

## APPENDIX 3C - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### CONTENTS TABLE

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

## APPENDIX 3C - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### CONTENTS TABLE

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

## APPENDIX 3C - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

### CONTENTS TABLE

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
<b>BHS/16 – Timber Yard Park Lane</b>				
Gemini Properties	<a href="#">LPP01195</a>	BHS/16	Object	The land in Gemini Property's control is identified as a mixed use development opportunity. We support this. However policy and supporting text is very limited and narrow on what form development should take on this gateway site. KCAAP provides detailed guidance and this should be replicated in the Local Plan Review. KCAAP lists site as being suitable for range of uses including C3, A3-5, B1(a), D1 and D2. Could also be suitable for C2. Adjoins Weavers Wharf and could potentially expand this area with bridge over canal and additional parking. On going discussions are being held with WFDC. A planning application is likely to be submitted in advance of the Local Plan reaching examination. Local Plan policy will thus be informed by the emerging planning application and discussions.
Sport England	<a href="#">LPP04368</a>	BHS/16	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. BHS/16 Timber Yard, Park Lane: appears to include a DW sport and fitness centre. How does this fit with the Built Sports Facility Strategy? Is it surplus? How does the proposal meet NPPF Par 74?
<b>BHS/18 – Blakebrook School</b>				
	<a href="#">LPP02</a>	BHS/18	Comment	This paragraph speaks of the potential for a cycle path/pedestrian path in relation to St John's Close (and Church View). It is difficult to understand how this may be achieved; currently, St John's Close is sealed off from the Blakebrook school site and is accessed via St John's Street. The dwellings on St John's Close are served by a private drive
	<a href="#">LPP030</a>	BHS/18	Comment	The residents of St Johns Close, own St Johns Close, it is private land and therefore not applicable to a pedestrian/cycle link.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0781</a>	BHS/18	Object	County Buildings and Blakebrook School - includes listed chapel and TPOs. Question whether capacity is too high at 35dph.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPP04341</a>	BHS/18	Object	BHS/18 – County Buildings and Blakebrook School – Site includes a listed Chapel that needs to be retained. TPOs on site. Quantum of development is inappropriate. Unlikely to develop 47

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				has been undertaken which has shown the site to be surplus to requirements or the open space would be replaced elsewhere. Not aware of evidence demonstrating how the requirements of Paragraph 74 of the Framework have been met. As a consequence the allocation should be removed.
Sport England	<a href="#">LPP04372</a>	FPH/18	Object	A number of sites listed will impact on open space, sport and recreation facilities and sites could be lost if allocated prior to being informed by the built and playing field strategies. FPH/18 Naylor's Field: If this site is playing field the loss needs to be justified under NPPF Par 74, SE Policy and in line with the PPS.
	<a href="#">LPP03214</a>	FPH/18	Object	<p>Please find below a number of objections to the inclusion of Naylor's Field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents access to fields will be restricted</li> <li>Community event held on fields</li> <li>Spoil the view from the house</li> </ul> <p>Have made numerous requests to purchase all or part of Naylor's field for gardens, Worcestershire County Council and More recently Wyre Forest District Council have made no final decision however stated in writing that "they do not support any housing scheme" and that historically the land had "educational use" as playing fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used as a community asset</li> <li>The loss of habitat for wildlife.</li> <li>Sutton Park Road itself is already busy and congested.</li> <li>Use brown field sites not green field</li> </ul>
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01455</a>	FPH/18	Object	Naylor's Field - maintained as open space - subject to para.74 of NPPF- should be protected unless assessment has shown it to be surplus to requirements or it would be replaced



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP048</a>	FPH/1	Object	I am against development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, home to many toads, frogs, polecats and protected species such as otter and great crested newt use the lagoons. More than 1000 common toads walk through the field each year to mate in North Pond. The field borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis. The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor. There would be an increase in light and noise pollution, and disturbance from cats, dogs, and people. Both the vibrancy and vitality of Wilden Marsh will be greatly negatively affected if such a development goes ahead. The Wilden Lane traffic would be horrendous – it is already horrendous.
	<a href="#">LPP02440</a>	FPH/1	Object	I also note that there are proposals to build on the site of the settling lagoons along Wilden Lane. This would be environmentally destructive to this green corridor which is abundant with wildlife and would create further traffic chaos in Wilden Lane, especially at Hoobrook island, where severe congestion exacerbated by the new traffic lights on Worcester Road, and other very poor traffic management is causing high levels of pollution in the immediate area. The loss of amenity to local residents caused by constant traffic queues is already real and apparent, and further development in this area can only make an already bad situation much worse.
	<a href="#">LPP02844</a>	FPH/1	Object	Objects to any use of the Green Belt, especially the Lagoon field on Wilden Marsh, a Site of Special Scientific Interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of wildlife parks</li> <li>• Land unsuitable for human habitation</li> <li>• Domestic/industrial activity would destroy the Marsh, which is also a flood plain.</li> <li>• Already traffic congestion in area; further housing could bring the whole of North/South traffic to a standstill.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03375</a>	FPH/1	Object	Object - Too close to marsh and wetland.



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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>in the Local Plan with Option A proposing employment and Option B proposing housing. Both options are likely to have impacts that we do not believe can be effectively mitigated because of the limited space available and the very close proximity of development to the SSSI and reserve. In light of this we are extremely surprised to note that the Sustainability Appraisal scored Option A as a minor negative and Option B as neutral in terms of the impact on the designated site and we seriously question the underlying assumptions made to reach this conclusion, especially given the commentary in the consultation document regarding the need for further hydrological study. Whilst additional hydrological information will be welcome it is important to note that impacts are likely to include, but may not be limited to: probable alterations in hydrology, adverse effects arising from noise and light disturbance (including with respect to protected and priority species including bats and birds), the potential for increased access (including unauthorised access) and pressure from domestic pets, fragmentation and isolation of the northern end of the marsh from the rest of the ecological corridor in which it sits with associated reductions in ecological connectivity that may lead from this. Further information demonstrating how all of these issues can be reconciled with the allocation proposed must form part of the evidence base prior to finalising the Plan. In connection with this it is essential to recognise that the council has a statutory duty to take steps to protect and where possible enhance the SSSI under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and we cannot see how this duty can be discharged in light of the significant effects anticipated. Taken together the comments above suggest that the site should be removed from the plan and that its allocation on present evidence would be unsound.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03551</a>	FPH/1	Object	<p><b>FPH/1 Settling ponds /lagoon field redevelopment. (A and B)</b></p> <p>I am shocked and saddened that this is even being proposed. It would be devastating to the local area to allow all natural land to be consumed by housing or industry. The suggestion that it would be used for more industrial units would also ruin the area with traffic, noise and light pollution and ultimately reduce the desirability of the village and road which is a thriving residential area not a main road to be developed into industrial units. We are small community on the outskirts of Kidderminster and Stourport and should be kept separate and valued as a</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>more desirable countryside location to live.</p> <p>Wilden lane has small pockets of houses starting with the smart estate at the North end then leading on to original housing, some dating back 150 years interspersed by the nature reserve, the old miners' cottages, some larger family homes, the village, school, Church, pub and farms. Any mass development or industrial development detracts from the look of the lane and would destroy prettiness of the road and future success of the village.</p> <p>The road itself cannot possibly support any more traffic at either end as well as the fact that cars race down Wilden lane in parts and more traffic would likely cause more accidents and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and residents. If the Wyre Forrest council want to make a positive impact on the road reduce the speed limit to 40 between the village and the McDonalds island, manage proper footpaths along the road, Forbid access for HGV's and install traffic lights at the island.</p> <p>Also, I am personally against any development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, and home to many toads, frogs and polecats, and protected species such as otter and great crested newt. Thousands of common toads walk through the Lagoon Field each year to mate in North Pond. Also, the Lagoon Field borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>I would welcome any opportunities to protect the road I live on, the nature that inhabits it and the residents of Wilden lane from any negative developments that do not 100% support the community and our quality of life.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03645</a>	FPH/1	Object	<p>The current problem posed to residents in the Wilden Lane area is traffic surrounding the Hoobrook Island. The introduction of more housing will only exacerbate this issue further, leaving residents more unhappy with the congestion they face when leaving their homes.</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				anymore traffic. You have wrecked Hartlebury Common tried to take the Green Belt at Spennells and now trying to spoil the wildlife and lagoons here!! There are plenty of other sites like Lea Castle Hospital site, the site where the pub was on Barnes Hill, the site where Sion Hill School was, the list is endless! Spend the money revamping all the derelict properties that you have boarded up and gone to rack and ruin!! SO WE SAY : NO to the building on Wilden for the sake of the wild life and our sanity NO NO NO!!!!!!
	<a href="#">LPPQ2025</a>	FPH/1	Object	<p>If projected need for the number of houses up to 2034 is correct, I accept that some Green Belt is needed for development but there doesn't appear to be any priority given to sites with obvious wildlife value. Looking at Kidderminster two sites come to mind which stand out compared to most of the sites highlighted which are under grain crops at the moment</p> <p><b>Settling Ponds FPH/1.</b> The area around this former lagoon site is either owned or managed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust, and the actual lagoons have become willow and alder wetland. The land is an important and valuable local wildlife asset, and home to many creatures some of which have protection in their own right. The development of the site can only add pressure to a location which currently acts as a buffer between a busy road and a SSSI.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ50</a>	FPH/1	Object	<p>I am against any development of the former Lagoon Field, the land is an important valuable local wildlife asset. I help with conservation work in this area I know that it is home to rare and protected plants and animals such as otters and great crested newts. The field borders an improving SSSI, acts as a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a flood plain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor.</p> <p>An increase in light and noise pollution from the proposed work and the new development, and then disturbance from cats, dogs, and people which could affect the wildlife in this area.</p> <p>Concerned that the traffic on Wilden Lane, which is already very bad would worsen making</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				commuting even more difficult.
	<a href="#">LPP0526</a>	FPH/1	Object	I object on the grounds that it will be detrimental to the general area and the SSSI site bordering this area in particular. This site "feeds" the SSSI site and use for industrial housing will have a long term effect on flora and fauna. Additionally the infrastructure and access to the site is insufficient to support any increase in traffic flow along Wilden Lane towards Kidderminster. This road is always congested at peak times and the relief road has not alleviated this.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0960</a>	FPH/1	Comment	Northern part of site has already has development opposite. Need to maintain buffer between development and SSSI but should be possible to make some land available.
	<a href="#">LPP03743</a>	FPH/1	Comment	Do you really consider this a worthy contender for housing? There are many alternative brown field sites in the area, please do not let any development on Wilden Marsh to go ahead.
Wyre Forest District Council	<a href="#">LPP01255</a>	FPH/1	Comment	<p>Proposed development areas immediately adjacent to some of our Districts most valuable wildlife areas. There is a real risk of increasing disturbance pressure on these sensitive areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FPH28 Settling ponds due to the sites immediate proximity to Wilden SSSI.</li> </ul> <p>Sites will be subject to current planning regulation and biodiversity concerns will make development more complicated and may even restrict the nature available developable area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP059</a>	FPH/1	Object	<p>I am against any development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, home to many toads, frogs and polecats, and protected species such as otter and great crested newt. Thousands of common toads walk through the field each year to mate in North Pond, borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>The north end development would cut off part of the SSSI, making it very poor.</p>

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster be a more desirable place to live, not build soulless housing by the hundreds.</p> <p>We are small community on the outskirts of Kidderminster and Stourport and should be kept separate and valued as a more desirable countryside location to live.</p> <p>Wilden lane has small pockets of houses starting with the smart estate at the North end then leading on to original housing, some dating back 150 years interspersed by the nature reserve, the old miners' cottages, some larger family homes, the village, school, Church, pub and farms. Any mass development or industrial development detracts from the look of the lane and would destroy prettiness of the road and future success of the village.</p> <p>The road itself cannot possibly support any more traffic at either end as well as the fact that cars race down Wilden lane in parts and more traffic would likely cause more accidents and danger to pedestrians, cyclists and residents. If the Wyre Forrest council want to make a positive impact on the road reduce the speed limit to 40 between the village and the McDonalds island, manage proper footpaths along the road, Forbid access for HGV's and install traffic lights at the island.</p> <p>Also, I am personally against any development of the former Lagoon Field on the basis of the land being an important and valuable local urban wildlife asset, and home to many toads, frogs and polecats, and protected species such as otter and great crested newt. Thousands of common toads walk through the Lagoon Field each year to mate in North Pond. Also, the Lagoon Field borders an improving SSSI, is a buffer between protected ground and a main road and other developments, is essentially a floodplain, and a valuable urban nature oasis.</p> <p>I would welcome any opportunities to protect the road I live on, the nature that inhabits it and the residents of Wilden lane from any negative developments that do not 100% support the community and our quality of life.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04360</a>	FPH/1	Object	I also note that there are proposals to build on the site of the settling lagoons along Wilden

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Site Ref	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Lane. This would be environmentally destructive to this green corridor which is abundant with wildlife and would create further traffic chaos in Wilden Lane, especially at Hoobrook island, where severe congestion exacerbated by the new traffic lights on Worcester Road, and other very poor traffic management is causing high levels of pollution in the immediate area. The loss of amenity to local residents caused by constant traffic queues is already real and apparent, and further development in this area can only make an already bad situation much worse.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPP04350</a>	FPH/1	Object	FPH/1 – Settling Ponds – Site currently within Green Belt, “exceptional circumstances” need to be demonstrated for the site to be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development. The Council’s Green Belt assessment advises that this site has an absence of clear defensible boundaries, a key consideration for releasing land from the Green Belt identified by the Framework. No evidence on how the “exceptional circumstances” test can be passed justifying the release of the site from Green Belt. As such, its allocation is highly questionable and should be removed.
	<a href="#">LPP04042</a>	FPH/1	Object	The proposed mixed use for this site is totally inappropriate to this area, lying adjacent to the nationally important SSSI and nature reserve. This area should again be retained as a buffer between development and the relatively rare and protected marshland habitat.
	<a href="#">LPP03351</a>	FPH/1	Object	Settling Ponds. Too close to marsh and wetland.
	<a href="#">LPP0527</a>	FPH/1	Object	I object on the grounds that it will be detrimental to the general area and the SSSI site bordering this area in particular. This site "feeds" the SSSI site and use for industrial housing will have a long term effect on flora and fauna. Additionally the infrastructure and access to the site is insufficient to support any increase in traffic flow along Wilden Lane towards Kidderminster. This road is always congested at peak times and the relief road has not alleviated this.
	<a href="#">LPP02027</a>	FPH/1	Object	If projected need for the number of houses up to 2034 is correct, I accept that some Green Belt is needed for development but there doesn’t appear to be any priority given to sites with obvious wildlife value. Looking at Kidderminster two sites come to mind which stand out

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. The population of our village has hardly changed over the last 5 years. In being asked to accommodate 600+ houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. Also this new development would be larger than the whole of Cookley. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current suggested plan does not do this. Where is the proposed development in nearby Wolverley which has 2 primary schools and a high school. Other local action groups are recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPQ1958</a>	Object	Concerns regarding the housing development of the Lea Castle site. I understand the plans have gone ahead for housing but many of the residents are concerned it is aggressive and will have an impact on all the nearby villages. I live in Cookley and want to maintain the feel of a village that is separate from Kidderminster. I therefore hope that a large majority of the Green Belt land can be saved to maintain our beautiful landscapes and our village. Otherwise we will lose our village which will become nothing more than an estate that is driven through to get to Kidderminster. It will also have a massive impact on the local primary school and on traffic into and out of the village. Currently a high proportion live within the village and therefore walk to school. I also feel that Kidderminster needs centralised high density housing rather than low density housing on greenfield land. Half of the tower blocks were (rightly) demolished in the Horsefair under a previous plan that involved the development at the bottom behind Sainsbury's. The majority of housing plans since have been low density out of town estates moving the population out of the town centre, increasing traffic into the centre and requiring the construction of additional link roads. A key point should be that in order to meet lower Co2 targets the plan should be promoting centralised housing development that reduces the dependency on car traffic.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2003</a>	Object	I object to 600 plus houses being built on the Lea Castle area with no schools/doctors/activities for children. Cookley school and doctors are both full already. I agree that building does need to be done on the Lea Castle area brown sites only. Save our Green Belt. There are plenty of brown sites that could be used prior to damaging our green. This plan has not been thought out as to how these new housing areas will be used and lived in. This is being rushed through due to invested interest by the council.

