li>5. Extra traffic exiting onto A456.</li> <li>6. Local schools overstretched.</li> <li>7. Increased demand on local services.</li> <li>8. Area of great beauty - negative impact on gateway to town.</li> <li>9. Rubbish concerns.</li> <li>10. Impact on property values.</li> </ol>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS921</a>	Hughes A	<p>Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is Green Belt - would this land be granted planning permission for small starter homes? No!</li> <li>• Understands that the Council must put forward potential sites but this beautiful unspoilt area is not suitable</li> <li>• Who will pay for the provision of services</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>It should be noted that many of the gypsy</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>(electricity, water, sewerage etc.) to this site if opened to gypsies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the impact on the adjacent car park and it becoming an overspill for the planned gypsy site and the potential impact on the business that is currently running from there and the affect on visitor numbers it would have</li> <li>• In the past travellers have 'pitched' on the car park and left behind a burnt out caravan - a small sign of things to come</li> <li>• Concerned about the impact on the economy and the potential decrease in tourism that would occur</li> <li>• Concerned about the impact on school services as these can become inaccessible to local families once gypsies take over</li> <li>• I pay a premium (Council Tax rates) to live in Bewdley, if the doors open up, why should I continue to pay my way? I may well cancel my council tax direct debit if this happens.</li> </ul>	<p>sites - should they go ahead on any of the identified sites, will be privately managed which would not incur a cost on the tax payer. Residents of the sites will also pay Council Tax.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service issues.</p> <p>The impact on tourism and the economy will need to be considered when a decision on potential allocations of sites are taken.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS782</a>	Hughes M	<p>Object for following reasons:</p> <p>area of outstanding beauty - countryside walks and cycle tracks from site; borehole supplies Bewdley's</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			water; is only free car park for visitors to town; on floodplain and in Green Belt	<p>Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1200</a>	Humphrey D	<p>Object on following grounds:</p> <p>Green Belt - would not allow residential development; gateway site - development would have detrimental effect; impact on beauty spot and</p>	<p>Objection is noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			leisure uses; site would suffer from traffic noise and lighting would impact on local amenity; severe road hazard - close to schools and leisure centre.	<p>be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS762</a>	Jennings S	Wyre Forest already has its fair share of gypsy sites. Neighbouring areas should provide sites.	The requirement to provide the additional pitches comes from the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment undertaken for the West Midlands Region, which identified the need for each District Authority up until 2013, the figure for Wyre Forest District being 30 pitches. The RSS outlined that the District should provide 43

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>pitches by 2017 with a further 15 by 2022 and another 15 by 2027. The Council has revisited the original work undertaken to inform this requirements and considers that a more appropriate number to plan for would be 35 pitches by 2017 and an indicative target of an additional 15 by 2022. This is considered to be the most up to date reflection of need for pitches by all the Worcestershire District authorities.</p> <p>The comments in relation to the Localism Bill and the Government's Review of Planning Policy are important. However, this does not remove the need for Local Authorities to allocate sites for Gypsy &amp; Traveller Provision in the future. The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS310</a>	Johnston D	This area which is part of the flood plain would be	Objection is noted. The Environment

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			totally unfair to the travelling community. There will be a risk of damage and loss to their property and disruption to their lives. It is wrong to put people with little security and low incomes on a site which puts them at a real risk of further hardship and disruption.	Agency have been consulted as part of the consultation process and flood risk is a key consideration for this site that will need to be understood.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS306</a>	Johnston I	A repetition of Dale Farm will become a reality in Bewdley. This would then have even greater significance to the likely traffic hazard and the life of Bewdley town and its tourist attraction. Within Stourport-on-Severn there are such sites and in fact it would make better sense to open a new site within one of those areas.	<p>Objection is noted. Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Options for site provision in Stourport-on-Severn is also being considered.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS981</a>	Jones A	Objects to the Stourport Road site as the site would not get planning permission for standard housing, it will have an adverse impact on the car-park, and it will reduce the number of visitors to the town.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				level of need.  The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1004</a>	Jones A	This is an incredibly beautiful area and I would not expect our Council to grant planning permission for any type of structure in this area. I have no doubt you would refuse such a request for any other housing or structures, temporary or otherwise, so why consider a travellers site? Any such site will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the car park and picnic area adjacent to it which draws significant numbers of visitors every weekend, many of whom go on walks that would include stopping for food or drink in Bewdley. I'm sure the use of this car park for tourists would decrease.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS566</a>	Jones I	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley Site for a number of reasons:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bewdley is thriving in difficult times and any development in or around the town must be controlled tightly - the proposal is the wrong town, the wrong location and it will damage a protected landscape and environment.</li> <li>2. The site is Green Belt and should be protected - brownfield sites should be utilised</li> </ol>	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>first, Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn have an abundance of brownfield land.</p> <p>3. Is groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, the most vulnerable zone, increasing development in this area would pose an unacceptable risk to the potable supply of water.</p> <p>4. Floodplain - the site is located within the floodplain and Bewdley's history shouts of the implications of development in the floodplain. It would be a ludicrous decision to choose consciously to develop an environmentally sensitive Green Belt site in the floodplain for residential use.</p> <p>5. The site is in an area of high amenity - a development in this tourist area next to a car park used by visitors will not be anything other than detrimental to the economy of the area.</p> <p>6. The site is within an area of geological importance - the site will be adjacent to the newly established Geopark Way. Blackstone Rock, the key local feature, immediately overlooks this site. The development would significantly alter the character of this view.</p> <p>7. The site has already suffered from illegal waste disposal activities - which had notable impacts on the beauty and amenity of this area.</p> <p>8. The site is within 100 metres of the</p>	<p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The cost of delivering any site will need to be considered when a final decision on allocation is made.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>increasingly popular Blackstone Farm nature reserve, owned by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>9. Cost. No financial information is provided with the supporting information. The financial status of WFDC is well publicised and I would expect to see a full cost-benefit analysis in support of these sites, particularly demonstrating their comparative costs to developing brownfield sites, bringing derelict land back into productive use, making use of existing infrastructure, etc.</p> <p>10. Need - this is a larger debate but an important consideration. Should these sites be required - would expect a competent local authority to choose the most appropriate sites. The site at Stourport Road, Bewdley simply is not an appropriate site for any development.</p>	<p>Need - The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1357</a>	Jones N	<p>Concerned at effect gypsy development on local area - travellers used site in summer and rubbish was left. Adjacent car park is busy at weekends and walkers and cyclists will need to access river alongside site. Concerned re environmental impact on River Severn.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS718</a>	Jones P	Green Belt.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS151</a>	King A	Proposed site right by water station which supplies all water for the town and is susceptible to pollution. Careless disposal of any waste material could pollute this site.	Noted. The District Council has consulted Severn Trent as part of the consultation period and their comments in relation to the water station will be considered very carefully when determining if any of the sites should go forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS152</a>	King A	The council can exercise special judgement to override the Green Belt issue however the other Bewdley site was dismissed as a result of protests over the use of Green Belt land and it didn't have any other real arguments.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS153</a>	King A	Concerns relating to the adverse impacts on the area and place of beauty.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS154</a>	King A	Likely to have a significant impact on the town's tourist trade. Impact on whole town - empty shops and loss of jobs.	Objection is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS155</a>	King A	Site is part of the flood plain. Planning guidelines recommend against approval of development on such sites.	Noted. The District Council has consulted the Environment Agency in relation to flooding issues and we await their views.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS156</a>	King A	Likely to be a significant increase in traffic on the junction. Site could home 100+ people. Could pose a threat to school children.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS157</a>	King A	Bewdley does not have the resources - very little policing and lack of facilities for young people already causing social problems. Issues will become more acute.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, West Mercia constabulary, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS158</a>	King A	Not enough school places for the families on the site. In reality families from the surrounding communities are likely to be displaced from Bewdley Schools.	As part of this consultation process, the District Council has asked for Worcestershire County Council's views as the Local Education Authority on school capacity issues in each of these areas.