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPQ2150</a>	Object	If there is a need for more housing, there are plenty of brownfield sites around the area. School is full to capacity, as is the medical centre. The Lea Castle site is home to a lot of wildlife. The Crescent cannot support the amount of extra traffic for the development and I fear that it will be unsafe for the residents. Cookley is a lovely village in its own right, it is not an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2333</a>	Object	Comment on Options A and B. I object to Option B due to lack of local infrastructure, schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport. Access/highways infrastructure would not cope with more traffic. As a brownfield site some development necessary but 600 homes too much; Option B would compound the problem. Need affordable housing/sheltered facilities for the elderly; development should be proportionate. I object to Option A as it would link Cookley to Kidderminster. Not a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village; Green Belt will be lost. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when southern Green Belt is removed? If Option A is large enough will extra infrastructure, roads, doctors, schools be provided. No evidence of any extra employment provision so are we just creating a commuter belt. There are brown field sites not on plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park/site of the old quarry on the B4189. Why is Wolverley washed over?
	<a href="#">LPPQ2385</a>	Object	<p>Comment on policy section 31 regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle Hospital site (WFR/WC/15), and southern extension (WFR/WC/16) between the A 449 and A451, and south of the A4521 (BW/4). I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this.</li> <li>- The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some cosmetic changes, additional visibility splays and traffic lights, will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also very close to one of the entrances to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</li> <li>- In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. The existing doctor's surgery would be overloaded.</li> <li>- I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to</li> </ul>

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

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



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPQ2499</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2503</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2624</a>	Object	<p>I object to both A and B on the planned proposal for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development takes over Green Belt land and is not just limited to the Lea Castle development.</li> <li>2. There are no submitted plans to describe where proposed facilities like doctors shops, schools for us to consider. Although stated in the options that the development will have its own amenities nothing is explaining on plans.</li> <li>3. I believe that the redevelopment of Kidderminster is needed prior to the development of either site A&amp;B to support jobs and infrastructure, rather than expecting people to commute. This will only increase carbon</li> </ol>

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of farmland and threats to the natural habitat (for example bats). In addition to the devastating environmental impact of this loss, the potential detriment to the health and wellbeing of the residents of Cookley should not be underestimated.</p> <p><u>Loss of village identity/infrastructure concerns.</u> A large scale housing estate would effectively make Cookley an outlying area of Kidderminster. This would mean the loss of identity of the village and the close knit community ties may weaken. Within the current economic climate, it is difficult to feel reassured that additional infrastructure would be provided to accommodate a significantly increased local population. The same concerns are associated with the capacity of Cookley Surgery. The additional volume of traffic to already busy main roads is also worrying, particularly if there are no pedestrian crossings factored in to the development. The A449 is also an accident black spot.</p> <p><u>Housing provision.</u> I am a strong advocate of prioritising affordable housing in new developments and am concerned that this aspect seems to have been minimised in favour of 'executive homes' by a large scale developer. I would urge you to prioritise the expansion of social housing, including part-rent/part-buy options. Any new housing development should be incorporated in to the environment as sensitively as possible and that shared green spaces form a part of this. I believe that Wyre Forest District Council has the opportunity to approach housing development with social and environmental responsibility and innovative design as core principles. The district's population is not growing at a rate that would necessitate immediate large scale development. By providing desirable accommodation in manageable numbers across the region (including Cookley), housing needs could be met without fundamentally changing the identity of a particular area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3864</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans for Lea Castle. The Infrastructure in, and surrounding, Cookley is inadequate for such a large scale development. The area is surrounded by Green Belt which should not be replaced by concrete due to flooding risks and disturbance to nature. An increase in population will lead to more unemployment and crime. People will be forced to commute, which does not create communities. I do not object to some development on Lea Castle but it needs to be done sympathetically will good infrastructure.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4067</a>	Object	<p><b>LEA CASTLE SITE.</b> The roads, around this site already have many problems. The site which was Sion Hill School is planned for 100 – 150 houses both this road &amp; the Wolverley road converge on to the crossroads of the A449 which is a very fast road. You have the Cookley turning which goes into the village, another accident BLACKSPOT. From there you have the Crescent, then onto Axborough Lane &amp; the Island Pool &amp; crossroads. All of this area has</p>

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration is given to the local environment and ecosystems;</li> <li>• The development is built with good housing principles (as described in section 14, below);</li> <li>• The local community is fully engaged with planning the development;</li> <li>• Infrastructure, such as transport, schools and GPs are provided.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02388</a>	Support	<p>We would like to voice our concern to the proposed building developments adjacent to Hurcott Lane and on the Lea Castle site. We support the need to build more affordable housing, particularly on brownfield sites, but feel that without improving the local infrastructure traffic, school and NHS chaos will follow. Despite the tunnel problem at the Lea Castle site, this would be a preferred option, as the infrastructure for schools, health provision, shops and community facilities could be established with 1000+ houses constructed. The issue of Hurcott Lane needs to be addressed. Access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve and preservation of the SSI site needs to be protected. The reality of no pavement and safe pedestrian access along Hurcott Lane to the Nature Reserve needs to be a priority and the volume of traffic restricted. Motorists will inevitably select the Hurcott Lane route to access the Birmingham Road. I'm sorry if developers' profit will be affected by constructing a suitable Eastern by-pass, but Wyre Forest should not allow construction of housing if existing routes and a valued Nature Reserve are compromised and made increasingly unsafe.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03076</a>	Support	<p>I am in favour of the Lea Castle site and land next to Lea Castle being developed as long as it does not result in additional pressure being put onto Cookley school. Lea Lane which the school is situated on gets dangerously busy in term time when the school starts and ends each day, so with additional people would only put more pressure onto a lane which is already too busy. People also attend the doctors which is opposite the school this just adds extra pressure on the lane. I can see the merit of developing road infrastructure around the Spennells area to provide relief to the centre of Kidderminster. It makes sense to me to develop just a few areas of the district with large housing sites rather than lots of areas with smaller developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04424</a>	Support	<p>I support the build on Lea Castle site as this is not a visual impact that will be observed everyday by local people &amp; commuters and therefore will not have a negative impact upon the landscape character.</p>

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP0679</a>	Object	I strongly disagree with both options. Lack of facilities in Kidderminster such as local shops and poor transport links, will not be able to cope with the volume of new homes. Beautiful Green Belt will disappear if plans are granted. Concern for the local wildlife, they will have no where to go if their natural habitat is destroyed, this includes bats which are protected species. The rural feel of the outskirts of Kidderminster will go, but be completely over-crowded with no local amenities to cope with the volume of people. Why are developments proposed on beautiful Green Belt and not derelict industrial sites.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0793</a>	Object	Hurcott ADR - Green Belt assessment states that this site prevents urban sprawl and encroachment and is visually sensitive. Development would also reduce openness. These factors must be weighed up in exceptional circumstances test.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01442</a>	Object	Hurcott ADR - Green Belt assessment states that this site prevents urban sprawl and encroachment and is visually sensitive. Development would also reduce openness. These factors must be weighed up in exceptional circumstances test. This process has not been undertaken, as such the allocation should be removed.
	<a href="#">LPP02152</a>	Object	The extra traffic, these new houses will bring will make this road even busier, at times it is really bad now. The loss of hedgerows will make a big impact on our wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPP02588</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hurcott Village is an ancient settlement, mentioned in the Domesday Book. The proposals in both Option A and Option B, allowing for development on Green Belt land and ADR land either side of the village, would result in it being totally engulfed and overwhelmed by new houses, thus destroying its unique character.</li> <li>In addition, the SSSI at the heart of the village would be under threat with so much development surrounding it. This is a fragile and sensitive location, where water levels are critical to its nature as wet woodland. Further development along the Lane would impact on this site, which is of national importance.</li> <li>There is no mention in the plan of infrastructure to support the developments either side of the village. Hurcott Lane is a single track road with passing places, already under enormous pressure from the volume of traffic using it as a cut through between Stourbridge Road and Birmingham Road. These</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>proposed developments, along with the proposed development at Lea Castle, would inevitably result in a significant increase over the current average of 100 cars per hour using this lane between 8am and 7pm. With no mention of new schools the most likely for those on the proposed site for Miller Homes would be along Hurcott Lane to St. George's, Offmore, Holy Trinity and King Charles, yet more volume of traffic on a rural single track lane, with a SSSI at its centre. Not to mention the increase in use by commuters driving into Birmingham or to the motorway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 25 Safeguarding the Green Belt – hollow words if the preferred options were to go ahead. The proposals would not protect the Green Belt</li> <li>• Policy 26 A and B - The proposals would not protect the historic environment with regard to Hurcott Village.</li> <li>• The Local Plan review scoping report mentions the hornet robberfly, on Hurcott pastures, being the only siting in the country. As the field has ceased to be grazed (it was a requirement of the landowner to have cattle on the site until 3 or 4 years ago) the fly has probably ceased to exist here. Shame that cutbacks mean that the diversity of creatures in our environment is diminishing and that rare insects are likely to disappear as a result.</li> <li>• One of the reports states: 'The eastern areas of the District fall within the West Midlands Green Belt and are therefore subject to Green Belt policy which restricts development except for very special circumstances. There are also a number of Sites of Special Scientific Interest which could be adversely impacted by new development. These constraints will all be very important factors in considering where new development should be located.' It doesn't appear that these constraints have been given much consideration in preparing the preferred options document.</li> <li>• The Hurcott ADR will be allocated for development. This sounds like a done deal, residents have submitted their responses to the application by Miller Homes in 2015, but will we have the opportunity to voice our concerns at the appropriate planning meeting. Will we be advised as to when this will take place?</li> </ul> <p>Recent applications in the area have been refused on the grounds that they are inappropriate development in a Green Belt location. Fairly ironic when you consider the proposals in this Local Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2628</a>	Object	Whilst we understand the need for a local plan and continued housing development in the Wyre Forest, we

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>must object in the strongest terms to any proposal to use Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Road and down into Hurcott Village. There are a large number of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest, particularly Kidderminster, which either do not appear in the plan or show absolutely no signs of development. These sites, e.g. the former Sladen School, former Sion Hill School, former Stourminster School, the Yew Tree Public House and run down factory and similar sites in and around Kidderminster show no signs of or intention to develop. These sites would significantly contribute to housing development land before any incursion into significantly larger areas of Green Belt land.</p> <p>The Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Rd is well developed agricultural land and contributes to environmental and agricultural sustainability for this area. The Green Belt land provides vital separation from Blakedown, Hagley and from the wider Bromsgrove and West Midlands area. Land here is also significantly higher than the surrounding land and would cause significant visual and environmental impact. This Green Belt land provides numerous wildlife habitats and development would seriously impact on ecological sustainability, biodiversity and the designated SSI areas.</p> <p>Any development behind Baldwin Rd, beyond Offmore and into Hurcott village would be smaller linear developments with no possibility of a community heart, community facilities and ongoing socio-cultural sustainability. These areas would not support the building of a primary school and local schools are already very full, Offmore Primary school which serves this area is full and cannot be extended. Roads in this area are already busy and dangerous with frequent accidents, Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Rd are used daily as 'rat runs/cut through' and increased development would bring this to intolerably dangerous levels. Developments such as behind Baldwin Rd would not generate a large enough financial contribution to roads and infrastructure to manage safety and increased capacity, indeed the development promoter for the rear of Baldwin Rd stated categorically that they would only 'contribute' to a new roundabout at the top of Husum way (a roundabout which would only serve to increase traffic and safety problems)! The promoter also stated that they would not bear any of the expense of roads or infrastructure, let alone a full scale eastern by-pass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2645</a>	Object	A further comment on the potential New House builds near Hurcott surely the road structure is ridiculously inadequate for this type of development without totally destroying the nature area which exists between the two planned Housing developments shown on your plans.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2835</a>	Object	I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2910</a>	Object	I would like to object to the plans to build more housing near Hurcott village. The strategy I would prefer is to better utilise unoccupied commercial buildings and existing brown fields sites firstly, rather than destroying areas of outstanding beauty.
	<a href="#">LPPO3020</a>	Object	Development to rear of Baldwin Road/Hurcott Village would worsen traffic access around Hurcott Village (change from top that being a through road?) and affect the nature reserves.
	<a href="#">LPPO3058</a>	Object	This path would be routed through an area that is currently beautiful woodland, and which is home to a great variety of wildlife. It is inevitable that construction of said pathway will adversely affect this area. I am very concerned that, with this proposed path running along the bottom of the gardens connected to the properties on Kendlewood road, that this will create a security risk along the proposed route, particularly at night. There should be no reason to disrupt this beautiful woodland area, nor introduce additional security concerns for the residents living on Kendlewood Road.
	<a href="#">LPPO3117</a>	Object	I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed, this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I suggest 540 Elderly persons development on Lea Castle Hospital site and no development at Hurcott.
	<a href="#">LPPO3315</a>	Object	Hurcott Road cannot cope with more traffic. The area designated is a wildlife haven. There are many sites more suitable within Kidderminster town for housing purposes. There are so many buildings going to waste that could be made better use of. How will schools, hospitals, doctors, fire service be able to cope if more people come to the town. I have lived here all my life and I feel that Kidderminster is a total disaster at present. Something should be done to improve things not make them worse. The affect on pollution with more cars etc. from his planned building of more houses is totally unacceptable in this area.
	<a href="#">LPPO3347</a>	Object	'South of Stourbridge Rd': this site should be limited to the proposal by Miller Homes. 'Rear of Baldwin Rd': this site should be limited to the top two fields that face the Birmingham Rd. Hurcott Village will lose its identity and sense of place if development is too close.

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			- Employment on 'Land off Birmingham Rd'. All industrial/trade units should be kept within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Zone.
	<a href="#">LPP03355</a>	Object	The area this would run through is, firstly on a site of scientific interest, and secondly in the past, was subject to lot of criminal activity. There is a jetty that runs from Broadwaters heath, across down to Wolverhampton Road, and I have encountered anti social behaviour here. Building on the corner of the very busy Hurcott Lane and an already busy A456, which is already an area for known heavy and speeding traffic, seems absolutely thoughtless and totally badly positioned.
	<a href="#">LPP03438</a>	Object	The proposed development concerns me as many of the sites are important wildlife conservation areas, also access to these sites would be severely compromised and lead to increased volume of traffic on what is already a very congested route. Both the A449 and A451 head to the bottle neck that is the Horsefair.
	<a href="#">LPP03455</a>	Object	Any developments of this traditional land with hedgerows and fields is found to impact negatively in the wildlife habitats. Hurcott Road/Baldwin Road would become very busy to traffic.
	<a href="#">LPP03777</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on policy section 31 of the Local Plan Review, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle Hospital site (WFR/WC/15), and southern extension (WFR/WC/16) between the A 449 and A451, and south of the A4521 (BW/4). I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some cosmetic changes, additional visibility splays and traffic lights, will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also very close to one of the entrances to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley.</li> <li>- In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. The existing doctor's surgery would be overloaded.</li> </ul> <p>I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already</p>

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP0568</a>	Comment	Concern to the integrity of Hurcott Village and the lanes to and from the village. That no access be permitted to or from the new estates onto Hurcott Road or Hurcott Lane, any access should be limited to Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road. Hurcott Lane is a Rat Run between Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road, any access here would make the problem worse. Lanes should remain within the green corridor without alteration. The border of the green corridor should extend from the bank on the right hand side of Hurcott Road just above the bridle path, to beyond the tree line on right of the brook that exits Hurcott Pool. The bridle path between Hurcott Road and Hurcott Lane must be preserved. No buildings backing onto Hurcott Road or Hurcott Village and the area between the bank, the bridle path and Hurcott Village would remain within the green corridor. Area between Podmore Pool and Hurcott Pool is an important wildlife corridor that extends through Hurcott Woods to Blakedown and beyond and should be guarded as an important natural area. All trees within the proposed site should be preserved.
	<a href="#">LPP02642</a>	Comment	A further comment on the potential New House builds near Hurcott surely the road structure is ridiculously inadequate for this type of development without totally destroying the nature area which exists between the two planned Housing developments shown on your plans.
	<a href="#">LPP03242</a>	Comment	It is not clear how some areas have been declared 'Core' and some as options (A and B). There should be more options at this stage, and less 'Core'. Lea Castle Hospital is an exception, but BW/4, OC/4, OC/5, OC/6 are all deemed core for no obvious or strong reason. Rear of Baldwin Road (OC/4). The development here concerns me for same reason as (BW/4). The Northern third of this development (where it crosses the public footpath) is too close to the SSSI. Development (if this site used) should not go beyond the public footpath. The whole OC/4 concerns me as the height of this land will make the western approach (A456) to the WF very unattractive indeed – for visitors, business and house buyers.
	<a href="#">LPP03770</a>	Comment	Whatever development is proposed for Kidderminster (whether at Lea Castle, Baldwin Road or Stourbridge Road/Hurcott Lane, it needs to address the dangerous junction between Hurcott Lane and the A456 and the weak road bridge at Hurcott Pool Reservoir. The junction of the A456 and Hurcott Lane is already a dangerous blackspot. There was another serious accident there only last week. The Highways Authority has already acknowledged the danger in part by reducing the dual carriageway to single carriageway access on the approach to and exit from Kidderminster. Hurcott Lane is also used as a rat run between Birmingham Road and

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>existence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bird-life flourishes in the area. A new survey should be carried out to determine the present diversity of bird life.</li> <li>• An up-to-date survey of flora, fauna and insect life should be carried out to determine the biodiversity in the SSSI, the Nature Reserve and surroundings.</li> <li>• If the land is built on, it will cause urban drift in the merging of Kidderminster with Hurcott Village – against county Green Belt policy. Clearly defined buffer zones for the SSSI will be required to prevent this.</li> <li>• If the land is built on it will cause urban drift as Kidderminster extends along the Stourbridge Road towards Stourbridge and along the Birmingham Road towards Blakedown - against county Green Belt policy.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04383</a>	Comment	Concern proposed developments either side of Hurcott village would completely change this hamlet. Potential impact of many more vehicles and people accessing Hurcott Wood and how sustainable this would be especially if they use cars to get there.
	<a href="#">LPP05122</a>	Comment	Hurcott Village is a fairly unique area and no major development should be considered as the character of this little village will be destroyed. The two core housing sites that are either side of Hurcott Village. 'South of Stourbridge Rd': this site should be limited to the proposal by Miller Homes. 'Rear of Baldwin Rd': this site should be limited to the top two fields that face the Birmingham Rd. Hurcott Village will lose its identity and sense of place if development is too close.
	<a href="#">LPP0351</a>	Object	I object to the proposals as per the disadvantages provided by Offmore & Comberton Action Group. I currently reside on Baldwin Road and believe the proposals will have an impact on the area in which we live.
	<a href="#">LPP0389</a>	Object	I am concerned about the potential increase in traffic from development at Hurcott behind Baldwin Road. Baldwin Road is already used as a shortcut for traffic avoiding the lights at the crossroads for Chester Road and the Birmingham Road. Traffic is heavy for this residential Road at certain times of day and the junction off the Birmingham road towards Husum Way is a very difficult junction to cross at peak times especially with the odd right of way. This would have to be thought about very carefully so as not to increase traffic congestion in these areas.
	<a href="#">LPP0430</a>	Object	I object to the local plan proposal for land rear of Baldwin Rd and the land East of Offmore/Comberton area.

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster is vital in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation.</li> <li>• The proposed eastern by-pass would cause additional traffic to the area and the A456 is already an extremely busy road.</li> <li>• The development would have a serious visual impact on the area and impact the eco system of Hurcott village and Hodge hill area.</li> <li>• The development would not be a sustainable community</li> <li>• Offmore primary school is ready full</li> <li>• The school cannot be developed further and in addition King Charles School is also full.</li> <li>• The area at the end of Shakespeare Drive/Husum Way is prone to heavy flooding and additional housing will only exacerbate the problem.</li> </ul> <p>My preferred option would be an extension to Option A &amp; B for the land at Lea Castle. This area could easily accommodate the required development and could be made into a sustainable village. A 2 form entry Primary school could be built and then feed the under subscribed Wolverley high school. It would be capable of sustaining a bus service which could also benefit Cookley residents. The transport links are already in place for such a development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0454</a>	Object	<p>Proposed development at the rear of Baldwin Road would not be a sustainable community. It would have no 'heart'. Limited facilities we have now include a pub, a garage and a small convenience store. The fields are regularly used - and have been for 30 years or more - with residents (including those from Offmore Estate) walking around the perimeters for exercise and dog walking too. If Green Space were to be provided for children's play, pollution would have to be taken into account especially from Hurcott Lane and the A456. The nearest doctors' practice in Linden Avenue has very limited parking so patients are forced to park on the road, causing a nuisance to the residents. The local Primary schools are full, the nearest one being on a restricted site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0580</a>	Object	<p>The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. If this is built on it will reduce the separation between dwellings from Kidderminster, Hurcott and Blakedown. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into Green Belt and would</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSI's. There are no parks or recreational areas in the Green Hill area. If the development were to go ahead in this area the only likely venue for recreation would be Hurcott woods. Due to the proximity there to the proposed development OC/4 people would more likely favour walking. Neither road leading to Hurcott is safe for pedestrians as it is narrow with a lot blind hills and corners. With the increased traffic of both pedestrian and vehicles there would not doubt be an increase in accidents. The habitat for many flora and fauna in Hurcott woods and wool would be over used and would not doubt suffer from an increase in pollution (noise, dog fouls and litter) This would ruin the natural habitat. A Linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no heart and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. Offmore Primary school is full, on a restricted site and can no be extended. The extra dwellings would not have local schools to use so would need to drive to nearby schools. This will increase pollution and worsen the already bad traffic in the surround roads during rush house. The topography to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher that the surrounding area. This would mean the visual impact of a development here would be an eye sore.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0664</a>	Object	<p>Proposed development of land behind Baldwin Road has number of disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of productive land</li> <li>• impact on wildlife in area</li> <li>• would not be sustainable community - not enough school places</li> <li>• Lea Castle site would allow proper community and require new primary school</li> <li>• Baldwin Road used a rat run - proposed closure of Hurcott Lane will make this worse.</li> <li>• Birmingham Road already accident blackspot</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0719</a>	Object	<p>Strongly object to use of this land for development for housing. Brownfield sites should be used as they are more appropriate and are available</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0739</a>	Object	<p>Concerned re increased traffic if site is developed. Hurcott Road already used as rat run at peak times. Bus service unreliable. Brownfield sites must always be used in preference to Green Field.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01860</a>	Object	<p>Objects to new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Reasons are:</p>

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

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



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggests Safari park and ring road traffic can be alleviated if it is re-routed via Wribbenhall from the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads.</li> <li>- Concerned about Brexit and questions what will happen to all the farming subsidies when it is introduced.</li> <li>- Raises concern that Hagley is part of the West Midlands conurbation and how long it will be until Kidderminster goes the same way.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01997</a>	Object	<p>Objects to new development Baldwin Rd East of Offmore / Comberton due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too much traffic on the Birmingham Rd</li> <li>- No school to put the extra children</li> <li>- No to industrial development</li> <li>- Suggests considering the extension of the Lea Castle site.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01999</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to the Hurcott/Baldwin Road development.</li> <li>• Do we need another 20,000 residents?</li> <li>• Where will they come from and where will they work?</li> <li>• Our current infrastructure is totally inadequate to support the influx.</li> <li>• Our town centre is pathetic and has nothing to boost economy.</li> <li>• Planners need to concentrate on today's problems.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02029</a>	Object	<p>If the projected need for the number of houses up to 2034 is correct, some Green Belt will be needed for development but there doesn't appear to be any priority given to sites with obvious wildlife value. Looking at Kidderminster two sites come to mind which stand out compared to most of the sites highlighted which are under grain crops at the moment</p> <p>Part of OC/4 Land at the back of Baldwin Road. Object to the northern two meadows part of OC/4. The other part of this area has been brought under cultivation the northern two meadows bordering Hurcott Road and straddling a public footpath has considerable wildlife and amenity value. These fields are lowland dry acid</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			that these sites should be developed BEFORE Green Belt land is requisitioned and developed. The Hurcott hamlet, itself incubated from an historic paper mill and adjacent to SSSI nature reserve, should be preserved along with the lake and woodland as an attractive and valuable leisure amenity for the citizens of Kidderminster and district so that it's attractions may remain available to all.
	<a href="#">LPP02278</a>	Object	I am writing to you in response to the suggested planning proposal behind Baldwin Road. Two years ago I enquired about this land and was told that planning is not allowed on Green Belt land. I feel quite aggrieved that the Council is going back on its word.
	<a href="#">LPP02358</a>	Object	Baldwin Road:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Current infrastructure cannot support suggested numbers.</li> <li>- Already bad traffic would be made worse.</li> <li>- Lack of primary school places.</li> <li>- Negative effect on wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02374</a>	Object	I wish to raise my objection to the proposed development for Offmore/ Comberton area and Baldwin Road. There are frequent accidents at Husum Way/ Birmingham Road junction as well as traffic jams in and out of Kidderminster through the Land Oak. So many additional houses is going to increase the amount of traffic dramatically and pollution will increase. Bank holidays will be horrendous, particularly with the development of the Safari Park and the people this will bring to the area. This in turn could actually put people off visiting the area rather than increase tourism in the area. Access to any houses behind Baldwin Road would have to be from the Birmingham Road and where this is positioned is on a blind bend which would be highly dangerous. In addition, the amount of houses will put pressure on the local primary schools which are already at capacity and for King Charles High School which is near capacity and unable to extend further. There are endangered species living in the land which has been put forward to be removed from the Green Belt which must be protected. I question why all proposals for development are to the east side of Kidderminster and nothing proposed for the other parts of town. Development of industrial units by Hodgehill also brings additional traffic to what is an already extremely busy road. The cost of a new bypass which requires two railway bridges would be extortionate and while so many existing roads are desperately in need of resurfacing, is not justifiable.

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02398</a>	Object	<p>Object Greenhill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt important for wildlife</li> <li>- already heavy traffic would worsen</li> </ul> <p>A small development would not bring additional support to area unlike a large one e.g. at Lea Castle, which would inc new school, transport services, community facilities.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02563</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object and comment on the proposed building rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area. The land you propose to build on is much higher than the existing Offmore Estate, overlooking nearby properties. The extra traffic would mean more noise and congestion. I appreciate that more houses are needed but more consideration should be given to Lea Castle being the better choice over the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02603</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a pristine piece of land. Why tear it up? Other sites have already been built upon in the past.</li> <li>2. This site is the main entry to the town approaching from the north and east. The proposed building work would be an urbanised eyesore for anyone driving into the town this way</li> <li>3. This site is raised on a hill - it will tower over houses on Baldwin Road. Other sites aren't on a raised site like this and more easily blend into the landscape.</li> <li>4. Houses on this site will add to existing traffic into the town and will create extra demand upon existing doctors, schools and other provisions. Other sites, such as Lea Castle would be large enough to warrant their own, new amenities and therefore not add pressure to other locations or require constant trips into the town.</li> <li>5. Other sites already have existing plumbing and sewerage - Lea Castle, Sladen School site, Sion Hill school site, industrial units off Stourport Road and other disused factory sites within central Kidderminster.</li> <li>6. These other sites are an eyesore that attract vandalism and metal theft, and should be used first, before fresh green sites are even considered. Why haven't they been built upon if housing is so urgently needed? Please ask the building firm why?</li> <li>7. The majority of employment is based nearer other parts of Kidderminster.</li> <li>8. The proposals for an 'Eastern Bypass'. Exactly what is this bypassing? I regularly travel across that section</li> </ol>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of the town - from Birmingham Road over to Bromsgrove at all times of day. There is almost never any congestion at all.</p> <p>9. Birmingham Road at Husum Way is already an accident prone junction which is confusing for some. Any entry or exit onto land to the rear of Baldwin Road will add to the danger considerably. Traffic lights will cause delays and add to the unsightly urbanised approach to the town.</p> <p>10. Finally, it is worth remembering that future generations will judge us by the decisions we have taken and the reasons why they were taken. Ripping up fields, creating a permanent blot on the horizon, just because it pleased building firms, will not be judged favourably.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02658</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the Rear (East) of Baldwin Road, Appendix A (OC/4) refers. We consider a plan to develop this area for housing as inconsiderate, inappropriate, short sighted and piecemeal.</p> <p>Inconsiderate - because it will not address the needs of our well established community, we are already starved of local amenities which other areas enjoy.</p> <p>Inappropriate - we are very surprised and disappointed that the council is proposing to allow such erosion of our precious Green Belt land. Development on current Green Belt land will seriously impact on wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Short sighted - because there are many more suitable areas available, with far more development potential to provide a sustainable community.</p> <p>Piecemeal - by adding bits and pieces of development communities are being created with no heart!</p> <p>The residential area bounded by the Birmingham Road and Chester Road North, known locally as the Greenhill Estate has very few amenities - a pub at the Land Oak traffic lights, a fuel station on Birmingham Road and a small shop on Hurcott Road. There are currently approximately 1000 dwellings in this area of Greenhill with a possible 400 or more proposed by a would-be developer. If the land to the rear of Baldwin Road is to be developed for housing, amenities to serve this area and Hurcott village should be provided. For example, a park (shared open space), a village hall/community centre (to facilitate the promotion of community activities) a small group of shops, a good regular/dependable bus service etc., to put a heart into the community! "Twenty is plenty" speed restriction on traffic is needed, because the local roads in this area have become a rat run for drivers avoiding the congestion at the Land Oak Junction. Hurcott Road, Baldwin</p>



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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are far too many deaths and accidents on the A449 Husum way/Hurcott road area due to planning of the junction.</li> <li>There is always extreme flooding by Husum Way Bridge and in Shakespeare Drive.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2677</a>	Object	<p>I object to building on land to the rear of Baldwin Road under option A because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plans do not include provision of new schools. The development falls in the catchment areas of Offmore Primary and King Charles 1 Schools, both of which are full and have no scope for expansion on existing sites.</li> <li>The development is on high ground above the town and would be visible for some distance around. To replace the green fields at the edge of the town with a development would significantly affect the visual impact of that side of town.</li> <li>The need for railway bridge provision makes it very unlikely that an Eastern bypass would ever be built. This development is reliant on such a bypass.</li> <li>This is a serious incursion into Green Belt and takes away open land that separates us from the West Midlands Conurbation. These fields must not be built on.</li> <li>The proposal would not create a sustainable community with schooling and village centre facilities.</li> <li>Proposals to close Hurcott Lane would lead to increased traffic on Baldwin Road.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2731</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill;</li> <li>noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters;</li> <li>pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc)</li> <li>Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access by walking.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2744</a>	Object	<p>It is understood that there is a lack of enough brown field sites for the Wyre Forest planning department to take advantage of, in consideration of building nearly 6000 more new homes by 2034.</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>However, the proposed options A and B have some serious disadvantages. A major one in our opinion is the likely impact on the two SSSI sites in the Hurcott area. With reference to the National Biodiversity Network data there are species in this area which have been verified that are on the red endangered list and frequent Hurcott Woods and the surrounding fields. We urge you visit the NBN web site and seriously consider the data that has been collected for area around the woods. The proposed linear add-on development to the west of Baldwin Road and Offmore Estate doesn't really seem to encourage the feeling of community, and the facilities on Offmore, e.g. the school wouldn't be able to expand or cope with extra demands on the infrastructure. Traffic congestion and the cost of road and railway bridge improvements would also be a serious financial disadvantage, to development in this area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02755</a>	Object	<p>I am opposed to the plans to develop the land rear to Baldwin Road and the Hurcott village area. I have not been reassured by information that the plans consider the local infrastructure nor the current residents for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• current road layouts are not suited for the extra traffic and would need significant alteration to safely incorporate another estate</li> <li>• With an increase of pedestrians (in particular children accessing Offmore primary) there would need to be provision of a suitable crossing. There is a crossing patrol (which I feel is inadequate for the road due to its traffic volume and width) further down the Birmingham road, but I fear people from the new estate would chance crossing the main road, rather than walk the extra distance to the patrol, if no other method is provided. The Birmingham road is a busy arterial route into Kidderminster: increasing traffic here will only increase the risk of injury to crossing pedestrians.</li> <li>• Without a suitable link road, Baldwin road and Hurcott lane would continue to and increasingly be used as rat runs. There is little room to expand these roads. Additionally, Hurcott lane is the primary access to Hurcott woods. More traffic flow here will inevitably increase the risk of pedestrian injury to those using the woods and lane as the road is narrow.</li> <li>• Any bypass linking the Wolverhampton road and Worcester road would require a bridge over the railway line. Creation of such a bridge seems an unlikely prospect due to its expense, requirements for sound buffering and also impact on natural habitats.</li> <li>• The land to the rear of Baldwin road is much higher than Baldwin road itself. Without proper landscaping</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the new estate would dominate the current houses and have a detrimental impact on our wellbeing and our house prices. Additionally, new build properties tend to have small gardens and I am concerned that the new houses will seem even closer to my boundary because of this and the elevation difference. Any development here needs to be considerably and sympathetically planned. I have not been reassured that this is the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am unsure of the necessity for new housing in Kidderminster - unless it is affordable starter homes - though I am concerned that the new development will mainly, if not entirely consist of larger, more expensive properties - which defeats the object I think the government are aiming for.</li> <li>• It is also disappointing that Green Belt land is being used and that such use will impact local wildlife, and encroach on the SSSI at Hurcott.</li> </ul> <p>Overall I do not feel that sufficient thought has been applied to the proposed development to ensure that it integrates within the local area with as little interference and intrusion as possible.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02852</a>	Object	<p>Concern at development on east side of Kidderminster. Lea Castle is big enough to include services, ie shops, schools, surgery and would negate need to develop other sites. Issues of traffic/pedestrian safety/impact on local infrastructure, schools and Hurcott nature reserve, a SSSI. Preserve Green Belt as a buffer zone between Kidderminster/Blakedown.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02868</a>	Object	<p>Ref: Development behind Baldwin Road and Offmore proposals</p> <p>‘The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’.....</p> <p>I strongly oppose this particular proposed development on our Green Belt for several reasons. Offmore and Comberton is already a ‘large’ housing estate, with many residents who need the open spaces of the Green Belt. Schools are already over subscribed and small estate roads used as main commuter routes to highlight just two ... any further development around this area will only compound these major concerns. I believe that WFDC have an obligation before embarking on any new development to safe guard and improve the environment/social care of the people already living there and a huge housing estate on the Green Belt which surrounds Offmore would be detrimental for all. I fully understand the need for housing and the compromises which will be needed ... I urge the Council to look for smaller sustainable sites and make certain that the basic NEW infrastructure is in place before the development starts, it is not acceptable for the Council just to accept that the present facilities are adequate.</p>

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>proposed by Barberry will increase traffic and add to congestion on these narrow roads. Motorists often drive at speed through the Village and there have been a number of accidents and these will increase. It is also becoming increasingly dangerous for pedestrians walking their dogs or pushing young children in pushchairs along the narrow Hurcott Road to get to the pool and woods. Any diverted traffic proposed by the developers would increase traffic diverting along Hurcott Road from the Village. This road is narrower and has 2 blind bends resulting in motorists using the horn twice to warn on-coming traffic. This contributes to noise pollution in an otherwise quiet area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is Green Belt land which plays a vital role in separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands conurbation. The land to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and an intrusion on the landscape. This proposed development also includes 2 fields going down to Hurcott Village and intrudes on the buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSI. This will impact on the varied wildlife frequently seen in these fields including Roebuck deer, foxes, rabbits, and hedgehogs. The mature trees and various areas of shrub land/hedgerows are also home to a variety of birds including bats as well as in Hurcott Woods themselves.</li> <li>• The current proposal for development of Baldwin Road and Offmore would result in housing without any supporting infrastructure which is not sustainable.</li> </ul> <p>We have lived in Kidderminster all our lives and contribute to the economy of Wyre Forest. Please do not include the Baldwin Road site in the WFDC local plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02951</a>	Object	<p>I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure — Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Since the opening of the Stourport link road the traffic on Husum Way has increased considerably and has become a rat run. How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husurn Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular.</p> <p>Offmore School is full and cannot be extended.</p> <p>GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&amp;E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that theses services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals.</p>

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			would have an impact on the air quality and therefore residents' health.
	<a href="#">LPP03067</a>	Object	Object to proposed development in the Offmore Baldwin Road area. Significant road alterations would be needed with a new railway bridge. Eastern By Pass will be expensive, increased volume of traffic will mean Baldwin Road being used even more. An increase in traffic volume on the Birmingham Road /Offmore junctions will increase accident risk. Land behind Baldwin Road is elevated, development will be very visible. This area of Green Belt land is home to a number of endangered bird species which should be protected. Why is all the development being proposed for the east side of town and nothing for other areas? Schools cannot cater for an increased number. Offmore Primary is full and King Charles nearly full. The proposals will not lead to a sustainable community, no community centre, shopping facilities etc,
	<a href="#">LPP03070</a>	Object	Loss of wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPP03080</a>	Object	The Green Belt on the Birmingham Road is the gateway to Kidderminster and is enjoyed by visitors from Birmingham. I support the proposed Lea Castle "Sustainable Village". Please do not spoil the Green Belt to the rear of Baldwin road.
	<a href="#">LPP03105</a>	Object	The proposed land behind Baldwin Road is elevated and any development would overshadow the remaining Green Belt and the existing housing community. Any houses built on this site would put extra pressure on the existing primary schools that, at the moment, have no spare classroom spaces. The number of houses being built on this site would not sustain a school, doctor's surgery, shop or community centre thus no community atmosphere.
	<a href="#">LPP03112</a>	Object	<p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic in these areas is already at unacceptable levels and any development would add to the already heavily used rat runs in these areas.</li> <li>• Loss of views and amenity / recreation space for local residents</li> <li>• Any bypass/link road to the east of Offmore would take away current breathing spaces and take up a nature resource and visual beauty</li> <li>• Visual impact of residential development at Baldwin Road (the land is much higher at the rear of Baldwin</li> </ul>



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>anything shorter would cause roads around Hurcott Rd/ Birmingham Rd. to be used as rat runs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Would be needed before land to the east of Offmore could be developed.</li> <li>○ Would need at least one and probably two new Railway Bridges. These are incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for them.</li> <li>○ The elevated position would need at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise.</li> <li>• Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to avoid congestion</li> <li>• Drainage of the land to the rear of the existing Offmore estate is extremely poor. In recent years heavy rain has led to serious flooding into gardens in Prior Close, Chaucer Cres., Offmore Farm Close, Ruskin Close and Munro Close. Even at times of severe drought, the high water table on the Offmore Estate means that if a two foot deep hole is dug in a garden on the lower part of the estate, it rapidly fills with water.</li> <li>• A linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no community “heart” and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. The Cavalier PH, Offmore Evangelical Church and Offmore Primary School are the only “community facilities” on the existing Offmore estate. The proposed extension of the estate would not be able to provide any extra facilities which would be accessible to existing residents.</li> <li>• Offmore Primary School is full, is on a restricted site and can’t be extended.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03365</a>	Object	Objects to plans for the Green Belt land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore/Comberton area.
	<a href="#">LPP03368</a>	Object	Opposes development at Baldwin Road because the area forms a natural separation between Green Belt and Kidderminster Borough and separates the town from the adjacent West Midlands towns. Concerned at lack of employment opportunities in Kidderminster and the impact of a growing population as they have to travel to work and add to road congestion, pressure on schools and Worcester hospital.
	<a href="#">LPP03417</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing here would remove all the habitats which wildlife that have been identified as at risk depend on.</li> <li>• This land is considerably higher than the surrounding so development would be very visible. The views as you drive into Kidderminster currently help lift the appearance of the area. Building vast amounts of property here is likely to have a further detrimental effect on Kidderminster’s reputation and appeal as a</li> </ul>