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Their views will be particularly important in determining whether any of the sites should be taken forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS191</a>	King C	Site is in Flood Zone 2, caravans would be washed down the river and damage flood defences.	Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS192</a>	King C	Water station supplies water for the town - could be polluted through careless disposal of waste	Noted. The District Council has consulted Severn Trent as part of the consultation period and their comments in relation to the water station will be considered very carefully when determining if any of the sites should go forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS193</a>	King C	Area classed as Green Belt.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS194</a>	King C	Concerned about traffic increase along the Stourport Road. Increase of traffic problems and accidents - additional costs.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS195</a>	King C	Not enough school places for families on the site. In reality surrounding communities are likely to be displaced from Bewdley schools.	As part of this consultation process, the District Council has asked for Worcestershire County Council's views as the Local Education Authority on school

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				capacity issues in each of these areas. Their views will be particularly important in determining whether any of the sites should be taken forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS124</a>	King J	Site is right by a water station which supplies all the water for the town and susceptible to pollution. Careless disposal of waste material could pollute this site.	Noted. The District Council has consulted Severn Trent as part of the consultation period and their comments in relation to the water station will be considered very carefully when determining if any of the sites should go forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS125</a>	King J	The council can exercise special judgement to override the Green Belt issue however the other Bewdley site was dismissed as a result of protests over the use of Green Belt land and it didn't have any other real arguments	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need
Object	<a href="#">GTTS126</a>	King J	Concerns over the impact on the surrounding landscape and place of beauty.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS127</a>	King J	Site will have significant impact on tourist trade - empty shops and loss of jobs.	Objection is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS128</a>	King J	Part of the flood plain - planning guidelines recommend against approval of development on such sites.	Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS129</a>	King J	Significant increase in traffic on the junction. Site could potentially home 100+ people. Poses a threat to school children.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS130</a>	King J	No resources to accommodate such a large site. Little policing and lack of facilities for young people causing social problems. Issues will become more acute.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, West Mercia constabulary, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS131</a>	King J	Not enough school places for the families on the site. Surrounding communities are likely to be displaced from Bewdley Schools.	As part of this consultation process, the District Council has asked for Worcestershire County Council's views as the Local Education Authority on school

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				capacity issues in each of these areas. Their views will be particularly important in determining whether any of the sites should be taken forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1237</a>	Latimer I	Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site because it will increase traffic, it is on the flood plain, it is close to the bore hole, applications submitted in the past have been refused, it is in the Green Belt, and it will affect tourism.	<p>Objections are noted. The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1080</a>	Lawrence J	Green Belt should not be developed; subject to flooding; adjacent water abstraction borehole; would need costly infrastructure for waste disposal; extra traffic plus problem with noise from bypass bridge.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS980</a>	Leedham-Green K	<p>Concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Situated at a major entrance point to a tourist town</li> <li>• Judging the precedent set by the three illegally parked travellers' caravans after the summer circus event, the squalor is an indication of what to expect</li> <li>• the soil is granular and there is accordingly a pollution issue</li> <li>• Don't set precedent allowing mobile dwellings on a Greenfield site</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1111</a>	Lewis S	Objects to the site. Raises concern in relation to the water supply and location of the water station, Green Belt location, impact on the surrounding landscape and biodiversity, impact on local trade, traffic impacts and inability of local services to cope.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1292</a>	Longmore B	Strongly objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because it is situated in the Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area and is particularly valuable as an area of natural beauty. The sandstone rock faces and poppy fields are	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>particularly attractive and draw in visitors.</p> <p>The site is in flood zone 2 and the Groundwater Protection Area Zone 1 which makes it inappropriate for development.</p>	<p>and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions to mitigate this.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1094</a>	Luxford G	<p>Gateway to Bewdley - prominent from main routes into town and from Severn Valley Railway - will detract from tourist appeal.</p> <p>Landscape Value - outstanding beauty of Severn Valley with Blackstone Rock outcrop. Bypass has opened up wonderful views of river and provided crossing point for walkers on several long distance routes. Poppy field attracts large numbers of</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>visitors. Presence of travellers site will detract from the appeal of the area.</p> <p>Green Belt - development would be detrimental to purposes of Green Belt and against policy.</p> <p>Flooding - in flood zone 2 and liable to flood - any bunding or hardstandings will exacerbate problems. Low lying site will make surface water and foul water drainage hard to achieve.</p> <p>Ground Pollution - risk of pollution from diesel oil, petrol and other harmful chemicals leaking into ground.</p> <p>Impact on nearby residential area - will reduce value of property and will have negative impact on character of area.</p> <p>Temporary use of site as fairground - this does not make site suitable for permanent occupation - activities on site would be much harder to control.</p> <p>Availability - site has recently been purchased by someone wanting to promote use as gypsy site - but for planning reasons outlined, such a use should not even be considered. Availability has been given too much weighting.</p> <p>Urge the Council to withdraw site from list and to</p>	<p>consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			provide strengthened recognition of its landscape value with affirmation of its protected status and designation within an appropriate use category.	be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1016</a>	MacAulay S	Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS984</a>	MacDougall G	Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is not an area where planning permission would usually be granted, it will prevent visitors from coming to the picnic site and reduce visitor numbers to Bewdley, and questions the impact on a beautiful stretch of the River Severn.	<p>Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment, and this will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1161</a>	Mace A	Objects to the Stourport Road site. Believes the issue should be considered on a County wide basis as Wyre Forest District already has more pitches	Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>than Malvern and Redditch. Objects to the site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is within the Green Belt</li> <li>• It lies within an area of natural beauty with a major landscape feature opposite (poppy field)</li> <li>• It is one of the gateways into Bewdley, a tourist Town</li> <li>• It is within a flood zone 2</li> <li>• There is a bore hole on the site</li> <li>• Environment agency classification 'source protection zone 1'</li> <li>• No water or sewage provision on site</li> <li>• Will be considerable noise and light pollution</li> <li>• Access to and from site extremely dangerous on highway grounds</li> <li>• The Bewdley Schools are currently full</li> </ul>	<p>Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots. The District Council is awaiting further clarification from the Department for Communities and Local Government in relation to this requirement within the finalised Planning Policy Statement.</p> <p>The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk and water supply</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Comments relating to highway safety and school places are noted and will be considered alongside those received from the Highways Authority and the Local Education Authority who are both statutory consultees.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1300</a>	Mackett D	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a zone 1 site for water protection and is susceptible to pollution.</li> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• The site is opposite the famous poppy field and is an area of natural beauty.</li> <li>• Blackstone is a popular site for walking and fishing.</li> <li>• The site is in the floodplain.</li> <li>• There will be a significant increase in traffic posing a threat to school children.</li> <li>• Bewdley does not have the infrastructure to accommodate such a large site.</li> <li>• There are not enough school places.</li> <li>• Gypsy and Traveller sites bring unrest and</li> </ul>	<p>Objection to this site for use for Gypsies/Travellers is noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>crime to the surrounding area, recent issues in Stourport-on-Severn demonstrate this.</p>	<p>any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The concerns relating to traffic are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS77</a>	Madden P	Objects to the potential use of the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision. It is Green Belt land. Impact on Blackstone Picnic area contentious. County Council is surprised that the site is being considered due to the impact on the landscape. The area is the open gateway into Bewdley, blight it and people will go elsewhere.	The concerns relating to the landscape character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire County Council Landscape Officers, Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process and we await their views.. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS150</a>	Madden P	Object.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1108</a>	Madden P	It would appear that a significant pipeline passes at 45% angle across the whole field and certain Deeds Of Grant and Grantor's Restrictive Covenants put a number of restrictions on the use of the land.  1. not to erect, construct or place or permit or knowingly suffer to be erected constructed or place upon, under or over the strip of land any building, wall or other structure or erection or any work of any kind, whether permanent or temporary.  2. not to permit or knowingly suffer anything in or on or under the strip of land or any adjoining land of the	Noted. This information is particularly useful and the District Council will consult with the relevant utility company to obtain more information in relation to the pipeline and the restrictions it places on the use of the land.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>Grantor.</p> <p>3. not to use the surface of the strip of land otherwise than for agricultural or garden purposes but not for the planting of trees or shrubs.....no pipes, wires, cables, posts, poles, timber, stone or materials or substance shall be erected, placed or constructed thereon or thereunder.</p> <p>4. not to alter or permit or knowingly suffer to be altered the level of the surface of the strip of land.</p>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS661</a>	Main A	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because it is in close proximity to the water station, it is in the Green Belt, it is a gateway to Bewdley, and it will increase the traffic at the junction and along the Stourport Road which is already very busy.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS646</a>	Main J	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site as it is too close to the bore hole and it is in the Green Belt. The response also raises concerns about the impact on tourism and traffic, and the lack of school places.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS898</a>	Marchant J	<p>I object to the site being at Blackstone because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk of flooding</li> <li>2. Proximity to local parking/walking venue</li> <li>3. Not a big enough site</li> <li>4. Possible contamination of bore hole</li> <li>5. Are proper amenities available?</li> <li>6. Local schools already full</li> </ol>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The site is considered to be of a sufficient size to accommodate a potential development</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS895</a>	Marchant M	<p>Objects to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley site on the basis that the need has not been proven, the picnic site provides the only free parking for Bewdley, access onto the A454 is difficult, there is a danger of contamination of the bore hole, and the electric, gas, water and sewage requirements should have been considered before the proposals were made public.</p> <p>Feels that the consultation process has been handled badly with the sites being leaked to the papers early and the first meeting having to be cancelled because there was not space and at subsequent meetings people were not allowed to express their views.</p>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the consultation process are noted. However, it should be noted that this is a consultation process to gauge the public view on the potential for any of the identified sites to provide pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Showpeople. The District Council will assess whether there is potential to allocate any of the sites following detailed consideration of the consultation responses.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS922</a>	Mauger P	Objects to the Stourport Road site as it is a Green Belt area and an area of natural beauty used by ramblers. Feels that allowing this development would encourage further development in this area and expand the built development of Bewdley. Suggests that cleared brownfield sites in Oldington would be more appropriate.	<p>Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The suggested alternative area for site provision is noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1253</a>	Millichip D	Concerned over traffic implications of developing site	The concerns relating to traffic issues surrounding this site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS208</a>	Mills P	Site is Green Belt and designated beauty spot. Public will be vary wary of using the path if a gypsy site borders the river bank. People will feel intimidated. Properties in the vicinity will be devalued. Rubbish will need to be removed at tax payers expense.	Noted. Should any gypsy and traveller pitch provision be made on the site in the future it would need to be subject to a detailed planning application. Security issues would be a primary consideration and West Mercia Constabulary would be statutory consultees.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS280</a>	Minchin P	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site, believes it would be an awful site. The land is Green Belt and houses would not be allowed to be built there so why consider it for a Gypsy site? Raises concern over proximity to the poppy field and the impact on visitors to this area. Raises concern over increased crime in the town, raises concern over the lack of school places. Raises concern over the adjacent water pumping station and Source Protection Zone 1 and possible contamination issues.	<p>Objections to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers is noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies,</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS982</a>	Montague-Fuller L	Objects to the Stourport Road site on the basis that it is an area for tourism, and raises concern about pollution and waste in the river. Questions the need for additional sites in the District.	<p>Objections are noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1025</a>	Montague-Fuller L	Question why sites are being spread around the area rather than being confined to one or two areas	The Coalition Government's recent consultation (April 2011) on planning policy