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

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



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			linnets, corn buntings etc.) and should be protected. Hurcott Road is already heavily polluted by traffic fumes and several hundred more cars will make it worse for the Horsefair and Hurcott Road residents. There is also a lack of infrastructure and any new development in the Hurcott Road, Baldwin Road and Spennells area would result in children having no primary school places.
	<a href="#">LPP03448</a>	Object	Families have used the rights of way for children to run free, and see the animals and birds. There are so many other sites where there have already been buildings. There is also the amount of extra traffic on Hurcott Road.
	<a href="#">LPP03453</a>	Object	Building behind Baldwin Road and the Offmore and Comberton areas would start a potential chain of development into Blakedown and other areas. Leave Green Belt alone.
	<a href="#">LPP03583</a>	Object	<p>The challenges we currently face every morning exiting Baldwin road onto Birmingham Road is significant. The traffic is heavy and at times just dangerous. It is dangerous the speed some drivers come through and a number of cats have been killed on this road. Local infra-structure i.e. GPs and dentists I believe are only struggling with local demand. The junction where Hurcutt Road meets Birmingham Road has had numerous accidents. It is a fatality waiting to happen. The field at the Back of Baldwin Road is on a hill, it would mean we are completely overlooked.</p> <p>We do not need large detached properties, we need 2/3 bedroomed affordable houses for people like my daughter who is saving for her first property.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03597</a>	Object	<p>Reasons for Objection of Proposed Core Housing Site behind Baldwin Road</p> <p>As a resident of Baldwin Road who would be affected if this scheme is approved, my reasons for rejection of this proposed scheme are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduction in property value</li> <li>• Interruption of rural outlook</li> <li>• Removal of privacy</li> <li>• Light reduction</li> <li>• Additional noise</li> <li>• Disruption throughout development</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic flow</li> <li>• Capacity of local schools</li> <li>• Capacity of health care provision</li> <li>• Removal of leisure facilities</li> <li>• Employment opportunities</li> <li>• Environmental effects</li> <li>• New services costs</li> <li>• Access</li> <li>• Traffic volumes</li> </ul> <p>Alternative Development Options for Consideration:  The space opposite Homebase on Chester Road South (old sports ground?)  The site of the former Sladen Middle School on Hurcott Road  The site of the former Sion Hill Middle School on Sion Hill  The site of the former Wyre Forest Glades Leisure Centre  Unused space within Crown House in the town centre  Use of the many empty redundant retail and industrial units around Kidderminster  The creation of a “Lea Castle village” on the whole site area of the former hospital</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03649</a>	Object	<p>I would like to make the following observations and comments on the proposed Wyre Forest Local Plan. In particular with reference to the area to the north-east of Kidderminster extending between Hurcott Village and the Stourbridge Road in the north, and Hurcott Village and the Birmingham Road to the south. Concerns and Disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The areas of Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster play a key role in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation.</li> <li>• The Local Plan predominantly concentrates proposed development along a wide eastern corridor. Is this not disproportionate?</li> <li>• The removal of Green Belt should only occur in exceptional circumstances when all other sites (ADR and brownfield) have been built upon.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			sites that appear in the current plans.
	<a href="#">LPP03775</a>	Object	I object to the proposal for building houses to the rear of Baldwin Rd and the Offmore Comberton area. There is perfectly good land going to waste in the old Lea Castle site, why can't that be used instead? The roads surrounding that area are more robust than the smaller roads surrounding Baldwin Road. The effect on the surrounding wildlife in Hurcott village would be devastating, and while I understand we need more housing surely that shouldn't be at the expense of our beautiful countryside and wildlife? Baldwin Rd is already used as a cut through and the majority of cars do not respect the speed limit and use it as a race track. More housing in this area would just increase this and put the families at risk along this road. What are the plans to support the increased infrastructure that would be needed if we suddenly have hundreds of extra families in the area? Kidderminster Hospital is already at breaking point and where would the children go to school? To cope with the increase of traffic, there would be more roads built, more traffic, more noise pollution and no-one policing the speed limits or behaviour of the motorists. It has already been established that the site at Lea Castle has enough space to accommodate a new school, bus services and plenty of houses. So surely this can be considered as a logical area for development?
	<a href="#">LPP03778</a>	Object	We would like to voice our concern to the proposed building developments adjacent to Hurcott Lane and on the Lea Castle site. We support the need to build more affordable housing, particularly on brownfield sites, but feel that without improving the local infrastructure traffic, school and NHS chaos will follow. Any development for Baldwin Road or land off the Stourbridge Road would cause impossible traffic situations for Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road. No traffic count or accident details can illustrate the reality of the dangers for motorists or pedestrians on these routes. The issue of Hurcott Lane needs to be addressed. Access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve and preservation of the SSSI site needs to be protected. The reality of no pavement and safe pedestrian access along Hurcott Lane to the Nature Reserve needs to be a priority and the volume of traffic restricted. Motorists will inevitably select the Hurcott Lane route to access the Birmingham Road. I'm sorry if developers' profit will be affected by constructing a suitable Eastern by-pass, but Wyre Forest should not allow construction of housing if existing routes and a valued Nature Reserve are compromised and made increasingly unsafe.
	<a href="#">LPP03781</a>	Object	We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health,

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>off towards the lower end of Hurcott Road where it is a narrow lane which in turn would run off into the outfall from Hurcott Pool and transfer to Broadwaters with the potential for flooding the adjacent main road. Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is generally much higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and not blend in spoiling the beauty of the area. The field height to the rear of Baldwin Road means that the proposed properties would adversely overlook the existing properties &amp; their gardens at the lower end of Baldwin Road. The Government's own policy regarding planning decisions is to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological interests. In brief all planning decisions must consider location on alternative sites to green fields.</p> <p>Amenities and Community Spirit: We already suffer from a lack of amenities in this area. One shop in which our post office was taken off us. A smattering of shops in Spennells and Offmore. Can local schools accommodate extra housing on this level? Offmore is already full and can't be developed. We no longer have an acute hospital so all this extra population would place more pressure on Worcester Royal already facing special measures. This also raises questions with regards the existing level of doctors, dentists and opticians in the area. Public transport is poor and infrequent. Big developments generally have no community spirit. Building on smaller pockets of land fosters integration. Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP. Doubling the size of Spennells would not be a wise move.</p> <p>Conclusion: We need smaller numbers of houses proposed which can be sustained by brown sites like Lea Castle. Smaller pockets of once used land should be considered like factories on Park Lane, closed pubs (The Broadwaters?) closed schools like Sladen and Sion Hill. We need to reinvigorate existing eyesores such as disused schools &amp; factories which are frequently vandalised and this will improve some of the more rundown areas rather than permanently erode Green Belt sites, which once gone they are gone forever. Don't bulldoze green field sites prior to using up every brown field or derelict site in the locality.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03859</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt acts as a barrier to the joining up to the conurbation spread from West Midlands.</li> <li>• Rat runs could be created causing danger to people.</li> <li>• Other options are more suitable.</li> <li>• Infrastructure would not be able to support the increased population.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03863</a>	Object	We are writing in response to the above. Whilst we understand the need for a local plan and continued



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>housing development in the Wyre Forest, we must object in the strongest terms to any proposal to use Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Road and down into Hurcott Village. There are a large number of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest, particularly Kidderminster, which either do not appear in the plan or show absolutely no signs of development. These sites, e.g. the former Sladen School, former Sion Hill School, former Stourminster School, the Yew Tree Public House and run down factory and similar sites in and around Kidderminster show no signs of or intention to develop. These sites would significantly contribute to housing development land before any incursion into significantly larger areas of Green Belt land. The Green Belt land at the rear of Baldwin Rd is well developed agricultural land and contributes to environmental and agricultural sustainability for this area. The Green Belt land provides vital separation from Blakedown, Hagley and from the wider Bromsgrove and West Midlands area. Land here is also significantly higher than the surrounding land and would cause significant visual and environmental impact. This Green Belt land provides numerous wildlife habitats and development would seriously impact on ecological sustainability, biodiversity and the designated SSI areas. Any development behind Baldwin Rd, beyond Offmore and into Hurcott village would be smaller linear developments with no possibility of a community heart, community facilities and ongoing socio-cultural sustainability. These areas would not support the building of a primary school and local schools are already very full, Offmore Primary school which serves this area is full and cannot be extended. Roads in this area are already busy and dangerous with frequent accidents, Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Rd are used daily as 'rat runs/cut throughs' and increased development would bring this to intolerably dangerous levels. Developments such as behind Baldwin Rd would not generate a large enough financial contribution to roads and infrastructure to manage safety and increased capacity, indeed the development promoter for the rear of Baldwin Rd stated categorically that they would only 'contribute' to a new roundabout at the top of Husum way (a roundabout which would only serve to increase traffic and safety problems)! The promoter also stated that they would not bear any of the expense of roads or infrastructure, let alone a full scale eastern by-pass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03887</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently have inadequate facilities and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Do not need industrial development.</li> <li>• The development would need shops/community facilities.</li> <li>• Will create environmental damage.</li> <li>• The development should include home for older couples and single people.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended.</li> <li>• GP surgeries are struggling to cope now</li> <li>• The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built</li> <li>• The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife/arable land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03953</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm &amp; Comberton and would like to include Franche and Ferndale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended.</li> <li>• GP surgeries are struggling to cope now</li> <li>• The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built</li> <li>• The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife/arable land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03968</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the proposed development of land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton, Kidderminster. I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of infrastructure - Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic.</li> <li>• We have lived in Husum Way for the past 20 years and have seen the traffic increase tremendously over this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and as we live on the corner of Shakespeare Drive we find it very difficult to get out, particularly since the Stourport Link Road has opened and Husum Way is being used as a cut through.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>immediate area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular.</li> <li>• Offmore Farm School is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended.</li> <li>• GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&amp;E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals.</li> <li>• The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead.</li> <li>• The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing whereas the land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is ample land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03981</a>	Object	The options of plan 'A' and 'B' would cause a considerable volume and build up of traffic congestion not to say the loss of agricultural land would be a bad idea.
	<a href="#">LPP03983</a>	Object	Object to OC/4.
	<a href="#">LPP03985</a>	Object	I am opposed to any development on Greenfield sites unless all brownfield sites have been developed except those too badly contaminated. I believe that the proposals for building on the east of Offmore OC/6 and the rear of Baldwin Road OC/4 would not result in any meaningful communities. This would also put added pressure on Offmore Primary School which is on a restricted site. Nor development on land to the east of Kidderminster should occur until the by-pass has been constructed and it would need to start at the Stourbridge Road because Hurcott Road and Baldwin Road are already used as 'rat runs' now and would only become much worse. The area to the rear of Baldwin Road down to Hurcott Lane is well used and much loved by walkers, dog owners and anyone interested in the countryside. It would be an eyesore if built on due to its

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>have a very negative impact on the residential amenity of the neighbourhood. My house backs onto the field and so I would completely lose any privacy, as the proposed buildings would be so much higher than my house. This field provides an important green space for the people of Greenhill, who have no other open spaces in the immediate vicinity. It also provides a barrier from the pollution on the Birmingham Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing the Green Belt land behind Baldwin Road would have a very detrimental effect on local wildlife. Hurcott Nature Reserve and pools incorporates the largest area of SSSI woodland in Worcestershire and the field behind Baldwin Road is a very important green space that adjoins this nature reserve, providing routes and habitats for wildlife species that are of conservation concern, including woodpeckers, sparrows, starling, owls, kestrels, house martins, frogs, toads, grass snakes, bats, hedgehogs and numerous species of bee, all of which I have seen in or from my back garden.</li> </ul> <p>Finally, I cannot understand why the proposal to build on the field behind Baldwin Road is in both current options, from a traffic perspective alone this site is a very bad choice and will have a very negative impact on the immediate neighbours, yet apparently no-one considered that? If you simply built the number of houses proposed for the Baldwin Road site on the Lea Castle site instead – you would create no traffic problems for the immediate neighbours?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03998</a>	Object	<p>I object to development proposals in sites OC/4, OC/5, OC/6, OC/13 as they are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>weighed to the east of Kidderminster/disproportionate to the district, should encompass all areas</li> <li>Could re-create a Birmingham commuter zone not local skill base. The area needs housing to attract a technologically competent workforce.</li> <li>Loss of good arable land in Green Belt which should not be used where alternative sites are available.</li> <li>Distribute development to allow for natural expansion to reduce the environmental impact.</li> <li>Points A or B options would worsen already bad traffic. A new rail bridge to Birmingham Road may be of benefit, but would not alleviate congestion and an eastern by-pass solution is costly and impractical.</li> <li>Being elevated land in Baldwin Road and east of Offmore/Comberton could cause drainage issues and would have an adverse visual impact.</li> <li>Local services and amenities would be affected. Schools are full or near to and medical services under pressure, bus services are poor.</li> </ul>



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial development at WFR/CB/7 Hodge Hill - site unattractive to business investment with limited access options, transport links are restricted;</li> <li>There is no obvious demand/supply chain sector in the vicinity.</li> <li>This is not the way forward.</li> <li>The basis for an alternative proposal is evident where option B housing is considered in conjunction with elements of option A, plus core mixed use sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4001</a>	Object	<p>Object to Baldwin Road/land east of Offmore/Comberton area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss habitat</li> <li>Lack school places</li> <li>Few rural /green areas would remain</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4004</a>	Object	The areas around Baldwin Road and Hodgehill for extra housing would be pointless as schools are already full up. Light industry around Hodgehill would spoil wildlife and the rural look as not much green space would be left.
	<a href="#">LPPO4009</a>	Object	I object to proposal for land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Kidderminster and the farm land east of Offmore and Comberton being Green Belt as this would destroy the Green Belt and surrounding area and damage the wildlife habitats of both birds and animals. Also the air quality and noise levels would increase.
	<a href="#">LPPO4017</a>	Object	I strongly object to houses being built at Baldwin Road/Offmore, purely on a traffic issue. As I live in Hurcott Road close to traffic lights with Chester Road it is already a nightmare trying to get off my drive. So adding more houses creating even more traffic using Hurcott Road as a rat run is just not on. As stated before there are enough Brownfield sites on which to build a sufficient number of houses, before looking at Greenfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4021</a>	Object	Ref: Local plans proposals for the Hurcott/Baldwin Road area. I believe that the use of this 'Green Belt' land for housing development should really be last resort.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not believe development of either Hurcott site would offer any benefit to the people of Kidderminster. It would most likely comprise of expensive housing which the majority within the area could not afford and a token amount of so called affordable housing on sites which in traffic terms, are wholly unsuitable.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04200</a>	Object	<p>Without a by pass, all the roads around Hurcott Road will be used as rat runs to an even greater extent than they already are.</p> <p>Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt. This would impact on wildlife habitats in the buffer zones for Hurcott &amp; Podmore SSIs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Birmingham Road is often already congested</li> <li>The proposed linear development would have no community heart.</li> <li>Offmore primary school is already full and cannot be extended.</li> <li>Additional building will add to flood risk.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04238</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposed building on land sited to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore. My main concern is the loss of about 2 ½ % of Green Belt land to development when there is a perfectly viable alternative at the Lea Castle site. I fully support the OCAGLP (Offmore Comberton Action Group Local Plans) for a sustainable village at Lea Castle as I see it as a solution to all the problems development brings with the necessary infrastructure that is required to go with it. The Husum Way railway bridge is in my opinion not big or strong enough to support the extra traffic from the proposed Offmore development. There would also be more air pollution and more flood water as a consequence of more housing. Husum Way already floods regularly when there is a prolonged period of heavy rain. The junction at the A456 Birmingham Road and Husum Way is a dangerous road crossing owing to the volume of traffic to and from Birmingham. The strain of extra traffic from any new development would only increase the problem that already exists. Not only will there be the visible impact of housing as the Offmore site is more elevated Offmore Primary School is already full to capacity with no more room to extend.</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04241</a>	Object	It will not deliver the additional infrastructure required to support. Will cause additional problems with traffic in a road that has already become a rat run
	<a href="#">LPP04244</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the development of Birmingham side of Kidderminster, namely, the site at the back of Baldwin Road. Also the site to the side of Offmore Road estate.</p> <p>Reason: Adverse Road traffic on already congested road junctions. We need to keep the Green Belt buffer zone at this side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>Note: In my opinion the 'Lea Castle Sustainable Village' would be a better site.</p> <p>Reason: This an empty site, not been used for years and would have a lot less impact on the Green Belt and the roads and road junctions surrounding it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04248</a>	Object	<p>First and Foremost it is Prime, High Grade Arable / Agriculture Land. Which will be required when we leave the EU, and certainly not for Housing, or Industrial Development. Offmore and Comberton schools are at capacity, anymore intake would be very detrimental to existing, pupils and staff. At certain times of the day there is a large volume of traffic in and out of the estate, which will increase. The council is supposed to be looking to make the approaches to Kidderminster more attractive and here you are proposing this huge sprawling, development, why on earth ruin something that is already a very attractive gateway to the town?</p> <p>We appreciate houses have to be built and hope a good majority would be affordable to first time buyers / rent and we would support an alternative extended Lea Castle site, which would make it a desirable, practical sustainable community, with all the necessary services. In conclusion the council / Government are saying there are approximately 8,000/10,000 people homeless in Wyre Forest (ie: 5,000 housing) if there are then the type of house that will be built are not suitable. If this is not the case then people will come from outside the district and will commute to work. The bottom line, this country cannot afford a large increase in the population, we do not produce enough of what we consume, you only have to look at our balance of payments deficit. This is why we should not be using farm land for housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04296</a>	Object	<p>Local Plan proposals for land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore / Comberton Areas - Options OC/4, OC/5, OC/6 &amp; OC/13. Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster currently plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation.</li> </ol>

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

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



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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local school is already full which cannot be extended.</li> <li>GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients.</li> <li>Kidderminster has no A&amp;E and Worcester is in special measures - these services will be overwhelmed by these proposals.</li> <li>The eastern by-pass and railway bridges are unlikely to be built due to expense. Developers will not provide this funding - which should be built before any development goes ahead anyway.</li> <li>The Green Belt land is vital for separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands Conurbation.</li> <li>Wildlife habitats are on this land.</li> <li>Other suitable areas are not included in the plans where fields are just used for horse grazing and are not arable land like what has been proposed - this will be needed when we leave the EU.</li> <li>Lea Castle site is a much better proposal.</li> <li>Lea Castle proposal would be able to support a primary school.</li> <li>Within the catchment for Wolverley high school which would impact positively on its long term viability.</li> <li>There are empty sites around Kidderminster which could be used for housing.</li> <li>The town centre needs regenerating; plenty of empty places could be used for houses/flats.</li> <li>Should propose development on the north/west of Kidderminster and in Stourport/Bewdley as there are areas which could be developed here.</li> </ul>
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPP04520</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with the Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans leaflet.</li> <li>Green Belt development should be the last resort - look at all the brownfield sites still around Kidderminster which could be used.</li> <li>The town centre has been killed off so pointless looking at development for shops.</li> <li>Look at potential for residential development in the town.</li> <li>We have no industry to attract extra people to need the housing.</li> <li>How will surrounding roads of Hurcott cope with double-triple the amount of cars to houses?</li> <li>How will doctors and schools cope?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04742</a>	Object	I have confined my comments mainly to the effect of the proposals on the Hurcott area. I leave it up to other members of the public to comment on their own areas of interest.

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>6.16 makes reference to the Green Belt boundary separating towns and relates it to the A456 corridor. This does not reflect in any way on the reason why the Hurcott area is being considered for building when the words say that 'it will be particularly important to ensure that the land remains open'.</p> <p>6.21 mentions the value of tourism to the Wyre Forest and the SVR and Safari Park are mentioned. Having lived with the huge amount of traffic during weekends and holidays using the A456 to reach these tourist areas I struggle to see the point of considering adding more traffic through additional housing in the Hurcott area with a roundabout on the A456 to slow the traffic even more. Tourists won't come if they can only reach a destination through constant heavy traffic.</p> <p>Section 11 A Unique Place. If we are taking this section to look at the character and distinctiveness of an area then I would make the case that there is little sense in proposing building large areas of housing around the SSSI in the Hurcott area which is included in both options A and B of this plan. The nature reserve of Hurcott Wood and the SSSI areas that feed in and out of the reserve would be severely compromised by building what I have heard is 400 dwellings down Hurcott Lane from the Stourbridge Road to the Birmingham Road. The area proposed in Plan A off the Spennells site has little of interest as far as character is concerned although I know that people who walk their dogs in this area are fond of it.</p> <p>Policy 11D on page 80/81 under section 3 relates to the biodiversity of a site. Certainly when I went to the meeting about the proposals for the land behind Baldwin Road and presumably that up to the Stourbridge Road focused on visual aspects and the transport problems within Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road but paid little heed to biodiversity of the site. I suspect that developers have little interest in biodiversity.</p> <p>Section 15 Water Management. I didn't notice much about drainage or water management in the proposals from RCA Regeneration and Barberry for the Baldwin Road site.</p> <p>Section 16 Pollution - What effect would the volume of dwellings proposed along the Hurcott corridor have on the SSSI areas being surrounded by this core option to follow Policy 16A?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04786</a>	Object	<p>I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/traffic emissions</li> <li>• Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools. Affect on tourism/wildlife/possible flooding.</li> <li>• Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings instead of Green Belt.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			households would have 2 cars. The volume of traffic would be ridiculous and very dangerous in that area.
	<a href="#">LPP05155</a>	Object	<p>I am objecting to this for reasons stated below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is Green Belt land and plays a vital part in our community.</li> <li>• Wildlife - we have endangered birds in this area and buzzards, hawks etc.</li> <li>• The schools are already full to the max and there is no room to expand.</li> <li>• Husum way is already a rat run for the A449 without adding a bypass which will come out on Husum Way before the bridge as there will be no funding and it will cause chaos to the rail as they cannot build another bridge it's too expensive.</li> <li>• Contact the local police and find that there are far too many deaths and accidents on the A449 Husum way/Hurcott road area due to planning of the junction.</li> <li>• There is always extreme flooding by Husum Way bridge and in Shakespeare Drive and the development areas are higher than Offmore and Comberton so flooding risk will be massive.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0822</a>	Support	<p>Land east of Baldwin Road</p> <p>Green Belt Site clearly makes positive contribution to openness of Green Belt. However, boundary to rear of gardens in Baldwin Road is not robust as some gardens have been 'extended'. Hurcott Lane to the east is a much more robust boundary. Podmore and Hurcott Pools plus Hurcott village itself to the north give a strong defensible boundary. Birmingham Road to south is also permanent enduring boundary. Mitigation to include linking areas of green infrastructure both new and existing.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Impact - Visual Appraisal carried out by specialist firm. Assessed Zone of Visual Influence - rolling topography and woodland blocks meant views of site were limited.</p> <p>Drainage and Flood Risk Geoenvironmental desk study and preliminary site appraisal done. Nearest areas at risk of flooding are within valley of Podmore and Hurcott Pools system.</p> <p>Archaeology assessment carried out - potential for medieval agricultural remains and WWII infrastructure.</p> <p>Ecology and Trees Preliminary ecological survey and tree survey undertaken by specialists. Predominantly species-poor improved grassland. Several veteran trees which will need to be protected.</p>

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO4044</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans leaflet.</li> <li>• Green Belt development should be the last resort - look at all the brownfield sites still around Kidderminster which could be used.</li> <li>• The town centre has been killed off so pointless looking at development for shops.</li> <li>• Look at potential for residential development in the town.</li> <li>• We have no industry to attract extra people to need the housing.</li> <li>• How will surrounding roads of Hurcott cope with double-triple the amount of cars to houses?</li> <li>• How will doctors and schools cope?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4065</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to development at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton.</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure - hard to exit estate due to volume of traffic on Birmingham Road; crossing is a death trap.</li> <li>• Husum Way traffic has increased already due to it being used as a rat run - how would this traffic be diverted if the development went ahead?</li> <li>• Local school is already full which cannot be extended.</li> <li>• GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients.</li> <li>• Kidderminster has no A&amp;E and Worcester is in special measures - these services will be overwhelmed by these proposals.</li> <li>• The eastern by-pass and railway bridges are unlikely to be built due to expense. Developers will not provide this funding - which should be built before any development goes ahead anyway.</li> <li>• The Green Belt land is vital for separating Kidderminster from the West Midlands Conurbation.</li> <li>• Wildlife habitats are on this land.</li> <li>• Other suitable areas are not included in the plans where fields are just used for horse grazing and are not arable land like what has been proposed - this will be needed when we leave the EU.</li> <li>• Lea Castle site is a much better proposal.</li> <li>• Lea Castle proposal would be able to support a primary school.</li> <li>• Within the catchment for Wolverley high school which would impact positively on its long term viability.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>for the Hurcott &amp; Podmore SSI's and endangered bird species.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The hundreds of houses planned in this area would have a dramatic effect on the recently built New Offmore Primary School which is at full capacity and can't be extended any further.</li> <li>7. In summary this ribbon development LP is a not sustainable or a community and an alternative proposal needs to be considered.</li> </ol> <p><b>Proposals:</b> The current draft proposals in Options: A &amp; B propose using only some of the land available at Lea Castle. My proposal would be to extend this by not only including both Options A &amp; B but also extend the site to land up to Wolverhampton Road and the rear of the Lea Castle site up to Axborough Lane. In addition further development along the western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill linking up with the development of the disused Sion Hill Middle School site. In addition the old Sladen Middle School site on Hurcott Road has also never been developed since clearance and should also be considered.</p> <p>Advantages of these proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With the additional land proposed a sustainable community of around 2,500 homes could be created.</li> <li>2. This community would be large enough for a new primary School.</li> <li>3. This community being within the Wolverly High School catchment area it would positively impact on this schools long term viability.</li> <li>4. This community would be large enough to sustain a Village Centre &amp; local shops.</li> <li>5. This community would also be large enough to sustain a bus service and live-work units.</li> <li>6. Additional development areas to the North / West of Kidderminster should also be considered, such as the rear of the existing Ferndale Estate where over 200 houses could be accommodated and this area has local shops &amp; a bus service etc.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP0457</a>	Object	I object strongly to developments to the East of Kidderminster. Why are there no proposals for any development



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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP0576</a>	Object	Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. If built on it will reduce the separation between dwellings from Kidderminster, Hurcott and Blakedown. An Eastern Bypass would need to be built to accommodate extra traffic caused by the increase in dwellings. This would need to be built from the Worcester Road to the Wolverhampton road. There are endangered species along this route so it must not be developed. Any eastern bypass would need to cross the railway as the Husum road bridge is inadequate. If this is not done the excess traffic would bring the area to halt as it would not cope. The expense of building a railway crossing would be extortionate and I doubt the council or developers can afford this. The elevated position of the new road linking the Wolverhampton Road and Worcester Road would require at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitats on the buffer zones for the Hurcott and Podmore SSI's. There are no parks or recreational areas in the Green Hill area. If development went ahead in this area the only likely venue for recreation would be Hurcott woods. Due to the proximity there to the proposed development OC/4 people would more likely favour walking. Neither road leading to Hurcott is not safe of pedestrians as it is narrow with a lot blind hills and corners. With the increased traffic of both pedestrian and vehicles there would not doubt be an increase in accidents. Habitat for flora and fauna in Hurcott woods and pool would be over used and would suffer from an increase in pollution  (noise, dog fouls and litter) This would ruin the natural habitat. Linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no heart and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. Offmore Primary school is full, on a restricted site and can not be extended. Extra dwellings would not have local schools to use so would need to drive to nearby schools. This will increase pollution and worsen the already bad traffic in the surround roads during rush house. Topography to the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher that the surrounding area. This would mean the visual impact of a development here would be an eye sore.
	<a href="#">LPP0746</a>	Object	High quality farmland, school full, loss of Green Belt, traffic. Should develop at Lea Castle instead
	<a href="#">LPP0749</a>	Object	Object to development to east of Offmore: loss of wildlife, strain on schools and GPs, rat-running on side roads,

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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Close and Munro Close. Even at times of severe drought, the high water table on the Offmore Estate means that if a two foot deep hole is dug in a garden on the lower part of the estate, it rapidly fills with water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would have no community “heart” and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. The Cavalier PH, Offmore Evangelical Church and Offmore Primary School are the only “community facilities” on the existing Offmore estate. The proposed extension of the estate would not be able to provide any extra facilities which would be accessible to existing residents.</li> <li>• Offmore Primary School is full, is on a restricted site and can’t be extended.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01825</a>	Object	I am very concerned by the Core site option to the east of Kidderminster because this being built on Green Belt land, which should be protected at all costs, as per the original aims of the Green Belt. There are many sites within Kidderminster that should be used first, in particular the old law courts and the redevelopment of Worcester Street - replace some of the empty shops with housing/flats and bring life back into the town centre again.
	<a href="#">LPP01857</a>	Object	Opposes development at Husum Way because the area forms a natural Green Belt separating the town from West Midlands towns. Concerned at lack of employment opportunities in Kidderminster and the impact of a growing population as they have to travel to work and add to road congestion, pressure on schools and Worcester hospital.
	<a href="#">LPP01861</a>	Object	<p>Objects to new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increase in volume of traffic - a bridge will be required</li> <li>- the impact of A2 very good agricultural land that is valuable land</li> <li>- schooling - the present is at full capacity</li> </ul> <p>Supports development of the Lea Castle site and the ADR site between Hurcott Village and Stourbridge Rd.</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			damage wildlife habitats and affect the air quality/noise levels
	<a href="#">LPP02142</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Schools in area are full.</li> <li>- Visual impact would be very visible</li> <li>- Volume of traffic unsustainable</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02183</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• We are a 'Garden of England' area - how long for?</li> <li>• Our heritage is need for these areas to refresh us, trees to sustain air quality and to protect wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• Once Green Belt is gone there is no going back.</li> <li>• When we need more land to grow food in the future it won't be there.</li> <li>• We need breaks between Kidderminster, Stourport &amp; Bewdley.</li> <li>• Wildlife habitats are under enough pressure - leave them alone.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02188</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would put a strain on schools and services in the Offmore area.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02226</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the proposed development of land at the rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm and Comberton, Kidderminster</p> <p>I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of infrastructure - Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic.</li> <li>• We have lived in Husum Way for the past 20 years and have seen the traffic increase tremendously over this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and we find</li> </ul>

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this period of time. The traffic is backed up down past Shakespeare Drive on many occasions and we find it very difficult to get out, particularly since the Stourport Link Road has opened and Husum Way is being used as a cut through.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents living in Husum Way would appreciate — and all agree — that something should be done about Husum Way/Birmingham Road junction before considering more houses being built in and around this immediate area.</li> <li>• How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular.</li> <li>• Offmore Farm School is full, on a restricted site and cannot be extended.</li> <li>• GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&amp;E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that these services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals.</li> <li>• The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead.</li> <li>• The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing whereas the land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is amble land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02351</a>	Object	<p>I am so greatly sorrowed by the apparent need to use highly productive Green Belt land to satisfy the needs of housing for this period and maybe more afterwards. The land at Offmore Farm is rolling fields, woods and all manner of wildlife around that at the moment is our pleasure. Apparently this land although Green Belt and intensely farmed is marked in red on the plans and that means it is for developers to do with as they will. If they must we would like to think that consideration is given existing properties and that they could be granted a little</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>space rather than housing butting up to us and totally robbing any views that they have of the Cleve and Malvern Hills and Worcestershire etc. One problem with all this building here, I feel would be extra noise and poor air quality with this much greater intensity, the biggest culprit probably being the transport needs of the modern household. During rush hour times we already experience a lot of effective grid lock with the existing road system as it is, but double this in the locality and it really would be a problem with nowhere to go. There was some talk about an Eastern Bypass being part of the overall plan, joining the Wolverhampton Road (A449) with the Stourbridge Road (A451) Birmingham Road (A456) and the Worcester Road (A449) to the South and M5. I think if the large amount of housing goes ahead then it must be met and serviced by what you could call a large amount of road to match what would certainly be a total change in traffic numbers. We were advised that the developers would possibly pay for this and the necessary railway bridges (two required) so I suppose that if needs must, this will tip the balance for acceptable traffic flows. I can only speak for the Offmore Farm area situation, but all these new homes will bring a lot of new people with children who will all need to use the local facilities. With the Primary Schools all full and nowhere to expand, where would the children go? There are Schools available, but on the opposite side of Kidderminster to the North East i.e. Wolverley / Fairfield area. With a larger population and many of us living longer, but maybe carrying with us health issues means we must mention the NHS. Without more money for new buildings, Nurses and Doctors the local Hospitals can't cope with present numbers. The answer is we need more facilities as well as houses. I hope that maybe some of these thoughts would inspire some out of the box ideas for ways to generate new growth in and around the town that maybe would go towards making Kidderminster bigger and better without totally taking away everything we enjoy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2352</a>	Object	<p>Too many homes proposed for the Eastern boundary; burden should be spread. I object to proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt to the East of Offmore includes prime agricultural land/wildlife habitat and it reduces air pollution.</li> <li>- School capacity issue.</li> <li>- Eastern bypass needed before new homes are built including bridges as necessary – who will pay?</li> <li>- If built on, Offmore being elevated would need a tree screen to reduce traffic noise/pollution.</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02353</a>	Object	<p>Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To the local plan for the locations of housing on either option A or B will devalue our property. This has been confirmed by a high profile local estate agent.</li> <li>To the loss of Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster which plays a vital part in separating Kidderminster town from Blakedown and the overall West Midland conurbation.</li> <li>To industrial development at Hodge Hill would also require a by-pass to avoid certain congestion.</li> <li>Due to the elevation of the proposed building land to the east of Offmore this will result in major traffic noise – trees would be required to ‘buffer’ the traffic/noise pollution.</li> <li>to the destruction of the beautiful Green Belt landscape to the east off Offmore would result in the loss of annual nesting habitat for endangered/declining bird species i.e., Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers; also ground nesting birds, Lapwings, Skylarks and occasionally Curlew. More common wildlife loss would be to Badgers, Foxes, Hares and protected Bats which are often seen flying overhead to the east of Offmore. All this Green Belt land if proposals are passed to the building of houses would be lost forever! And this is unforgivable.</li> <li>To the proposed building to the east of Offmore where existing houses are bordering the fields on the Green Belt/farmland. This will have a significant visual impact as the ground is elevated. Building in this area will result in loss of privacy for residents, high visibility, light and noise pollution.</li> <li>To a linear development to the east of Kidderminster/Offmore would not create a sustainable community. It would have no community ‘heart’ and would not accommodate a neighbourhood centre.</li> </ul> <p>Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An eastern bypass/ road would need to be built prior to any housing development from the Wolverhampton Road to the Worcester Road to be of any use.</li> <li>A bypass road would be needed before the land to the east of Offmore could be developed.</li> <li>An eastern bypass would need at least one new railway bridge. The building of bridges is extremely expensive. Will a private developer pay for this? Or are you expecting the tax payer to pay the cost?</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			2034. Perhaps they should concentrate on development in Kidderminster town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO2427</a>	Object	<p>We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health, pollution and social problems. Alternative brown field sites are available along with pockets of derelict land ripe for redevelopment. The amount of development required has also been vastly overestimated and the actual amount needed could be sustained on alternative brown sites (Lea Castle, disused pubs, disused factories such as those in Park Lane, Sladen/Sion Hill schools). <b>Pollution:</b> Any development of these areas would substantially increase the already heavy traffic pollution. We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. Also the speed of this traffic is seriously dangerous, especially to children, the vulnerable and animals. This development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. Add to this an increase in the already incessant traffic noise levels. I would not wish to see a further increase in traffic using Hurcott Road. The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Road infers that Hurcott Lane will require the road to be blocked for vehicle access at either the Birmingham Road or Stourbridge Road ends but this will not prevent traffic flow just divert more traffic into Hurcott Road increasing pollution and volumes of traffic on roads only designed for local residential traffic which have inadequate flow characteristics. In conclusion, this is not a healthy and community spirited decision to develop the area. Baldwin Road is similarly treated like a rat run and as for the Horsefair how much more can this bottle neck sustain? We are trying to improve the look of this run down area not destroy it and end all hope of engendering a happy community spirit. Extra housing would require a by-pass to be built as the aforementioned roads just cannot sustain more traffic and the pollution it brings. <b>Wildlife:</b> The area is known and loved for its beauty and wildlife. This Green Belt plays an aesthetic role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation and these green fields are the first glorious introduction to Kidderminster on the A451 and A456. Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. Consider the importance of recreational activities in terms of health, wellbeing and tourism. People need space to thrive. It's unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. Compared with neighbouring towns like Stourbridge we are lucky to have such big green spaces. Don't destroy it for future generations when alternative brown or</p>