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>which would be more beneficially socially and economically.</p> <p>Raises concern over the illegal use of some sites being allowed to continue and further sites still being allocated.</p> <p>Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site.</p>	<p>for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>Sites would still need to apply for planning permission and through this the amount of pitches stipulated - no further occupation would then be allowed and this would need to be enforced.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS842</a>	Morris M	<p>Site is close to picnic area, river walks and poppy field - gypsy site would deter visitors. Use money to provide toilets. Understand site is floodplain and nearby school is full. Site is poorly served by public transport - would need a car.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS660</a>	Murphy J	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site because it will have a detrimental impact on tourism, it is in the Green Belt, light pollution, it is located on a busy road and this is dangerous and noisy, it suffers from flooding, it is on the bore hole, it would increase traffic and it would increase traffic along the footpath making the school less secure.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS662</a>	Murphy J	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site because it will have a detrimental impact on tourism, it is in the Green Belt, light pollution, it is located on a busy</p>	<p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			road and this is dangerous and noisy, it suffers from flooding, it is on the bore hole, it would increase traffic and it would increase traffic along the footpath making the school less secure.	<p>County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS985</a>	Newton P	Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is within a beauty spot where permission would not be granted for any other development and it would have a detrimental impact on a picturesque location which would reduce visitor numbers.	<p>Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment, and this will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS688</a>	Orbell H	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site as Stourport-on-Severn already has provision for Gypsies and Travellers.	Objections are noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS778</a>	Pagett I	Objects on the basis that there are already enough Gypsy sites in Stourport-on-Severn, dentists, doctors and schools already struggle to accommodate residents, should not build on Green Belt or by nature reserves. Land should be used for affordable housing.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1295</a>	Parker G	Site is too near schools and houses. Site is area that visitors come too - needs to be welcoming and tidy.	<p>Objection is noted as are the concerns relating to the impact on the residential area. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS989</a>	Parker M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We re-built our house and had to supply samples of roof tiles/bricks for approval as they had to be in keeping with the houses along the road - so how can the Council use Green Belt land and a flood plain to accommodate Gypsies in caravans that are not in keeping with the beautiful area?</li> <li>• People travel many miles to visit this fabulous historical place and visit and shop in the town, people will be put off</li> <li>• The location is a gateway into Bewdley and it will affect the car park and the visitors to the Poppy field</li> <li>• Please re-think, this site is completely wrong</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS894</a>	Pearson Mr D	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is in the Green Belt;</li> <li>• the picnic site provides free parking for Bewdley Town Centre;</li> <li>• the need is not proven, and 15 pitches is too high a density;</li> <li>• slow moving large vehicles will create a traffic hazard;</li> <li>• the schools are full; and</li> <li>• there is a risk to water supply as the site is next to the bore hole.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the utility companies who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS567</a>	Pennington S	<p>Objects to Stourport Road, Bewdley for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt - inappropriate to develop on Green Belt - other site in Bewdley was dismissed because of this reason.</li> <li>• Water Station - concerned about impact and</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>potential contamination on the station that serves all of Bewdley, which is adjacent to the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location near to the poppy field and concerned about the associated impact on tourism within this important gateway. Bewdley relies on Tourism and will impact on the whole town.</li> <li>• Located on the flood plain so should not be considered as it is at risk of flood.</li> <li>• The site will potentially home 100+ people. The is likely to be a significant increase in traffic on that junction and could pose a threat to school children.</li> <li>• Lack of resources in Bewdley to accommodate a site - very little policing and facilities for young people.</li> <li>• Tourism - Bewdley is a premier destination for tourism in Wyre Forest and the income generated would diminish and could result in shops closing down and job losses.</li> </ul>	<p>capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS577</a>	Perks A	Disagrees with the methodology used to assess local site needs - its not objective research to ask	Objections are noted. The methodology used to inform site needs was based on a

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>what one large group wants and then use the outcome as the objective on which to consult. Where is the regional assessment and distribution to ensure fairness?</p> <p>Objects to site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt misuse - local authorities riding roughshod over local opinion.</li> <li>• Why the disparity between houses on Brownfield and gypsies on Green Belt?</li> <li>• Concerned that the shortlisted sites had been drastically reduced by at least half - how can you now take, and compare, all factors when you have already almost pre-determined the result?</li> <li>• Why such an increase in caravan units in the Bewdley area? More than 18% of the proposed new build houses for the whole of the Bewdley area and surrounding villages, according to the Core Plan. These houses will be spread over a large area and in surrounding villages. This may leave some communities with the proportion of Gypsy and Traveller caravan units being at least 50% the number of proposed local new build houses.</li> <li>• Concentrated educational facility development along Stourport Road has</li> </ul>	<p>regional wide evidence base.</p> <p>Objections to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. In terms of residential development, there are sites currently available within the District for this use in more sequentially preferable locations, which means that at this time the Council does not have to consider Green Belt locations.</p> <p>The concerns relating to traffic issues the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.</p> <p>The Council are following a set timetable for producing new planning policy documents.</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>created traffic chaos twice a day already. Why propose a large site, in such a tourist focal point for Bewdley, and which will generate more traffic which will exacerbate an already dangerous situation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe planning is being rushed and several aspects of the process appear to be flawed.</li> </ul>	
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1325</a>	Perrin J	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not believe there is an overall need in the District.</li> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated.</li> <li>• The site is in the Landscape Protection Area.</li> <li>• It is the best gateway to Bewdley, the landscape is particularly beautiful here, and the area is popular with tourists.</li> <li>• It is contrary to policy LA1 of the Adopted Local Plan and paragraph 9.14 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>• It is a groundwater protection area.</li> <li>• It is in the floodplain.</li> <li>• Residents would be subjected to noise and light pollution from the main road.</li> <li>• Nearby schools are full.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns about capacity at the school are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the Local Education Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1298</a>	Perrin S	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not believe there is an overall need in the District.</li> <li>• The site is in the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated.</li> <li>• The site is in the Landscape Protection Area.</li> <li>• It is the best gateway to Bewdley, the landscape is particularly beautiful here, and the area is popular with tourists.</li> <li>• It is contrary to policy LA1 of the Adopted Local Plan and paragraph 9.14 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</li> <li>• It is a groundwater protection area.</li> <li>• It is in the floodplain.</li> <li>• Residents would be subjected to noise and light pollution from the main road.</li> <li>• Nearby schools are full.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted. The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para. 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions to mitigate</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>this.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS648</a>	Quinn M	<p>I completely object to the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley.</p> <p>This is an area of Green Belt land and a local beauty spot.</p> <p>My objection is based on the site being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too close to Bewdley High School.</li> <li>• Within a flood risk area.</li> <li>• On our local bore hole.</li> </ul>	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential pollution into the River Severn.</li> <li>• Additional traffic congestion to A456 and local routes.</li> <li>• High risk of road accidents involving young people due to additional volumes of traffic.</li> <li>• Access issues to properties on Stourport Road and other roads.</li> <li>• Effect on local Doctor and healthcare services.</li> <li>• Sewage and waste considerations and the impact on the local environment.</li> </ul> <p>There are more suitable sites listed including the Lea Castle Hospital site.</p> <p>Why has no consideration been given to the old Sugar Beet site in Kidderminster?</p>	<p>that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>The former British Sugar site was considered as part of the original site survey undertaken by Baker Associates, however the site was discounted as it was not available for this use and therefore would not be deliverable.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1171</a>	Reynolds A	Objects to the Stourport Road site because of additional heavy traffic, the site is very close to schools and sports facilities, and new development in the floodplain should be resisted at all costs.	Objection is noted. The comments in relation to highway safety will be considered alongside those from the Highway Authority who are a statutory consultee.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS400</a>	Roberts A	Objects to the Bewdley site on the basis that it could lead to water pollution because of the proximity to the bore hole, it is in the Green Belt, there is likely to be a detrimental impact on tourism, the site is in the flood plain and there are not enough school places.	The concerns relating to the site are noted. Both Severn Trent and the Environment Agency have been consulted for their views in relation to water quality and flooding issues and their responses will be carefully considered alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS263</a>	Roberts B	Proposed site is in the Green Belt, falls within Flood Zone 2, contamination from the site will eventually affect water quality for Bewdley, its a tourist area where people enjoy walking and other activities, is a beautiful vista when travelling down the A456, busy local roads. Money would be better spent on job creation. No of gypsy sites in Wyre Forest compared to Worcestershire as a whole.	The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. As part of this consultation process, the District Council has consulted with the Environment Agency in relation to specific flooding issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS217</a>	Rogers D	Considers there are enough travellers in the area. Need more jobs in the area.	Noted. The District Council is committed to comprehensive regeneration for the area and this will be delivered through the Local Development Framework process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS574</a>	Rose K	Objects to site at Stourport Road, Bewdley	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1236</a>	Scaplehorn H and A	Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site because the area is particularly attractive and is in the Green Belt, it is visible from a number of key points, its	Objections are noted.  Although it is recognised the safeguarding

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>visitor potential has been recognised with the nearby picnic site, the site is on the floodplain and is above the source of Bewdley's drinking water supply and a number of adjacent properties will be affected by the site.</p>	<p>of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the impact on the residential area are noted. We recognise</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS363</a>	Scott N	Green Belt with nature reserve opposite which brings in tourists; flood zone; car park is starting point for several walks and used by fishermen - people would be fearful if gypsy site located there; water borehole adjacent; young children use leisure facilities without adult supervision; already parking problems caused by schools and SVR events.	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health</p>

Wyre Forest Local Development Framework

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1107</a>	Sellers E	Objects to the site has concerns relating to water quality and potential contamination , the site is located within the Green Belt; impact on the landscape and biodiversity, location on the flood plain and loss of trade to the local shops. Inability of local services to cope with the extra pressure.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1177</a>	Sellers S	Objects to the Stourport Road site because it is in the Green Belt, it will increase traffic volumes, no consultation has been undertaken with the schools to make sure they have sufficient places, it will be costly to implement health and safety, it will have an adverse impact on the town's economy, it will detract from the nature reserve, increased pressure on the local drainage system, and the site is in the floodplain with poor drainage.	<p>Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore, although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The safety of the site will need to be considered through any potential redevelopment of the area.</p> <p>The concerns about service capacity and facilities are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1302</a>	Severn Trent Water	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site as it is adjacent to a groundwater source which provides drinking water. The Environment Agency has identified a Source Protection Zone 1 around the area. There is a concern that any development without proper mitigation could have the potential to contaminate the existing groundwater sources. States that Severn Trent would object to a planning application unless it was accompanied by a full</p>	<p>Objection to the use of this site for Gypsies/Travellers/Travelling Showpeople is noted.</p> <p>Should the site be identified as suitable for this use then a planning application would still be required to ensure that any development had proper mitigation to</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>hydrological risk assessment which satisfactorily confirms that there is no risk to these groundwater sources.</p> <p>The proposed site appears to be in flood zone 2 and therefore any development would need to pass the exceptions test. PPS25 classifies caravans mobile homes and park homes intended for permanent residential use as "Highly Vulnerable", therefore any development proposal would need to satisfy the Exception Test which requires:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wider sustainability benefits that outweigh the flood risk;</li> <li>• should be on brownfield land, or otherwise council needs to confirm there are other, more suitable reasonably available brownfield sites, before a greenfield site like this can be bought forward</li> <li>• requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate it is safe, and risk can be managed</li> </ul> <p>Given the greenfield nature of the site and location within the Green Belt we would observe that the proposed site may fail the exception test unless there was significant justification which would support development on this site.</p>	<p>ensure that contamination of existing groundwater sources would not occur.</p> <p>The site is located within Flood Zone 2 and therefore the site would need to satisfy the Exception Test</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS598</a>	Sewell A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is peaceful, beautiful and attractive for</li> </ul>	Concern about impact on the environment