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPQ2505</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the urban extension core sites to the East of Kidderminster:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is Green Belt and plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. The Plan clearly states in Policy 6B that locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Many endangered bird species such as corn buntings, yellowhammers &amp; skylarks also live in this area.</li> <li>• There may be drainage issues with this site a proper investigation into this should have taken place before the area was allocated.</li> <li>• A bypass road would be needed in order to access these new houses properly, so should be considered alongside Option A. To truly operate as a relief road it should be extended to the Wolverhampton Road. This would be a very expensive project as it would need to be built over the railway line. It is unlikely that any developer would want to pay for this.</li> <li>• Offmore &amp; Comberton would not be able to cope with these extra people. Offmore Primary School is already full and on a restricted site so cannot be extended.</li> <li>• The proposed development would not be sustainable and due to its linear nature could not accommodate a neighbourhood centre.</li> <li>• Can the NHS cope? Kidderminster &amp; Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand.</li> <li>• Money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2554</a>	Object	<p>I understand that new housing needs to be provided but think there are better alternatives. On both of your plan options you wish to build on the land to the east of Offmore and propose a bypass on these fields thus completely ruining the feel of the local area. I have grave concerns of what the destruction of green areas will mean for the local wildlife. There are many species of birds in the area. These include birds that are listed as being endangered such as Corn Buntings, Skylarks and Yellow Hammers. There are also many hedgehogs and whilst they are not officially listed as endangered, it is a fact that they are in vast decline. Please reconsider your plans for Offmore</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			and think about alternatives. It really would destroy this already established area and cause much upset to local residents.
	<a href="#">LPP02562</a>	Object	I wish to lodge my objection to the proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton areas. This involves interrupting a natural wildlife habit- bird sanctuary at Hurcott Pool which has taken years to develop and is hugely supported by nature lovers and walkers - why destroy a beautiful area it is your duty to make sure this valuable area is conserved. Which private developer would pay for a new Railway Bridge which this Eastern By Pass would require? This would be an elevated position which would need screening off! The local school would not be able to cope - so what would your answer be to this problem.
	<a href="#">LPP02572</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed developments around Offmore and Comberton for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of good quality agricultural land which is in constant production</li> <li>• This land is teeming in wild life including badgers, bats, foxes, common newts and Great Crested Newts, frogs and bees. A full survey should be done to identify all of the species which will be destroyed.</li> <li>• The land is used by local residents for health walks and other leisure activities.</li> <li>• There are plenty of brown field sites such as Lea Castle which would make a better alternative and fulfil the needs of Kidderminster. The housing need figures seem excessive and are not in line with historical growth.</li> <li>• Insufficient services: Doctors, Schools, Hospitals.</li> <li>• There are no jobs for the local population how will the plan provide jobs for additional people?</li> <li>• Where is the money to come from? Is the local community going to be lumbered with unsustainable debt?</li> <li>• Such a large development will increase pollution, road congestion flooding issues for existing and new development with the amount of water run off down to Blakeway stream.</li> <li>• Loss of privacy to residents. The top fields are substantially higher than the existing estate. The lower field is much lower and also takes our soak away water which could affect the stability of the ground.</li> <li>• Concentrating too many houses on the east of Kidderminster, overwhelming the existing communities which could cause social problems.</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The schools and Doctors to the east of Kidderminster are already at capacity.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02586</a>	Object	<p>Concerned regarding the proposed development of the fields at Offmore and appalled at the proposal. My concerns are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When purchasing our property the local search did not reveal anything. I asked the planners regarding any future or possible development with regard to the surrounding fields. The planner advised me that there were numerous other sites that would be used before the fields surrounding my property and he also stated “it won’t be in my life time that development happens in your location”. I have since contacted the farmer who currently owns the land and he stated that he had been in conversation with the Council and Developers for over 12months, I would like an explanation why we have been lied to both in a verbal enquiry and in a legal criterion. The land is raised by a considerable degree and development will cause the water run-off that will to the adjacent property gardens. The height of properties built in this location, ‘houses would tower over the current barns and would cause a reduction in property values. There is a Gentleman’s agreement with the farmer for use of a track that surrounds all the properties in the courtyard as there is no rear access to the properties and this has been in place since the barns were converted. What will happen when the land is sold?</li> <li>The development will have a severe impact on the surrounding roads and infrastructure, the council do not have the finances to maintain roads in the area as it is so how do you expect to build new roads and maintain them? I was always led to believe that Greenfield sites and brownfield sites would be used before any Green Belt. Why are the proposals all on Green Belt land. There are numerous sites of brownfield and greenfield sites unused and located around Wyre Forest. All the development is in one area and one side of Kidderminster when if the developments were located around the area there would be less impact on everything?</li> <li>I also understand there has been a challenge raised as to the percentage of houses required and the percentage that Wyre Forest District council have requested which according to figures is far in excess of</li> </ol>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>actual requirements.</p> <p>4. Kidderminster Hospital was downgraded yet Worcester Royal is unable to cope with the extra workload to the extent it is in special measures. How can an authority allow more influx of residents when the current ones have to use sub standard services. The Doctors surgeries will not cope neither will the schools. With all increases of population, there is a rise in crime, how will West Mercia Police cope, they do not have the resources to attend all incidents so they are prioritised and only the major incidents are attended.</p> <p>5. The impact on the surrounding nature will be devastating. There is an established badgers set at this site. There are common and great crested newts in and around the properties, my understanding is the newts and their environment are of great importance and both are protected. I would be very interested to see a copy of an ecological report on the areas nature population and the impact a development will have.</p> <p>Nature cannot cope with constant depletion of its natural resources from badgers, birds, bats, amphibians, butterflies and the bees that are constantly in the media regarding loss of habitat and if they disappear then the human race will suffer untold consequences.</p> <p>6. The increase in traffic fumes and noise will have detrimental effects to health for all, the picture is a very bleak one.</p> <p>7. The developers at a recent drop in meeting said that not only were the houses needed as a requirement by central government but for people working in and wishing to move to Kidderminster for employment, this I feel is a very weak and unjustifiable reason as what few jobs there are in Kidderminster are either low paid, zero hours contracts or voluntary work, there are no large volume employers now the carpet works have closed. The centre of the town is appalling with shops either closed, charity shops or low quality merchandise. The Horsefair is a total eyesore yet there is no regeneration for this area, people are not going to travel to Kidderminster when they can go to Merry Hill, park for free, shop in an environment that is both pleasant and not subject to weather conditions.</p> <p>8. It is a well documented fact that when local authorities have introduced green areas for residents to walk along hedgerows, on grass, by running water and where trees grow, their health and well being has risen in some instances that depression has been reduced considerably and health issues have dramatically</p>

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>&amp; Grade 2 agricultural land. According to Policy 28D and paragraphs 28.13-28.15 - Only Lower grade agricultural land should be considered for development and not permitted on higher grade land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Development of the best and most versatile agricultural land as defined by the NPPF will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that it can not be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land.</li> <li>2. Proposals for development on agricultural land should not prejudice the viability of farming operations on any remaining agricultural land.</li> <li>3. Applications for development on agricultural land of higher quality will be resisted where the site has not been allocated in the Local Plan and is considered worthy of protection.</li> </ol> <p><b>Climate Change:</b> The latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP 2009) reaffirm that winters are likely to get wetter and that we are also likely to experience more extreme weather conditions such as intense rainfall events. Existing surface water drainage systems are not designed to cope with these extreme conditions. Extensive flooding in the UK in the summer of 2007 was mostly due to surface water overwhelming traditional piped surface water drainage systems. Therefore, it is considered prudent to ensure that new SUDS schemes are developed taking into account</p> <p>7.1 The attractiveness of the District's natural environment is identified as being a particular asset within the Sustainable Community Strategy. Safeguarding the District's Green Belt will help to maintain the appeal of the District to residents and visitors and will also maintain the opportunities that the Green Belt offers for recreation.</p> <p>All of these exerts of the current plan that are also reinforced the past (2006-2026) plan, and should be seriously considered when considering any development on prime Green Belt land. I must reiterate when the Green Belt is dissolved it can't ever be undone.</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The proposed development would lead to other issues such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are not enough jobs in the area to sustain such an increase in the population of the East of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• A linear development in this area would not be a sustainable community in any sense of the word</li> <li>• Kidderminster has been naturally in decline since the loss of the carpet industry and other businesses, there is no way such a large population increase with planned housing projects would be sustainable.</li> <li>• The proposed development on Green Belt goes against so many existing and past governmental &amp; District council policies &amp; guidelines.</li> </ul> <p>As a local resident I am appalled at the lack of communication by the local Council who are supposed to work for not against the people.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02745</a>	Object	<p>The Green Belt is a vital part in separating Kidderminster from the advance of the West Midlands Conurbation, the public footpaths are used by many walkers both with and without dogs. This would cause massive congestion at peak times. Husum Way already carries a large amount of school traffic to and from Offmore and Comberton schools and is used as a cut through. Speeding traffic already causes concerns for the children who walk to school. The very dangerous junction between Husum Way and the A456 cannot cope with any additional traffic. Both Offmore and Comberton primary schools are full. The lower end of the field behind the existing houses in Prior Close is boggy as the water from all the higher ground surrounding it collects at this low point.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02773</a>	Object	<p>I would have serious concerns about the proposed housing developments for Baldwin Road and Offmore surrounding areas. This area of Kidderminster is already congested with school issues, traffic issues, etc., The wildlife habitat in Hurcott Wood and the Green Belt areas of Offmore Farm would be severely affected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02774</a>	Object	<p>I am writing regarding my concerns about the local plans proposed on both your options A and B for the Offmore and Comberton areas. Offmore is currently on the edge of the town and the Green Belt plays a vital part in the separation from the West Midlands conurbation. It seems totally inappropriate to be building on Green Belt sites when there are far better options that I feel should be considered. Green Belt is vital not only for the purpose of</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			local wildlife but for the local area to. I chose to live in the Offmore area as it is now, on the edge of town and surrounded by aesthetically pleasing green areas not further housing sites that will create a feel of being in a built up area. Whilst I totally understand the need for providing more housing I do not see how expansion to Offmore and surrounding areas is viable.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2789</a>	Object	I object to the proposal to build to the rear of Offmore, Comberton, Baldwin Rd and also Spennells.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2811</a>	Object	Support the OCAG-LP objections to local plan proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton area.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2839</a>	Object	We prefer more dispersed strategy where although construction costs are inevitably higher, there can be more architectural diversity, e.g. Lea Castle which would allow a development to include a Primary school/medical amenities. Our home in Green Belt fields on a small estate lies on the Eastern boundary of Kidderminster so we had no notification of these plans which could result in us being located between an industrial park and a large traffic island.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2859</a>	Object	Object to development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm & Comberton and would like to include Franche and Ferndale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic</li> <li>- Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended.</li> <li>- GP surgeries are struggling to cope now</li> <li>- The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built</li> <li>- The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife/arable land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2860</a>	Object	Object to development of land to rear of Baldwin Road, Offmore Farm & Comberton and would like to include

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Franch and Ferndale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of infrastructure/volume of traffic</li> <li>- Offmore Farm School is full and cannot be extended.</li> <li>- GP surgeries are struggling to cope now</li> <li>- The promised Eastern by Pass/railway bridges are unlikely to be built</li> <li>- The Green Belt separates the town from the West Midlands Conurbation</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife/arable land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2970</a>	Object	<p>I believe you should take careful note and consideration of the alternatives drawn up by 'The Offmore Comberton Action Group'. Theirs seems to be a reasoned argument in favour of the alternative proposals. I have objections to placing industrial land close to Hodge Hill nursery, right in the middle of countryside when so many alternatives are open to you; the Old court house, the new court house, the Frank Stone building in Green Street (empty as long as I have lived in Kiddy,)), the old labour exchange, Sion Hill school, the area alongside Louise Hewitt's that burnt down. Why use Green Belt for Industry? Please reconsider your plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3055</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The gateway to Kidderminster from the Birmingham side would be totally spoiled.</li> <li>• The volume of traffic would increase dramatically, on what is already an extremely busy section of road/dual carriageway(near to Husum Way).</li> <li>• The junction of Husum Way &amp; Birmingham Road is already an accident blackspot , &amp; surely building near to this will only increase the chance of even more accidents.</li> <li>• At regular times throughout the year, especially Bank Holidays the "through traffic" going to the Safari Park creates a traffic jam from the Land Oak to Husum Way , &amp; further. Once again , building near this stretch of road would only add to the problem.</li> <li>• Why can't sites that have already had buildings there be used i.e. Lea Castle former hospital or where schools have been closed etc. Thereby saving Green Belt land.</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apart from the aforesaid , do we in Kidderminster really need such a large volume of new housing</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3086</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Rd. This road is already used as a rat run from people using Crossley Retail Park and or wishing to avoid the traffic lights at the Land Oak pub.</li> <li>Husum Way and Borrington Road/Tennyson Road similarly act as an unofficial bypass and development in both these areas will only intensify the increasing use of roads in and around this area. Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Road are just single tracks and cannot accommodate increased volumes of traffic and so this will push more traffic along Baldwin Road. The speeds that some motorists go at in this road are frightening.</li> <li>From a visual perspective, the land behind Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. The Green Belt land around Baldwin Road and Hurcott supports much wildlife and is a beautiful gateway to Hurcott Woods and Pool an area enjoyed by many locals.</li> <li>Offmore is similarly high in places and will have a potent visual impact on the local surroundings.</li> <li>The land behind Baldwin Road and to the east of Offmore/Husum Way contributes strongly to reducing the impact of urban sprawl from Kidderminster through to Blakedown and then Hagley and the wider West Midlands.</li> <li>As a gateway into our town and district, our rural/semi rural heritage should be retained.</li> <li>Offmore Primary School is on a restricted site and cannot be extended. A further school would contribute to additional traffic issues at peak drop off and pick up times.</li> <li>Development of land to the east of Offmore would create a linear estate which would not be a sustainable community, it would have no community “heart” . Apart from the school the only community facilities on the estate are The Cavalier PH and Offmore Evangelical Church. The shopping precinct contains only a NISA Supermarket, a fish and chip shop and a hairdressers; there is no pharmacy or post office and no room to develop them.</li> <li>Proposed employment development adjacent to Hodge Hill would cause traffic and potentially noise problems and have a huge visual impact on this “rural” landscape.</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals for an eastern bypass would require a new railway bridge – how would this be funded and again there is a huge visual impact.</li> <li>The proposed eastern bypass would also create much traffic noise which would then impact upon the proposed newly built housing “estate” to the east of Offmore and existing residential roads. Further, any eastern by pass which started at Birmingham Rd would exacerbate traffic problems on Baldwin Rd which would be used as an access to that bypass. The only way a satisfactory eastern bypass can be provided is for it to run, at the very least, from the Stourbridge Rd round to The Mare and Colt on the Worcester Rd.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03089</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Rd. This road is already used as a rat run from people using Crossley Retail Park and or wishing to avoid the traffic lights at the Land Oak pub.</li> <li>Husum Way and Borrington Road/Tennyson Road similarly act as an unofficial bypass and development in both these areas will only intensify the increasing use of roads in and around this area. Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Road are just single tracks and cannot accommodate increased volumes of traffic and so this will push more traffic along Baldwin Road. The speeds that some motorists go at in this road are frightening.</li> <li>From a visual perspective, the land behind Baldwin Road is one of the highest points in Kidderminster and housing development here will have a huge visual impact from a wide area. The Green Belt land around Baldwin Road and Hurcott supports much wildlife and is a beautiful gateway to Hurcott Woods and Pool an area enjoyed by many locals.</li> <li>Offmore is similarly high in places and will have a potent visual impact on the local surroundings.</li> <li>The land behind Baldwin Road and to the east of Offmore/Husum Way contributes strongly to reducing the impact of urban sprawl from Kidderminster through to Blakedown and then Hagley and the wider West Midlands.</li> <li>As a gateway into our town and district, our rural/semi rural heritage should be retained.</li> <li>Offmore Primary School is on a restricted site and cannot be extended. A further school would contribute to additional traffic issues at peak drop off and pick up times.</li> <li>Development of land to the east of Offmore would create a linear estate which would not be a</li> </ul>



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>sustainable community, it would have no community “heart”. Apart from the school the only community facilities on the estate are The Cavalier PH and Offmore Evangelical Church. The shopping precinct contains only a NISA Supermarket, a fish and chip shop and a hairdressers; there is no pharmacy or post office and no room to develop them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed employment development adjacent to Hodge Hill would cause traffic and potentially noise problems and have a huge visual impact on this “rural” landscape.</li> <li>• Proposals for an eastern bypass would require a new railway bridge – how would this be funded and again there is a huge visual impact.</li> <li>• The proposed eastern bypass would also create much traffic noise which would then impact upon the proposed newly built housing “estate” to the east of Offmore and existing residential roads. Further, any eastern by pass which started at Birmingham Rd would exacerbate traffic problems on Baldwin Rd which would be used as an access to that bypass. The only way a satisfactory eastern bypass can be provided is for it to run, at the very least, from the Stourbridge Rd round to The Mare and Colt on the Worcester Rd.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3102</a>	Object	<p>Any development would be a serious visual incursion on the Green Belt land and would impact on the wildlife habitats herein. Much of the land to the rear of Offmore is considerably higher than the existing housing so any development would be very visible. The whole area seems to be a series of 'rat-runs' at many times of the day. Hurcott Road, Hurcott Lane, Husum Way and Tennyson Way are all very busy roads some with difficult junctions. Any development on this side of town would need a substantial By-Pass from the Wolverhampton Road to the Worcester Road with possibly two very expensive railway crossings. Hurcott Lane really needs widening to make it safer (not a single track road with passing places) The busy junctions at The Park Gate and Husum Way/Birmingham Road need significant improvements to make them safer. Whichever options are chosen the road network needs significant improvements to maintain safety and minimise congestion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3118</a>	Object	<p>I am emailing to oppose the planning for building to take place on Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster. I cannot see why these proposals would be made when there is perfectly good land to be built on at Lea Castle, especially as this site could be used as a sustainable village. There is also land to be used on the existing Ferndale estate that seems perfectly reasonable to me for at least 200 houses. To build on the proposed Green Belt land</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			would be an intrusion on the beautiful wildlife that inhabit there and a visual intrusion to the stunning land also. There are many endangered bird species that would be affected and I personally think it would be a crime to damage that. I truly hope you take Lea Castle and the Ferndale estate into consideration before destroying our lovely countryside.
	<a href="#">LPPO3124</a>	Object	I am emailing to oppose the planning for building to take place on the Green Belt land east of Kidderminster (Offmore estate). I'm not sure why this area is being considered when it would be much easier to build a sustainable village at Lea Castle as there is already planned building works for this area. The schools in the Comberton area are already to there limit and this would also add more pressure to the schools. Another area which could be developed on would be the Ferndale area which could easily house 200 more new builds.
	<a href="#">LPPO3157</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I don't agree that the east Kidderminster Green Belt land should be built on.</li> <li>- An eastern by pass would need at least one new railway bridge.</li> <li>- Offmore Primary School is full.</li> <li>- Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to avoid congestion.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3172</a>	Object	We understand, that all brown belt sites have already been allocated for development and that additional land needs to be made available in order to support the ever growing population and the local housing needs, we believe this does not have to be the land on Baldwin and Offmore. We want to protect the Green Belt land and the beauty of the countryside and all the wildlife within it. We have Bat's, Muntjac, Snakes and a variety of rare birds living in the area. We feel that noise and light pollution would have a major impact on the wildlife. We worry that Kidderminster's boundary would be moving nearer to Blakedown and that the visual approach to the town from the Birmingham Road would change the existing landscape dramatically. The local Schools have no capacity to take on additional pupils, the doctor's surgery just about copes . The infrastructure of the bridge at Offmore could not withstand additional traffic, the local roads are already used as "rat runs".
	<a href="#">LPPO3193</a>	Object	Against proposal:

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster separates Worcestershire from the west midlands.</li> <li>• The Eastern By Pass would have to be built from the Wolverhampton road to the Worcester road to be of any use as anything shorter would cause roads around the Hurcott area to become heavily congested/rat runs/dangerous.</li> <li>• There are endangered bird species along the bypass route.</li> <li>• As a bypass road would be needed before land to the east of Offmore could be developed this means this development should not go ahead</li> <li>• the eastern bypass would need an expensive railway bridge which no developer sound be willing to fund</li> <li>• The elevated position of the western bypass would need at least a 30m tree screen to buffer against traffic noise.</li> <li>• development of Green Belt site will lead to increase in localised flooding as the water course will be disrupted</li> <li>• Development of the land behind Baldwin road would be a serious visual incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on protected wildlife habitats and incursion onto the buffer zones for hurt and Podgier SSIs.</li> <li>• A linear development impact on community spirit and would not include local amenities/increase in anti-social behaviour and crime.</li> <li>• Offmore primary school already full.</li> <li>• Would not support a new bus route.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3245</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An Eastern Bypass would have to be built from the Wolverhampton road to the Worcester road and would require one new railway bridge (very expensive)!</li> <li>- The elevated position of this bypass would need a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise.</li> <li>- Offmore Primary school is full, is on a restricted site &amp; can't be extended.</li> <li>- There are endangered bird species along the route the by pass would have to take from the A456 to the A449</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development behind Baldwin road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt and would impact on wildlife habitat.</li> </ul> <p>Why not increase the building proposal for land around the Lee Castle area?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3246</a>	Object	<p>Concerns re implementation of the use of brown sites, with the effect that Green Belt land is taking prominence in pursuit of housing. Acknowledge the requirement for housing, especially social housing, but must challenge the bulldozing of Green Belt in ill-conceived plans, when brown sites continue to be allowed to lie dormant. We should address the imbalance that empowers developers and disadvantages the public requirement for housing, by legislation if necessary. Transparency of interest by developers should be mandatory as the current system is not acceptable. Need to find a solution to all the disused properties before embarking on new build. I totally oppose the use of Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster, for the following reasons:</p> <p>Husum Way/Tennyson Way has already become an overburdened and dangerous thoroughfare, with accidents being a regular occurrence at the Birmingham Road junction. The intersection itself is misused and hazardous. Any additional housing would necessitate an Eastern By Pass, which would be a major cost, particularly when a new railway bridge would be inevitable. Would a developer cover such an exorbitant cost or would it be a further burden to the taxpayer? Common sense dictates that a By Pass would need to stretch from Stourbridge Road to Worcester Road, otherwise increased traffic would exacerbate the "rat-run" imposition already being endured.</p> <p>Environmentally, this proposal is outrageous. For over 40 years we have enjoyed the countryside, breathing in good fresh air. There is no doubt that health will be compromised by the noise and traffic pollution that will ensue from such a massive change to the neighbourhood. The surrounding district is renowned for its beauty and abounding wildlife with easy access to walkers and ornithologists. I am confident the Worcester Wildlife Trust will have an input in any suggestion to sabotage the well established wildlife habitat, from Hurcott, east Offmore, and Spennells. No doubt some endangered species would be identified.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to ensuring any large development is first and foremost a sustainable community. The linear plan, with or without a by pass, would be "heartless". Surely we have learned from the past that</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>vast housing schemes lacking community spirit and amenities quickly deteriorate into slums. To my knowledge there is no opportunity of extending Offmore Primary School, neither is there easy access to overcrowded surgeries and our sadly downgraded hospital.</p> <p>The Kidderminster community has already suffered from a short-term strategy in downgrading our hospital and from loss of industry. It is good to have a forecast of redevelopment and growth - let's get it right this time.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03298</a>	Object	I strongly object to houses being built at Baldwin Road/Offmore, purely on a traffic issue. Adding more houses creating even more traffic using Hurcott Road as a rat run is just not on.
	<a href="#">LPP03309</a>	Object	<p>Infrastructure to areas WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any substantial increase in housing. The A456 would require substantial capacity development to deal with the increase in traffic, if this was achieved Husum Way will not cope. An additional road and a bridge over the railway would be required. This is unlikely to happen due to the high development costs and therefore the affordability of the housing scheme. There is currently a high level of wildlife within this area including badgers, foxes, deer and a large variety of birds, including endangered species. This development would have a significant impact on them and should not go ahead. Currently the A456 is a single lane carriageway and would not be able to cope with the proposed industrial development near Hodge Hill Farm. This proposal does not support a sustainable community, does not accommodate a neighbourhood centre and will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. The Offmore primary school is currently at full capacity and cannot be developed as it is on a restricted site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03378</a>	Object	Proposals do not encourage a sustainable community, as a parent of an Offmore pupil we know the school is full and unable to extend and as a Practice Nurse in a local GP surgery, how would a development of this size be served?
	<a href="#">LPP03567</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning permission was refused 6 years ago to build a semi built onto house.</li> <li>• Were told no new houses were to be built in the area.</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fought for the public footpath to stay at the land behind Baldwin Road.</li> <li>• Accidents on Husum Way, Birmingham Road junctions will only increase - already have many.</li> <li>• Have a lovely view of fields - don't want to look at new builds.</li> <li>• Where will the birds go?</li> <li>• Lack of schools, doctors etc.</li> <li>• Lea Castle would be a better option.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03589</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with everything on the Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans sheet.</li> <li>• Has watched the surrounding countryside disappear.</li> <li>• The council will not be satisfied until Kidderminster is sat side-by-side with neighbouring towns/villages.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03607</a>	Object	<p>Residents are surrounded by open countryside which is good for both quality of life, health and well-being as well as helping to maintain good mental health. To make such a change to our environment would have a serious impact on our health and well-being. Anything built at the rear of the properties would tower over them and would completely overpower the properties. This would have a significant impact on the value of the properties. The wildlife that exists around Spennells is very precious and we are losing vital habitat for species that are struggling to adapt to the changing environment. Around the barns there is a very healthy bird population, foxes, a badgers set, bats and great crested newts which are a European Protected Species. There are many brown field sites available where new housing can be developed without taking Green Belt that is vital to our towns and communities. This land is good quality agricultural land which has good crop production year on year. The current road network will not sustain a development of such a scale. There will be a much higher traffic flow for those people working on the other side of town. There are little to no employment opportunities on this side of town and it would be better to build high density homes in the town where people do not need to take car journeys to work. The increase in pollution through additional exhaust fumes increases the health risks to everyone in the community. This along with the increase in volume of traffic and traffic noise makes for a dismal picture for the future. Our current infrastructure will not cope with the increased population. It will only serve to</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			further impact on a hospital service that is already struggling to cope. I have the same concerns about the rest of the infrastructure in terms of Schools, GP surgeries, dentists, etc. Regeneration should be concentrated on brownfield sites within Kidderminster to help regenerate the centre of Kidderminster and bring some life back into the town.
	<a href="#">LPPO3799</a>	Object	I object to planned building to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore. I believe this would have a negative impact on wildlife and pose increased pressure on local schools (Offmore is already full). As a local resident I have seen many road traffic collisions on the Birmingham / Offmore turn, therefore with increased traffic this could see more collisions. I believe that the site at Lea Castle would prove a more viable option and have less negative impact on local services and wildlife. The site is on an easily accessible main road and is ready to be developed. There are also 3 local schools within that catchment.
	<a href="#">LPPO3867</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not suitable for the development proposed.</li> <li>• Green Belt will be destroyed - most of it agricultural land.</li> <li>• Would need to build a by-pass and rail bridge - costly (time and money).</li> <li>• Other sites are better.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3921</a>	Object	Objects to plans for the Green Belt land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore/Comberton area.
	<a href="#">LPPO3951</a>	Object	<p>I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/Traffic emissions</li> <li>- Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools.</li> <li>- Affect tourism/wildlife/possible flooding.</li> </ul> <p>Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings before Green Belt.</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP03954</a>	Object	<p><b>Ref: Development behind Baldwin Road and Offmore proposals</b></p> <p>‘The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open’..... I strongly oppose this particular proposed development on our Green Belt for several reasons. Offmore and Comberton is already a ‘large’ housing estate, many people and families live here and need the open spaces of the Green Belt. Furthermore we already have problems, over subscribed schools and small estate roads used as main commuter routes to highlight just two ... any further development around this area will only compound these major concerns. I also believe in this day and age WFDC have an obligation before embarking on any new development to safe guard, improve the environment and social care of the people already living there and in this particular proposal a huge housing estate on the Green Belt which surrounds Offmore would be very detrimental for all.</p> <p>I am sure like many other residents fully understand the need for housing and the compromises which will be needed ... I urge the Council to look for smaller sustainable sites and make certain that the basic NEW infrastructure is in place before the development starts, it is not acceptable for the Council just to accept that the present facilities are adequate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03959</a>	Object	<p>I object to the above proposed development for many reasons:</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure — Birmingham Road and Husum Way crossing is a death trap and we cannot exit the estate at holiday times due to the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Since the opening of the Stourport link road the traffic on Husum Way has increased considerably and has become a rat run. How would traffic from the proposed development be diverted from Husum Way and what are the plans for Hurcott Lane and Baldwin Road in particular.</p> <p>Offmore School is full and cannot be extended.</p> <p>GP surgeries are struggling to cope with existing patients due to a lack of GPs, Kidderminster Treatment Centre has no blue light A&amp;E and Worcestershire Royal Hospital is in special measures — where are the proposals to ensure that theses services will not be overwhelmed by these proposals.</p> <p>The promised Eastern by Pass — which has been promised for the last 40 years to my knowledge — is unlikely to be built, as will any railway bridges which are incredibly expensive to build. No developer would provide this</p>



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>funding, which should in any case be built before any development is allowed to go ahead. The Green Belt plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation, and is also home to many endangered bird species and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The land at Baldwin Road and behind Offmore and Comberton is arable land which will be needed more so when we leave the EU.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3975</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the urban extension to the East of Kidderminster core site proposed for allocation in table 31.01.1 of the Plan.</p> <p>The land is Green Belt and plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. Many endangered bird species such as corn buntings, yellowhammers &amp; skylarks also live in this area. The Plan clearly states in Policy 6B that locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt. The Plan even agrees at paragraph 2.10 that many local residents raised the importance of protecting the Green Belt, so it must be agreed that all must be done possible to avoid building in this area.</p> <p>It also needs to be considered if building on this land will cause drainage problems. Paragraph 31.5 touches on this need for it to be considered but provides no answer as to whether it is known if problems will occur. Obviously flooding to the area would definitely not be wanted and so maybe a proper investigation into this should've taken place before the area was allocated.</p> <p>The proposed development in the Offmore &amp; Comberton area would be a large site of 1,735 dwellings (table 31.01.1) so a bypass road would be needed in order to access these new houses properly. This would mean that the site should be part of Option A as opposed to just simply core housing. However, to build an eastern bypass as Option A proposes would equally cause problems. Not only are you building on Green Belt land but it would be an incredibly expensive project as it would need to be built over the railway line and it is unlikely that any developer would want to pay for this. Also it is doubtful that it will really provide relief to the congestion on the A449 Chester Road (as argued in paragraph 31.5). This is because a large amount of traffic that travels down the A449 Chester Road comes from the Wolverhampton Road. The relief road would only start from the A456 Birmingham Road and so would not take away the bulk of the traffic. To be truly effective the relief road would need to begin from the Wolverhampton Road.</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			In terms of the local community, Offmore & Comberton would not be able to cope with these extra people — for example Offmore Primary School is already full and on a restricted site so cannot be extended. The proposed development would not be sustainable and due to its linear nature not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. I understand that these new houses do have to be built somewhere but I would also ask whether the NHS can cope with the influx of extra people to the area. Kidderminster & Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand. Maybe money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services.
	<a href="#">LPP03977</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the urban extension to the East of Kidderminster core site proposed for allocation in table 31.01.1 of the Plan.</p> <p>The land is Green Belt and plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation. Many endangered bird species such as corn buntings, yellowhammers &amp; skylarks also live in this area. The Plan clearly states in Policy 6B that locating new development should wherever possible safeguard the open countryside and maintain the openness of the Green Belt. The Plan even agrees at paragraph 2.10 that many local residents raised the importance of protecting the Green Belt, so it must be agreed that all must be done possible to avoid building in this area.</p> <p>It also needs to be considered if building on this land will cause drainage problems. Paragraph 31.5 touches on this need for it to be considered but provides no answer as to whether it is known if problems will occur. Obviously flooding to the area would definitely not be wanted and so maybe a proper investigation into this should've taken place before the area was allocated.</p> <p>The proposed development in the Offmore &amp; Comberton area would be a large site of 1,735 dwellings (table 31.01.1) so a bypass road would be needed in order to access these new houses properly. This would mean that the site should be part of Option A as opposed to just simply core housing. However, to build an eastern bypass as Option A proposes would equally cause problems. Not only are you building on Green Belt land but it would be an incredibly expensive project as it would need to be built over the railway line and it is unlikely that any developer would want to pay for this. Also it is doubtful that it will really provide relief to the congestion on the A449 Chester Road (as argued in paragraph 31.5). This is because a large amount of traffic that travels down the A449</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Chester Road comes from the Wolverhampton Road. The relief road would only start from the A456 Birmingham Road and so would not take away the bulk of the traffic. To be truly effective the relief road would need to begin from the Wolverhampton Road.</p> <p>In terms of the local community, Offmore &amp; Comberton would not be able to cope with these extra people — for example Offmore Primary School is already full and on a restricted site so cannot be extended. The proposed development would not be sustainable and due to its linear nature not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. I understand that these new houses do have to be built somewhere but I would also ask whether the NHS can cope with the influx of extra people to the area. Kidderminster &amp; Redditch Hospitals have already had great cut backs and Worcester Hospital is regularly pilloried in the press for poor service as it just cannot cope with the demand. Maybe money is better spent being put into our local hospital and looking after the people who already live in Kidderminster. People will not want to move to the area if we do not first have the services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03980</a>	Object	Object to development East of Kidderminster North.
	<a href="#">LPP03989</a>	Object	<p>I object to the local plan proposals for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land is Green Belt and should remain so.</li> <li>2. As a bypass road would be necessary for the development of land to the east of Offmore it should NOT be developed.</li> <li>3. A by-pass would need to be linked to the Birmingham Road over the railway. Bridges are very expensive and private developers would not build one which means that Husum Way road bridge would be used more resulting in more traffic/accidents at the Birmingham Road/Husum Way junction.</li> <li>4. Offmore primary school is full and has no room for expansion.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP04006</a>	Object	I strongly object to the proposed development to the land the rear of Baldwin Road, and the Offmore, Comberton

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			area and I agree with all the disadvantages given by the OCAQ-PL.
	<a href="#">LPPO4013</a>	Object	<p>Objects to new development on the land east of Offmore Farm and Comberton. Reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- increase in volume of traffic - a bridge will be required</li> <li>- the impact of A2 very good agricultural land that is valuable land</li> <li>- schooling - the present is at full capacity</li> <li>- Concerned about the industrial development at Hodge Hill and the impact it will have on noise and pollution.</li> </ul> <p>Supports development of the Lea Castle site and the ADR site between Hurcott Village and Stourbridge Rd. Overall supports 'B' sites as more sustainable with minimum impact on the community and road structure, doctors, schools, shops and welfare.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4020</a>	Object	The impact of building behind Baldwin Road and the Offmore and Comberton areas would start a potential chain of development into Blakedown and other areas. Leave Green Belt alone.
	<a href="#">LPPO4076</a>	Object	<p>We would like to take this opportunity to express our most extreme concerns with regards to the proposed building plans in the Kidderminster area. The affect on the countryside and wildlife would be tragic. Why is it felt necessary to look at Green Belt sites when there are a number of abandoned buildings, some of which have been empty for over 20 years. Why not develop these sites? Other examples of land which should be considered in the first instance are Sion Hill School and the site of Sladen School, land ripe for being used for new properties. The infrastructure of Kidderminster is not adequate to cope the development of these sites.</p> <p>We are at a loss to understand the reason for building more business units on the Worcester Road when after some 8 years or so the units that are already in existence have not been occupied.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4123</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to proposal.</li> <li>• Kidderminster town centre could be made into affordable housing as it's a dying down for employment.</li> </ul>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The infrastructure needed would be huge – schools, roads, shops, amenities.</li> <li>• Hurcott would have more pollution - air pollution is high.</li> <li>• Lorries already whizz past making houses shake - this will get worse.</li> <li>• Hurcott Road is already used as a rat run.</li> <li>• The land below the area designated along the Alma Lodge Road runs into lakes and ponds - home to many species.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04127</a>	Object	Whilst we appreciate the pressure to build more homes in the Kidderminster area, we feel that such a hastily conceived 'top of the head' scheme at the behest of a developer, who's first criteria is profit, may not be the best solution for the town.
	<a href="#">LPP04201</a>	Object	The Green Belt plays a vital role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. Without a by pass, all the roads around Hurcott Road will be used as rat runs to an even greater extent than they already are. Development of land behind Baldwin Road would be a serious incursion into the Green Belt. This would impact on wildlife habitats in the buffer zones. Birmingham Road is often already congested. The proposed linear development would have no community heart. Offmore primary school is already full and cannot be extended. Additional building will add to flood risk.
	<a href="#">LPP04242</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development of the Green Belt around Offmore / Husum Way because: it separates Kidderminster from West Midlands.</p> <p>Roads already congested – by-pass would cause roads around Hurcott to be used as rat runs.</p> <p>More houses – more schools!! (Offmore already full). A new railway bridge would be needed (very expensive).</p> <p>Shakespeare Drive and Husum Way already flood (more housing less drainage).</p> <p>Wildlife and endangered bird species would suffer.</p> <p>Suggest that Lea Castle would be much more appropriate for development – maybe linking with the Sion Hill Middle School site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04246</a>	Object	I wish to raise my objection to the proposed development for Offmore/ Comberton area and Baldwin Road. There

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			are frequent accidents at Husum Way/ Birmingham Road junction as well as traffic jams in and out of Kidderminster through the Land Oak. So many additional houses are going to increase the amount of traffic dramatically and pollution will increase. Bank holidays will be horrendous, particularly with the development of the Safari Park and the people this will bring to the area. This in turn could actually put people off visiting the area rather than increase tourism in the area. Access to any houses behind Baldwin Road would have to be from the Birmingham Road and where this is positioned is on a blind bend which would be highly dangerous. In addition, the amount of houses will put pressure on the local primary schools which are already at capacity and for King Charles High School which is near capacity and unable to extend further. There are endangered species living in the land which has been put forward to be removed from the Green Belt which must be protected. I question why all proposals for development are to the east side of Kidderminster and nothing proposed for the other parts of town. Development of industrial units by Hodge Hill also bring additional traffic to what is an already extremely busy road. The cost of a new bypass which requires two railway bridges would be extortionate and while so many existing roads are desperately in need of resurfacing, is not justifiable.
	<a href="#">LPP04252</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in traffic already congested at peak times = impact on air quality/noise</li> <li>- There is no objective assessment of future trends</li> <li>- Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife, should sustain biodiversity.</li> <li>- Impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage in</li> <li>- Detrimental visual impact forever.</li> <li>- The proposal to build next to one of the already largest housing estates in the area is poorly considered.</li> </ul> <p>Regenerate brownfield areas to attract new businesses. Implement plan B is implemented - more dispersed strategy across the district</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4253</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase in traffic already congested at peak times = impact on air quality/noise</li> <li>- There is no objective assessment of future trends</li> <li>- Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape</li> <li>- Loss of wildlife, should sustain biodiversity.</li> <li>- Impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage in</li> <li>- Detrimental visual impact forever.</li> <li>- The proposal to build next to one of the already largest housing estates in the area is poorly considered.</li> </ul> <p>Regenerate brownfield areas to attract new businesses. Implement plan B is implemented - more dispersed strategy across the district</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4255</a>	Object	<p>I object to all of the Core Sites and Option B in the Green Belt to the north and east of Kidderminster on the basis of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill;</li> <li>2) noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters;</li> <li>3) pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc);</li> <li>4) Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre and secondary schools to access by walking.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4291</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the development of the whole area of Option A as shown by the blue and red shading on the maps provided. The new development will lead to:</p> <p>Removal of fields which could diminish the mental health and physical well-being of the people who use them for</p>

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>walking, jogging and exercising dogs  Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to health.  Alternatively building higher density homes in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution.  Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing Rights of way  Loss of wildlife habitat of birds nesting in the fields.</p> <p>Rather than encroach upon our countryside I urge the Council to build on Brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town.  I urge you not to make use of Green Belt land for the reasons given above.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04323</a>	Object	<p>I object to the local plan proposal for land rear of Baldwin Rd and the land East of Offmore/Comberton area. The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster is vital in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation. The proposed eastern by-pass would cause additional traffic to the area and the A456 is already an extremely busy road. The development would have a serious visual impact on the area and impact the eco system of Hurcott village and Hodge hill area. The development would not be a sustainable community. Offmore primary school is ready full. The school cannot be developed further and in addition King Charles school is also full. The area at the end of Shakespeare Drive/Husum Way is prone to heavy flooding and additional housing will only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>My preferred option would be an extension to Option A &amp; B for the land at Lea Castle. This area could easily accommodate the required development and could be made into a sustainable village. A 2 form entry Primary school could be built and then feed the under subscribed Wolverley high school. It would be capable of sustaining a bus service which could also benefit Cookley residents. The transport links are already in place for such a development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04324</a>	Object	<p>I am objecting to this for reasons stated below</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is Green Belt land and plays a vital part in our community.</li> </ul>



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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife - we have endangered birds in this area and buzzards, hawks etc.</li> <li>• The schools are already full to the max and there is no room to expand.</li> <li>• Husum way is already a rat run for the A449 without adding a bypass which will come out on Husum Way before the bridge as there will be no funding and it will cause chaos to the rail as they cannot build another bridge it's too expensive.</li> <li>• Contact the local police and find that there are far too many deaths and accidents on the A449 Husum way/Hurcott road area due to planning of the junction.</li> <li>• There is always extreme flooding by Husum Way Bridge and in Shakespeare drive and the development areas are higher than Offmore and Comberton so flooding risk will be massive.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04328</a>	Object	Object to the local plan proposals for the land at the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore/Comberton area. I agree with all the disadvantages of these proposals as stated below from the Offmore Comberton Action Group. I'm particularly concerned with the amount of extra traffic plans to build would create as there is already a long queue of traffic down the Birmingham Road each day in the rush hour am & pm traffic, surely the roads will be gridlocked with considerably more traffic from the proposed amount of homes.
	<a href="#">LPP04391</a>	Object	I don't believe we need to use the land at Offmore.
	<a href="#">LPP04444</a>	Object	The size of development planned for the north east side of town is massive – 1100+ houses in a tranche will completely alter the character of the town and destroy Hurcott Village, spoiling a historic area forever. Urban sprawl on the scale proposed is not in keeping with Kidderminster's semi-rural character. The roads around the Park Gate public house, Hurcott Lane and Birmingham Road are already dangerous with numerous accidents occurring. The massive increase in traffic which would result from these plans would worsen the accident rate and cause gridlock. The Clensmore development has made the Horsefair congestion much worse as no change to the road system was included. Further development on this side of town will only add to this.
	<a href="#">LPP04528</a>	Object	I would like to object and comment on the proposed building rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area.