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>visitors - if approved it would mean a lot more traffic, noise and a complete eyesore.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council are trying to encourage tourism and this would have a negative effect for the area in an already difficult economy.</li> <li>• A better place would be Stourport, where travellers currently are.</li> </ul>	<p>is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Support for sites in Stourport-on-Severn are noted.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1041</a>	Shackleton S	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road site and regularly walks and runs through the proposed site, objects on the basis that the site is in the Green Belt, it is in an area of natural beauty where no further development should take place, the area is tranquil and well known for its wildlife, it is in the floodplain, access will cause highway safety issues, Bewdley is a small town and has facilities commensurate with its size and therefore will not be able to handle the influx of people.</p>	<p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS159</a>	Simmonds C	Proposed site right by water station which supplies all water for the town and is susceptible to pollution. Careless disposal of any waste material could pollute this site.	Noted. The District Council has consulted Severn Trent as part of the consultation period and their comments in relation to the water station will be considered very carefully when determining if any of the sites should go forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS160</a>	Simmonds C	The council can exercise special judgement to override the Green Belt issue however the other Bewdley site was dismissed as a result of protests over the use of Green Belt land and it didn't have any other real arguments.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS162</a>	Simmonds C	Concerns relating to the adverse impacts on the area and place of beauty.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS163</a>	Simmonds C	Likely to have a significant impact on the town's tourist trade. Impact on whole town - empty shops and loss of jobs.	Objection is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS164</a>	Simmonds C	This site is part of the flood plain, as so should not be considered as it is at risk of flood. Planning guidelines recommend against approval of any planning site such as this.	Noted. The District Council has consulted the Environment Agency in relation to flooding issues and we await their views.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS165</a>	Simmonds C	Likely to be a significant increase in traffic on the	The concerns relating to access to the site

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			junction. Site will potentially home 100+ people. Threat to school children.	are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS166</a>	Simmonds C	Lack of resources to accommodate a large site. Little policing and lack of facilities for young people in Bewdley already causing social problems. Issues likely to become more acute.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, West Mercia constabulary, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS167</a>	Simmonds C	Not enough school places for the families on the site. In reality families from surrounding communities likely to be displaced.	As part of this consultation process, the District Council has asked for Worcestershire County Council's views as the Local Education Authority on school capacity issues in each of these areas. Their views will be particularly important in determining whether any of the sites should be taken forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS168</a>	Simmonds S	Proposed site right by water station which supplies all water for the town and is susceptible to pollution. Careless disposal of any waste material could	Noted. The District Council has consulted Severn Trent as part of the consultation period and their comments in relation to the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			pollute this site.	water station will be considered very carefully when determining if any of the sites should go forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS169</a>	Simmonds S	The council can exercise special judgement to override the Green Belt issue however the other Bewdley site was dismissed as a result of protests over the use of Green Belt land and it didn't have any other real arguments.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS170</a>	Simmonds S	Concerns relating to the adverse impacts on the area and place of beauty.	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS171</a>	Simmonds S	Likely to have a significant impact on the town's tourist trade. Impact on whole town - empty shops and loss of jobs.	Objection is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS172</a>	Simmonds S	Site is part of the flood plain. Planning guidelines recommend against approval of development on such sites.	Noted. The District Council has consulted the Environment Agency in relation to flooding issues and we await their views.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS173</a>	Simmonds S	Significant increase in traffic on that junction. Site will potentially home 100+ people. Threat to the school children.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS174</a>	Simmonds S	Lack of resources to accommodate a large site. Little policing and lack of facilities for young people in Bewdley already causing social problems. Issues likely to become more acute.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, West Mercia constabulary, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS175</a>	Simmonds S	Not enough school places for the families on the site. In reality families from surrounding communities likely to be displaced.	As part of this consultation process, the District Council has asked for Worcestershire County Council's views as the Local Education Authority on school capacity issues in each of these areas. Their views will be particularly important in determining whether any of the sites should be taken forward for allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS565</a>	Smith D	Objects to the site at Stourport Road Bewdley and asks that it is removed from consideration.  It is Green Belt land and should not be developed. The site is also next to the water station that supplies the whole town, concerned that there would be pollution and contamination issues.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				level of need.  Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1</a>	Smith R	Wyre Forest has many brownfield sites available. The Green Belt is important in preventing the coalescence of the three main towns. The site at Stourport Road, Bewdley should be rejected for these reasons.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to <u>meet a specific, identified need</u> for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated at Stourport Road, Bewdley could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1589</a>	Southall A	Considers that Blackstone site is unsuitable site for gypsy use for following reasons: adjacent to 2 nature reserves and a picnic site; next to the River Severn used by anglers; near a salmon fishery; near Blackstone barn development; near schools and family housing.	<p>Objection is noted. The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1590</a>	Southall A	This area of the River Severn is one of the most dangerous stretches especially near the 'Rock',	Objection is noted. The safety of the site will need to be considered as part of any

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			where depths can reach 40 -50 feet. Steep slopes of riverbank become slippery after prolonged rain.	potential allocation.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1175</a>	Stephens B	Objects to the Stourport Road site for the reasons which were discussed at the meeting.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1238</a>	Stephens B	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site and questions the need for sites suggests using existing caravan sites and chalets. This is valuable Green Belt between the three towns and is constantly being encroached on, the Baker Report is not objective and not thorough, it is not clear which group needs provision and permanent provision should not be provided as it encourages settlement and further migration, travellers need minimum facilities on a small site.</p> <p>There are many reasons why the site is not suitable e.g. important approach to Bewdley, flooding, seepage of sewage and oil, Green Belt and poor access.</p>	<p>Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>In terms of need for sites - The Government's recent consultation on planning policy for travellers specifies at para. 3.12 that "Local Planning Authorities will continue to assess the accommodation needs of travellers (as required by the Housing Act 2004) and in accordance with the definition of travellers for this purpose. Para 3.14 of the consultation specifies that the Government proposes to ask local planning authorities to plan for a five-year supply of traveller pitches/plots.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS672</a>	Stewart P	Objects to the Stourport Road site as new Gypsy sites will not promote business or support livelihoods and will devalue property.	These concerns are noted. We recognise that the impact on property values is a key concern to local residents, but this cannot be taken into account as a material consideration for planning purposes in its own right.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1024</a>	Styles R	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because the incoming community would be 3-6 times that of the existing and would change the nature of this rural hamlet; the site is in the Green Belt; it is in flood zone 2; it could contaminate the ground water abstraction bore hole; it will increase noise and light pollution; substantial fencing for privacy would be out of character with the area; infrastructure such as water, gas, electricity and sewerage will need to be installed and there is concern that this will impact ground water. There is	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>provision for 30 vehicle movements per day and this could impact traffic safety, and there will be considerable impact on the environment and amenity of the area. Refers to the attractions in the area and Bewdley more generally and argues that the proposed site will be to the detriment of this. Argues that holiday chalets would not be allowed on the site so a gypsy site should not be allowed.</p>	<p>of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS569</a>	Sutton W	I object to the proposed site in Bewdley because the land is in Green Belt and not residential land, and therefore should not be approved as such.	Objection is noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1342</a>	Swan E	Situated at gateway to Bewdley - development would be detrimental to town's image; negative impact on Blackstone Rock; damaging to visual amenity and openness of Green Belt; liable to flooding; risk of groundwater pollution; site is readily visible from elevated positions nearby.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment and its visible nature is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will therefore need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1341</a>	Swan R	Situated at gateway to Bewdley - development would be detrimental to town's image; negative impact on Blackstone Rock; damaging to visual amenity and openness of Green Belt; liable to flooding; risk of groundwater pollution; site is readily visible from elevated positions nearby.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the 'gateway' environment and its visible nature is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment and this will therefore need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS697</a>	Talbot W	Raised a number of objections to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site including the proximity to the school and leisure centre, health and safety concern given the proximity to the river and the bypass, impact on congestion on the Stourport Road, the impact on tourism in the area and access to shops and services.	The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS556</a>	Taylor S	<p>Objects to Stourport Road, Bewdley for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water Station - concerned about impact and potential contamination on the station that serves all of Bewdley, which is adjacent to the site.</li> <li>• Green Belt - inappropriate to develop on Green Belt - other site in Bewdley was dismissed because of this reason.</li> <li>• Location near to the poppy field and concerned about the associated impact on tourism within this important gateway. Bewdley relies on Tourism and will impact on the whole town.</li> <li>• Located on the flood plain so should not be considered as it is at risk of flood.</li> <li>• The site will potentially home 100+ people. There is likely to be a significant increase in traffic on that junction and could pose a threat to school children</li> </ul>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency.</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of resources in Bewdley to accommodate a site.</li> <li>• There are not enough school places for the families the site will house, families from Far Forest and Arley are likely to be displaced.</li> </ul> <p>Please reject this proposed site.</p>	<p>The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS296</a>	Underwood A	<p>Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because the schools are over subscribed, the site is in the floodplain, there is no adequate sewerage and waste could affect the watercourse, the site is in the Green Belt and is a naturally beautiful area popular with walkers and it would reduce tourism.</p>	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>any possible new site.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1005</a>	Waldron A	Agrees with the need to find sites but objects to the Stourport Road site as it close to the river, it is a site of natural beauty, having a site there would reduce visitors to the picnic site and permission would not	The concerns relating to the character and biodiversity of the site are noted. The District Council has sought the views in relation to each of these sites from

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			be grated for any other development at this site.	Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Natural England as part of this consultation process. If any application for any type of development were to come forward on the site in the future it would be subject to detailed comments from these statutory consultees and appropriate mitigation measures would need to be taken as part of the planning process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1170</a>	Waldron P	I object to the above proposal.  My objection is based on the fact that the very considerable enhancement of the amenity value of the unique landscape on both sides of the river at Blackstone - both by local authorities and private owners, would be seriously undermined by any new development in the area.	Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1038</a>	Webb P	Objects to the Stourport Road Bewdley site, feels that it is totally unsuitable on the basis of issues that have been debated at the meetings.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS332</a>	Wendy F	Green Belt - development should not be allowed; potential flooding issues; schools full; adverse impact on poppy field tourism; additional traffic near school.	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p> <p>We will carefully consider these comments alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS861</a>	Westcott C	Loss of car park, would spoil town and make congestion worse.	<p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.</p> <p>The concerns relating to highways are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be</p>



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS557</a>	Wigzel D	This site in Bewdley is a greenfield site. With many brownfield sites available priority must be given to those.	Objection is noted. Brownfield sites have been considered as part of this process and although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS72</a>	Williams Mrs H	Concerns over the Stourport Road, Bewdley site relating to flood risk as it falls within Flood Risk Zone 2; also visual impact and screening opportunities; how the site will be contained and monitored; possible impact on the picnic site and tourism; what will the inhabitants be giving back to the community; limits to vehicles and horses kept on the site?; will the dogs be contained?	The concerns relating to flood risk are noted and the Environment Agency's views as a Statutory Consultee are being sought as part of the consultation process. It should be noted that some of the views in relation to the potential occupants of the site are based on opinion and perception rather than facts. Any application that comes forward will be subject to planning conditions which can be enforced by the Local Planning Authority.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS30</a>	Wilson N	Objects to the potential of the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley to make provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Rubbish and damage will occur to the surrounding areas and schools.	Objection is noted.  Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS362</a>	Woodcock Judith	Site is Green Belt land; known floodplain - suffers from seasonal flooding and flash floods - potential loss of life.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS364</a>	Woodcock Julian	Site is greenfield and in floodplain - would not normally allow development here. Not appropriate location.	<p>Objections are noted.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding</p>

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p> <p>Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating any possible new site.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS606</a>	Wood D	Objects to Stourport Road site.	Objection is noted.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS297</a>	Wood J	Objects to the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because there are no school places available, the location has inadequate service provision and a sewerage plant would need to be constructed, and these sites should be built on brownfield land not in the Green Belt.	<p>The objections to the use of this site for traveller pitch provision are noted. We will carefully consider these alongside the views from the service providers, utility companies, Local Education Authority and Local Highway Authority who are statutory consultees in this process and will be able to comment specifically on local service capacity issues.</p> <p>Concern about impact on the environment is noted. Government guidance specifies that any proposals for traveller sites should have due regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment. Any</p>

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>planning application that could come forward in relation to this site would be subject to planning conditions following consultation with Environmental Health Officers.</p> <p>Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS809</a>	Woolams M	Strongly Objects - as a tourist town, local business people do not want the first impression to be that of a traveller site.	Objection is noted. The potential impact on tourism within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS100</a>	Yarranton G	Believes that the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley is unsuitable as its in the Green Belt and Flood Zone 2.	Objection is noted. The Draft NNPF reiterates the importance given to Green Belt policy within the Local Development Framework. Para 143 specifies that local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt. "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations." Policy E in the Draft

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>Planning Policy Statement: Planning for Traveller Sites (April 2011) specifies that if a local planning authority wishes to make an exceptional limited alteration to the defined Green Belt boundary (to accommodate a site inset for example) to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should do so only through the plan making process. It should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only. Therefore although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need. The Environment Agency is a statutory consultee in this process and we await their views in relation to the site's partial location within a Flood Zone 2 area.</p>
Object	<a href="#">GTTS101</a>	Yarranton G	There are no vacancies at Bewdley school. Concerned where school places will be found for any children on this site.	Noted. As part of the comprehensive consultation process the District Council has consulted Worcestershire County Council as the Local Education Authority in relation to capacity issues at local schools. Their comments are awaited.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS102</a>	Yarranton G	Site adjacent to River Severn - dangerous for	The concerns relating to safety are noted. It

*Wyre Forest Local Development Framework*

Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Responses (November 2011)

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			children living on the site.	should be noted that there are other settled families living in close proximity to the river and these issues also apply to them.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS103</a>	Yarranton G	Difficult access - A449 is a very busy road and an accident blackspot.	The concerns relating to access to the site are noted. The District Council has requested comments from Worcestershire County Council on highway and accessibility issues in relation to each of the sites as part of the consultation process and these will be given full consideration in the decision making process.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS104</a>	Yarranton G	Could adversely impact on the number of visitors to the area.	Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. They consider that this will increase meaningful public participation meaning that people are more likely to be supportive of development. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
Object	<a href="#">GTTS105</a>	Yarranton G	Local residents have expressed their fear of increased crime in the area.	The perceptions in relation to fear of crime are noted. Paragraph 3.18 of the Government's recent consultation on Planning for Traveller Sites, specifies that in order to further reduce tensions between settled and traveller communities, the Government also proposes to ask local authorities to pay particular attention to early and effective community engagement with both settled and traveller communities when formulating their plans. This will enable local authorities to obtain a balance of views to enable them to make their decisions and reduce opposition to development based on misunderstanding and lack of information.
Object	<a href="#">GTTS1218</a>	Yearsley V	Objects to the site at Stourport Road Bewdley because the site is in the Green Belt and at risk of flooding, it is also adjacent to fast roads and the river, it is not a safe place for families to be raised. The other proposed sites offer travelling families a much safer environment. The Stourport Road site is important to the local economy as it is near to a beauty spot and is an entry point into the town.	Objections are noted. Although it is recognised the safeguarding of Green Belt land is of paramount importance in the area, a traveller site could be allocated if a specific need for pitch provision is identified and if there are no other sequentially preferable sites available to address the level of need.  Concerns about flood risk are noted. As part of this consultation we have requested comments from the Environment Agency. The potential of flood risk will need to be taken into account in considering allocating

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				any possible new site.  The potential impact on tourism/economy within this location will need to be fully considered when a decision on potential allocation is made.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS1595</a>	Anonymous	I think the land at Blackstone behind the picnic area would be good as either a small gypsy/traveller site or better as a show ground. It has good access and is not too close to other residents.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS277</a>	Austin A	Support for site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitch provision.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS81</a>	Blount R	Support for site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople provision.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS849</a>	Carpenter T	Site is well screened but has local facilities within walking distance. Site has good road access and is not adjacent residential properties. Gypsy families should have same rights as others to live in nice area.	Support for the site at Stourport Road is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS119</a>	Glover S	Stourport Road site is suitable as it stands alone with no neighbours around to cause unnecessary or unwanted conflict.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS966</a>	Jennings R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Jennings family have been residents of Low Habberley for over 150 years - now</li> </ul>	Comments are noted and will need to be considered when a decision on any of the



**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

Support / Object / Comment	Response ID	Respondent	Response Summary	WFDC Response
			<p>require a Show Business Depot to continue the businesses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The business started in Habberley Valley in 1900</li> <li>• We wish to purchase and develop a site within planning guidelines</li> </ul>	sites is made.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS4</a>	Nunn S	Support for the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley for provision for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople as it is near to local services and employment.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS35</a>	Pagett S	Support for the site at Stourport Road, Bewdley. The field behind Blackstone picnic area would be suitable. It is close enough for schools, shops etc, but far enough away so that their way of life won't impose on other residents.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS474</a>	Porter D	Supports the Stourport Road, Bewdley site as it is private and will allow them to live a normal life.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS1075</a>	Porter D	Yes. Let them have somewhere to live on a proper site and Showpeople.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS1076</a>	Porter G	Yes, let them live like everyone else - a stable address.	Support is noted.
Support	<a href="#">GTTS1316</a>	Smith P	Supports the Stourport Road, Bewdley site because it is a good site for 15 pitches and is owned by Gypsies and will be delivered. It is near roads and is not a very good piece of Green Belt.	Comments are noted and allocation of sites will be considered following the close of the consultation.

**Appendix 4: Summary of Responses received to Potential Site Allocations for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Consultation - Site at Stourport Road, Bewdley**

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
<a href="#">2012GTTS3</a>	28/29 Sandy Lane, Stourport-on-Severn	Hodgetts B	Object	Strongly against any residential development at 28/29 Sandy Lane as the site is designated for industrial uses. The area is still an industrial site and as such attracts a lot of heavy traffic and has no safe footways or places for children to play. Wishes to see more support for businesses in Sandy Lane.	Comments are noted. The site at 28/29 Sandy Lane was subject to a planning application during the consultation period and was granted planning permission on 22nd February 2012.
<a href="#">2012GTTS10</a>	Land Opposite The Gatehouse, Sandy Lane, Stourport-on-Severn	Anonymous	Object	<p>Before making this a permanent site you need to consider the people and factories around.</p> <p>An accident is waiting to happen on the corner.</p> <p>Temporary permission is all that should be given to see how things work out before allocating the site.</p>	Comments are noted. The importance of the industrial estate within the local economy is recognised, as is the need to balance this with the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. Should these sites be allocated the Site Allocations and Policies DPD will include policy wording to resist further sites coming forward within the Sandy Lane area.
<a href="#">2012GTTS15</a>	Land Opposite The Gatehouse, Sandy Lane, Stourport-on-Severn	Environment Agency	Comment	<b>Flood Risk</b> - Site 1 is located within Flood Zone 3 of the River Severn, based on our Flood Zone Map. This is the 'high risk' floodplain where there is a 1% annual probability of flooding occurring in any given year. Sites 2 and 3 are located within Flood Zone 2, where there is a 'medium probability' of flooding. The vehicular	Comments are noted. However, there are currently caravans on all of the sites as land opposite The Gatehouse has a temporary two-year planning consent, when this consent was granted Members felt that appropriate mitigation measures had been put in place to

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>access for all 3 sites is located within Flood Zone 3. I would refer to the flood risk policy comments provided within our previous response (dated 17 November 2011, our ref. SV/2010/103971/OR-04/IS1-L01), which still apply (copy enclosed).</p>	<p>evacuate people from the site should a flooding event occur. 28/29 Sandy Lane has recently been granted planning permission and 1a Broach Road already has a planning consent and this allocation seeks to increase the number of caravans on-site. Further planning applications for non-allocated sites within the Sandy Lane area will be resisted.</p>
<p><a href="#">2012GTTS14</a></p>	<p>Not site specific</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Objects to the sites and suggests the consultation is pointless because the sites are already occupied and one has been granted planning approval.</p> <p>Objection is based on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area is an industrial estate and the current Gypsy sites are having a negative effect on the industrial units. Increasing the number of sites will exacerbate this.</li> <li>• Concern that there will be a Dale Farm scenario on Sandy Lane industrial estate.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted. The importance of the industrial estate within the local economy is recognised, as is the need to balance this with the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. Should these sites be allocated the Site Allocations and Policies DPD will include policy wording to resist further sites coming forward within the Sandy Lane area.</p>

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is unsuitable because it is liable to flooding.</li> <li>• There is nowhere for children to play and they are playing in the roads causing danger.</li> <li>• Some businesses operate 24 hours and this will cause conflict with residential sites.</li> <li>• Gypsies would prefer not to be located on an industrial estate.</li> <li>• Council's should be supporting businesses.</li> </ul>	
<a href="#">2012GTTS12</a>	Not site specific	APT Chemicals International Ltd	Object	<p>Disappointed that the Council is even considering putting further Gypsy sites on what is already an over-crowded industrial estate. Raises concern that the businesses in Sandy Lane are closing and questions how this proposal will help. Understands the duty to provide such sites but suggests these should be away from business locations and considers Lea Castle suitable.</p> <p>Wishes that should these sites be approved the Council buy the respondents land in Sandy Lane at pre-2007 prices to enable</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The importance of the industrial estate within the local economy is recognised, as is the need to balance this with the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. Should these sites be allocated the Site Allocations and Policies DPD will include policy wording to resist further sites coming forward within the Sandy Lane area.</p> <p>The Lea Castle site was considered as a possible option</p>

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				current business to relocate.	however, following a six week consultation on a number of sites the site is no longer being considered for this use.
<a href="#">2012GTTS13</a>	Not site specific	Bennett J	Object	Expresses disappointment at the Council's decision to consider further Gypsy sites in the Sandy Lane area. The area is inadequate for families with no open space or play facilities. If it is necessary to site Gypsy and Traveller provision in Sandy Lane it should be separate from the industrial use and money should be invested in the area to make it a more suitable residential environment.	Comments are noted. The importance of the industrial estate within the local economy is recognised, as is the need to balance this with the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. Should these sites be allocated the Site Allocations and Policies DPD will include policy wording to resist further sites coming forward within the Sandy Lane area.
<a href="#">2012GTTS5</a>	Not site specific	British Waterways	No further comment	No further comments.	Noted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS6</a>	Not site specific	Dudley MBC	No further comment	No further comments to add to our response dated 17 <sup>th</sup> November 2011 to the initial consultation.	Noted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS7</a>	Not site specific	English Heritage	No further comment	English Heritage has no comments to make at this stage.	Noted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS16</a>	Not site specific	Environment Agency	Comment	<b>Groundwater Vulnerability / Pollution Prevention</b> - All three sites are located within Source Protection Zone 3 (total	Comments are noted. However, there are currently caravans on all of the sites as land opposite The

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				catchment area) of public water supply boreholes. I would refer to the groundwater vulnerability and pollution prevention comments provided in our previous response, which are relevant for these sites.	Gatehouse has a temporary two-year planning consent. 28/29 Sandy Lane has recently been granted planning permission and 1a Broach Road already has a planning consent and this allocation seeks to increase the number of caravans on-site. Planning applications for further non-allocated sites within this area will be resisted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS4</a>	Not site specific	Harman G	Object	<p>Objects to the provision of any further Gypsy sites on Sandy Lane Industrial Estate. as it is the main industrial estate in Stourport-on-Severn. Raises concern over the safety of having people living on the industrial estate, especially children. Raises concern over the lack of recreational space and also the heavy industrial traffic in the area.</p> <p>Recognises that Sandy Lane is traditionally an area where Gypsies have located but suggests that they should be kept to the periphery in order to reduce the risk of accidents. Raises concern that the units will not be available for industrial when the economic upturn comes. Questions why</p>	Comments are noted. The importance of the industrial estate within the local economy is recognised as is the need to balance this with the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community.

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				the sites are being considered for Gypsy use when houses would not be allowed on them.	
<a href="#">2012GTTS1</a>	Not site specific	Highways Agency	Comment	The proposals are unlikely to have a significant impact upon the operation of the strategic road network.	Comments are noted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS11</a>	Not site specific	Natural England	Comment	<p>The additional sites are in close proximity to Hartlebury Common &amp; Hillditch Coppice Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). There may be the potential for cumulative impacts on the SSSI in combination with sites previously consulted on, namely Site 4 Nunns Corner, Site 5 Saiwen and Site 6 Gables Yard.</p> <p>The SSSI is vulnerable to impacts from recreation which could damage the heathland, woodland, pools, marshes and associated flora and fauna. Natural England would like to work with the council to ensure the delivery of appropriate mitigation and/or compensation. This might include controlling access onto the SSSI. We invite further discussion on this issue.</p>	Comments are noted. This issue will be explored further through discussions with Natural England as the Site Allocations and Policies DPD Publication document is developed.
<a href="#">2012GTTS17</a>	Not site specific	South Worcestershire	Object	Representation made on behalf of South Worcestershire authorities. Welcomes the	Support is noted.



## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
		Development Plan		<p>approach taken to identifying sites to meet identified need and maintain an appropriate level of supply in line with nation policy.</p> <p>Raises concerns relating to the level of identified need and the concentration of sites in Sandy Lane which are set out in more detail in subsequent representations.</p>	Concerns are noted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS18</a>	Not site specific	South Worcestershire Development Plan	Object	<p>In relation to the level of identified need for gypsy and traveller pitches in Wyre Forest, we wish to reiterate a point raised in our response to your previous consultation. The consultation document suggests that the need for Gypsy and Traveller provision to 2017 is based on the need identified in the 2008 South Housing Market Area GTAA (30 pitches), plus an additional 5 pitches for the period 2013-2017 based on a RSS Phase 3 "Options Generation". The regional Interim Policy Statement, published by the West Midlands Regional Assembly (and approved by Government Office for the West Midlands) in March 2010, indicated that the additional residential pitch requirement for Wyre Forest for the period 2007-2017 was 42 pitches (not 35). Given that Wyre Forest has approved 16 pitches since 2006, this would leave 26 pitches to</p>	<p>Concerns are noted however, emerging national guidance removes the requirement to meet regional top down targets set out in the Regional Interim Policy Statement. The District Council considers that the provision of 30 pitches for the 2007-12 period, with a further 5 from 2013-17 and an indicative target of a further 15 post 2017 is a realistic assessment of need and takes into account the significant planning constraints within the District. It is not considered that this would lead to an increase in the neighbouring South Worcestershire Districts as this is no longer deciphered at the regional level and it will be for the individual Districts to set out their</p>

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				be allocated to 2017, and a further indicative 15 pitches from 2017-2022.	target pitch levels for delivery through the South Worcestershire Development Plan based on the need levels within their Districts.
<a href="#">2012GTTS19</a>	Not site specific	South Worcestershire Development Plan	Object	<p>Raises concerns relating to all three of the consultation sites being in very close proximity to the Malvern Hills DC and Wychavon DC administrative boundaries. Supports the extension of existing sites in principle but is concerned that the allocation of these sites along with recent planning approvals will lead to an unnecessary concentration of sites within this area when there are other potentially suitable sites within the District.</p> <p>Argues that such an over-concentration could form a "ghetto" which would be contrary to the creation of a sustainable, mixed community - a key objective of PPS3; it could have a negative effect on relationships between the Gypsy and Traveller and settled communities and put pressure on areas such as Ombersley which are not afforded Green Belt protection; and it could lead to further leaking over the boundary into the South Worcestershire Districts, including putting</p>	Concerns are noted. The Sandy Lane area has traditionally been the home for Gypsy and Traveller communities within the District. The sites which have recently gained planning permission were already occupied by the Gypsy and Traveller community, as are the sites proposed in this consultation. The draft Publication Site Allocations and Policies DPD seeks to resist the further development of Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Sandy Lane area once the allocated sites have come forward. Regarding other suitable sites being identified within the District, the Baker Report and subsequent consultation on seven sites failed to identify any sites outside of the Sandy Lane area which were appropriate to bring forward. The sites within the

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				pressure on Stourport Primary School.	Sandy Lane area have been met with a considerably lower level of objection than any of the sites outside of that area and also have the fewest constraints on their delivery. It is not considered that will led to any additional pressure being placed on Wychavon and Malvern Hills District to meet growth above their own identified need. With reference to Stourport Primary School, the Local Education Authority have been consulted on both the first site specific consultation and this consultation on additional sites and have raised no concerns regarding the capacity of the education system within Stourport-on-Severn to accommodate the additional sites.
<a href="#">2012GTTS8</a>	Not site specific	Speedflex Engineering	Comment	<p>It is not easy trading in the current climate and our current location is not conducive to growing our business and attracting customers.</p> <p>If the Council is determined to expand the residential side of Sandy Lane Industrial</p>	Comments are noted. The importance of the industrial estate within the local economy is recognised, as is the need to balance this with the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community. Should these sites be

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				Estate, we would be happy for the District Council to consider the purchase of our buildings and land. Any sensible offer would be considered. This would enable our business to move to a more prestigious industrial estate within the Wyre Forest such as Hoo Farm and enable us to grow our business and continue to employ local people.	allocated the Site Allocations and Policies DPD will include policy wording to resist further sites coming forward within the Sandy Lane area.
<a href="#">2012GTTS20</a>	Not site specific	Stourport-on-Severn Town Council	Object	<p>The Town Council has already raised objections on the topic of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople on the basis that all of the sites are currently within Stourport-on-Severn. The town already has a large number of holiday caravans too and collectively they are having a detrimental impact on the character of the Georgian town.</p> <p>Since the original consultation planning permission has been granted to regularise two further Gypsy and Traveller sites at Sandy Lane, in one case against the advice of the Environment Agency relating to flooding issues. This has led to a loss of valuable employment land. If the three sites now being consulted on are zoned as employment land then it would be</p>	Objections are noted. The emerging Site Allocation and Policies DPD includes a policy which resists further Gypsy and Traveller provision within the Sandy Lane area once any allocations within that area have come forward. Two of the consultation sites are zoned as employment land within the 2004 Adopted Local Plan, however, one of these has now been granted planning permission for use as a Gypsy site. The third site is zoned as a Gypsy site within the 2004 Adopted Local Plan. The Site Allocations and Policies DPD also makes provision for a balanced portfolio of employment land

## Appendix 5: Summary of Responses received to Consultation on additional Potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites

ID	Site	Reporting Name	Support/ Object/ Comment	Response Summary	WFDC Response
				<p>appropriate for the Town Council to object on this basis. If they are not zoned as employment land then it would be appropriate for the Town Council to object on the basis that there is no sound planning reason for all Gypsy and Traveller provision to be within this one area of the District.</p> <p>The Town Council is also concerned that there are no play facilities for children within the Sandy Lane area and allowing them to play on an industrial estate is dangerous.</p> <p>The objections are therefore maintained and it is hoped they will go forward to the Examination in Public.</p>	<p>across the District.</p> <p>The sites are within 10 minutes walk of children's play facilities.</p> <p>The Publication stage will be undertaken in August/September 2012. Any representations made at that stage will be taken forward to the Examination in Public.</p>
<a href="#">2012GTTS9</a>	Not site specific	The Coal Authority	No further comment	Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.	Noted.
<a href="#">2012GTTS2</a>	Not site specific	WCC	Comment	No further comments.	Noted.