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

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			The land you propose to build on is much higher than the existing Offmore Estate, overlooking nearby properties. The extra traffic would mean more noise and congestion. I appreciate that more houses are needed but more consideration should be given to Lea Castle being the better choice over the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Comberton area.
	<a href="#">LPP04790</a>	Object	Concern at development on east side of Kidderminster. Lea Castle is big enough to include services, i.e. shops, schools, surgery and would negate need to develop other sites. Issues of traffic/pedestrian safety/impact on local infrastructure, schools and Hurcott nature reserve, a SSSI. Preserve Green Belt as a buffer zone between Kidderminster/Blakedown.
	<a href="#">LPP04798</a>	Object	<p>The existing land immediately adjacent to the rear of Prior Close on the east of Offmore is already elevated at about 1.5 metres at the point it abuts existing gardens. The field then rises in both an easterly and northerly direction. Development in this area will have a significant impact upon the quality and wellbeing of the existing residents because any new housing will be at a much higher level and result in severe overlook from the new properties. The proposal for small pockets of development would result in an unsustainable community. It will be separate from the existing community because it will require totally separate access/egress, leaving its residents isolated from a community that is on their own doorstep. In order to access the existing community facilities the new residents will need to travel by car for the simplest of things such as popping out to the local shop. Walkways might be incorporated into the design but the simple fact is that human nature will result in traffic movements rather than walking.</p> <p>The local Offmore Primary School is full and does not have any spare land within it's boundary for extending the building. In fact this school was completely rebuilt in recent years and has made maximum use of the land on which it stands.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04406</a>	Support	Just an idea, please build on housing estates like Comberton or Spennells. As they have been designed for and could just be extended.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP0463</a>	Object	Infrastructure to areas WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any substantial increase in housing. The A456 would require substantial capacity development to deal with the increase in traffic, if this was achieved Husum Way will not cope. An additional road and a bridge over the railway would be required. This is unlikely to happen due to the high development costs and therefore the affordability of the housing scheme. There is currently a high level of wildlife within this area including badgers, foxes, deer and a large variety of birds, including endangered species. This development would have a significant impact on them and should not go ahead. Currently the A456 is a single lane carriageway and would not be able to cope with the proposed industrial development near Hodge Hill Farm. This proposal does not support a sustainable community, does not accommodate a neighbourhood centre and will put pressure on the current Offmore infrastructure and amenities. The Offmore primary school is currently at full capacity and cannot be developed as it is on a restricted site.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP01000</a>	Object	WFR/CB/6-7 Land in front of Hurcott Hall and land opposite at Hodgehill. The development of this site would be a case of gross sprawl. It is bad enough that moving the edge of Kidderminster town out to Hurcott Lane should be proposed. The land on either side of A456 here is open countryside and should remain so. Its transport links to the motorways involve trucks using the already overloaded A456 though Hagley.
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01023</a>	Object	<u>Hodge Hill Employment Site</u> - Core Strategy Policy DS04: Rural Regeneration is quoted which stated that development proposals will not be permitted where they would be likely to have an adverse impact on the District's best and most versatile agricultural land. The proposals at Hodge Hill are in conflict with Policy CB16 of the Neighbourhood Plan which provides for the use of existing rather than new buildings. This is Green Belt land and the Parish Council would oppose this, especially if proposal for relief road is implemented. Hodge Hill Farm is locally listed and access to the site is dangerous.
	<a href="#">LPP01602</a>	Object	Objects to site being allocated for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on highways</li> <li>• impact on wildlife</li> <li>• loss of good agricultural land</li> <li>• loss of and impact on Green Belt</li> <li>• loss of amenity</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>noise and air pollution</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02033</a>	Object	<b>Land for Employment.</b> Land for employment opportunities such as Land off Birmingham Road (WFR/CB/7) appears to be misplaced on a green field site. Surely there are plenty of sites in a town with declining traditional industry rather than set a precedent on a green site. The Easter Park site for instance has failed to fill some of its units in the time since it was built.
	<a href="#">LPP04380</a>	Object	Employment on 'Land off Birmingham Rd'. All industrial/trade units should be kept within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Zone.
	<a href="#">LPP04611</a>	Object	We agree with all 10 "Disadvantages listed on the circular known as "OCAG-LP (Offmore Comberton Action Group-Local Plans). In addition, the idea of industrial units between Hodge Hill Farm on the A456 and the farm house near corner of Husum Way simply goes right into the face of current road restrictions made a few years ago to keep traffic in single file and generally slow it down as it approaches Husum Way, a 40 mph limit and the urban development straddling the A456 (Birmingham Road). WE cannot imagine the problem of INCURSION that the need for commercial vehicles coming in and out needing to go west and east of such a development would cause. The Lea Castle development seems far more workable than say extending Kidderminster development eastwards from its current edge. We have informed the RSPB as members, the danger of such units and a proposed Eastern bypass via the outskirts of Kidderminster to particular bird life. (See one of the 10 disadvantages above-mentioned). "Ah, but it's only one incursion." Travelling the country as we do and witnessing new housing and industrial unit development, more traffic congestion. Means we are seeing land taken up from nature on a frightening scale! Similarly the possible future development of fields behind Stanklyn Lane running to the current boundaries of Spennells Estate will remove another current wildlife eco-system, which numerous species of birds rely on let alone other wildlife. The "material drive" of those in power will eventually attack us all, if not destroyed by its own very nature in "Nature's scheme of things." The human race has this problem they always believe they'll get by or round. The people who drive this may not be affected yet, but their descendants will. We will in future be unable to create the space required to keep catering for more traffic and population. We have the dilemma of its future approach, and ultimate reality.
	<a href="#">LPP05118</a>	Object	I also object to the proposal of allowing Industrial development at Hodge Hill as again without the road

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			infrastructure this would not be tenable. The reason that people move to and visit Kidderminster and the surrounding areas is that it gives a feel of a rural location when travelling into Kidderminster along the Birmingham Road.
	<a href="#">LPP05150</a>	Object	The suggestion that land between Husum Way and Hodge Hill Nurseries should be used for industrial development is beyond outrageous. It represents inappropriate ribbon development of the worse kind in one of the more attractive approaches to Kidderminster!! At this stage it seems appropriate to say there are empty units on nearly every industrial site in town.
Moor Park Trustees	<a href="#">LPP03127</a>	Support	<p>We write to support the sites OC/5 and WFR/CB/7 and note that these sites are discussed collectively in table 13.0.1 as East of Kidderminster (N) for a mixed use of housing and employment collectively providing circa 1,735 dwellings and 9.66ha of employment land.</p> <p>There are few other options, of this scale, on the outskirts of Kidderminster. The site in question is currently allocated as Green Belt but it is noted that the site, upon allocation, would be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC, since the 1970s and WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district.</p> <p><b>The site off Husum Way (OC/5)</b> is self-contained with little constraint. Bound to the North by the A456, the East by Hodgehill, the South by the railway line and Husum way to the West. Removal of this site from the Green Belt will not create risk of further sprawl into the Green Belt at a later date and due to its boundary constraints it will work well as a standalone residential development or as part of a larger scheme. The site is an agricultural field which will have limited ecological value due to the processes which currently take place as part of conventional farming practice. Topographically the site is relatively level.</p> <p>We have had approaches from developers, and promoters, and in that regard the land (OC/5) is under option to a local developer (subject to the relevant planning consents) the site is deliverable within the required timescales for the local plan.</p> <p><b>Site WFR/CB/7</b> was initially identified by WFDC themselves and in that regard was not put forward by the landowner in the original call for sites. Similarly to the site of Husum Way — the site is self-contained/self-governing. It is bound by the Birmingham Road to the North, the railway to the South, Hodgehill Farm to the West and Hodgehill Farm shop/Deli/Cafe to the East.</p> <p>Since its potential for employment use was identified the landowner made contact with County Highways to discuss access in light of such proposals. Subject to further confirmation as to the LPA's aspirations for the site, and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/CB/7 – LAND OFF BIRMINGHAM ROAD

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>an allocation, we would need to undertake a transport assessment and potentially a strategic transport model run. These would all benefit from being undertaken upon allocation of the sites to the East of Kidderminster. Birmingham Road itself, however, has space for upgrade to accommodate upgraded access depending on the employment uses proposed and its location on the outskirts would assist in keeping traffic off the more limited road network within Kidderminster itself. Comments were made regarding the sustainability of the site, however, as noted below — a development of this scale will ensure effective provision of infrastructure to support new development.</p> <p>There are regular bus services along the Birmingham Road and this route itself is a strategically important route, is a lorry route network and also a cycle route network. There are good footpath links back into Kidderminster. The site already has sustainable transport links which are able to be vastly improved by a development of this size and nature through increased users.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0969</a>	Comment	OC/5 Husum Way. This is a relatively small site enclosed by A456, the railway, farm buildings and developed land. If Kidderminster is to extend out to Hurcott Lane, it may be appropriate for it to extend out as far on the other side of A456, but that should not mean that there should be similar extensions south of the railway.
	<a href="#">LPP01603</a>	Object	<p>Objects to site being allocated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on highways</li> <li>• impact on wildlife</li> <li>• loss of good agricultural land</li> <li>• loss of and impact on Green Belt</li> <li>• loss of amenity</li> <li>• noise and air pollution</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02055</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing here would remove all the habitats which wildlife, that have been identified as at risk, depend on.</li> <li>• This land is considerably higher than the surrounding so development would be very visible. The views as you drive into Kidderminster currently help lift the appearance of the area. Building vast amounts of property here is likely to have a further detrimental effect on Kidderminster's reputation and appeal as a place to visit.</li> <li>• The junction on the Birmingham Road onto Husum Way is already very dangerous and proposing to add to the traffic and congestion in that area would be catastrophic.</li> <li>• People would use the Hurcott Road as a 'rat run' even more than they do now, it is already a dangerous road which has seen many an accident.</li> <li>• To overcome the congestion issue a by pass would need to be built and no development should take place until this has been done. The by pass would need at least one railway bridge, which would be incredibly expensive and no private developer would pay for it.</li> <li>• The houses could also prove difficult for a private developer to sell due to the traffic noise from the Birmingham Road and the traffic congestion your proposals will cause.</li> <li>• The community would have no heart and could not accommodate a neighbourhood centre. There would also be no local schools children could walk to as Offmore is already full and cannot be extended.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I appreciate houses needs to be built but they should not all be piled on one area which is what you are proposing.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04332</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Local Plan proposals for land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore / Comberton Areas - Option OC/5. Objections:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster currently plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation.</li> <li>2. Before any building work commences the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to be constructed along with the required and very expensive railway crossing / bridge, which would need funding by the proposed developers (unlikely to happen).</li> <li>3. For this plan to work the proposed Eastern By-Pass would need to extend from the A449 Wolverhampton Road all the way to the A449 Worcester Road to be effectual, if not the side roads &amp; lanes in the Hurcott / Offmore / Spennells areas would end up being used as rat runs.</li> <li>4. The proposed housing at the rear of Baldwin Road &amp; Offmore together with the By-Pass itself would be in an elevated position making them very visible and obtrusive.</li> <li>5. The developments at the rear of Baldwin Road &amp; along Hurcott Lane would impact on the buffer zones for the Hurcott &amp; Podmore SSI's and endangered bird species.</li> <li>6. The hundreds of houses planned in this area would have a dramatic effect on the recently built New Offmore Primary School which is at full capacity and can't be extended any further.</li> <li>7. In summary this ribbon development LP is a not sustainable or a community and an alternative proposal needs to be considered.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP05136</a>	Object	The options of plan 'A' and 'B' would cause a considerable volume and build up of traffic congestion not to say the loss of agricultural land would be a bad idea.
Churchill and Blakedown	<a href="#">LPP03115</a>	Object	Concerned that Parish will become even more of a 'through route' if sites east of Kidderminster are developed. Character will be badly affected if Eastern Relief Road is built. County proposals already mean likelihood of



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Parish Council			increased commuter traffic for station and school has been expanded. We would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. Kidderminster-Blakedown section narrowed to single carriageway for safety reasons and alterations at Hagley junction mean traffic often backs up to Blakedown. Proposals at Baldwin Road and Offmore would add to traffic levels. Employment proposal at Hodge Hill would add traffic at an accident blackspot. Proposed relief road would bring more traffic onto A456 from A448 and A449. Why is this needed when A450 meets A456 at Hagley? Blakedown village centre - concerns re air quality and pedestrian safety. Suggest traffic lights for junction of Belbroughton Road and moving pedestrian crossing to near Station Drive. Proposed eastern relief road would add further pressure to A456 in village. If A448/A450 junction was improved it would divert traffic from centre of Kidderminster and relieve pressure on A456.
Moor Park Trustees	<a href="#">LPP01046</a>	Support	<p>We write to support the sites OC/5 and WFR/CB/7 and note that these sites are discussed collectively in table 13.0.1 as East of Kidderminster (N) for a mixed use of housing and employment collectively providing circa 1,735 dwellings and 9.66ha of employment land.</p> <p>There are few other options, of this scale, on the outskirts of Kidderminster. The site in question is currently allocated as Green Belt but it is noted that the site, upon allocation, would be removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC, since the 1970s and WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district.</p> <p><b>The site off Husum Way (OC/5)</b> is self-contained with little constraint. Bound to the North by the A456, the East by Hodgehill, the South by the railway line and Husum way to the West. Removal of this site from the Green Belt will not create risk of further sprawl into the Green Belt at a later date and due to its boundary constraints it will work well as a standalone residential development or as part of a larger scheme. The site is an agricultural field which will have limited ecological value due to the processes which currently take place as part of conventional farming practice. Topographically the site is relatively level.</p> <p>We have had approaches from developers, and promoters, and in that regard the land (OC/5) is under option to a local developer (subject to the relevant planning consents) the site is deliverable within the required timescales for the local plan.</p> <p><b>Site WFR/CB/7</b> was initially identified by WFDC themselves and in that regard was not put forward by the landowner in the original call for sites. Similarly to the site of Husum Way — the site is self-contained/self-governing. It is bound by the Birmingham Road to the North, the railway to the South, Hodgehill Farm to the West and Hodgehill Farm shop/Deli/Cafe to the East.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/5 – LAND AT HUSUM WAY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Since its potential for employment use was identified the landowner made contact with County Highways to discuss access in light of such proposals. Subject to further confirmation as to the LPA's aspirations for the site, and an allocation, we would need to undertake a transport assessment and potentially a strategic transport model run. These would all benefit from being undertaken upon allocation of the sites to the East of Kidderminster. Birmingham Road itself, however, has space for upgrade to accommodate upgraded access depending on the employment uses proposed and its location on the outskirts would assist in keeping traffic off the more limited road network within Kidderminster itself. Comments were made regarding the sustainability of the site, however, as noted below — a development of this scale will ensure effective provision of infrastructure to support new development.</p> <p>There are regular bus services along the Birmingham Road and this route itself is a strategically important route, is a lorry route network and also a cycle route network. There are good footpath links back into Kidderminster. The site already has sustainable transport links which are able to be vastly improved by a development of this size and nature through increased users.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP04921</a>	Comment	<p>The land at Comberton Road currently lies within the West Midlands Green Belt. The site is included within the Green Belt Review as a number of smaller parcels which were assessed as follows:</p> <p><b>Land to the north of the A448 – CONTRIBUTION.</b> The site overall makes a contribution to Green Belt purposes by virtue of its role as open countryside containing the built edge of Kidderminster. In the absence of clear, significant boundaries, development would represent encroachment and sprawl into open countryside which could only be overcome through master planning which considered the development in a wider context which attended to the south-eastern edge of the town more generally. Whilst there are few visual receptors in this locality and the site is generally well screened from the A448, development would create a fundamentally new relationship between town and country.</p> <p><b>Land to the south of the A448, north of Captain's Pool and Stanklyn Pool - CONTRIBUTION</b> The site overall makes a contribution to Green Belt purposes by virtue of its role as open countryside containing the built edge of Kidderminster. Whilst the site is largely contained by substantial boundaries and the overall effect on Green Belt in this location (in combination with wider development) would not be significant, the absence of an eastern boundary is problematic. Whilst an external boundary could be created, it is suggested that it would be more sympathetic to halt development at the access road which bisects the site, using the topography to contain development rather than the arbitrary line of the high voltage power line.</p> <p><b>Land to the north of Stanklyn Lane, south of Captain's Pool and west of Stanklyn Pool – CONTRIBUTION.</b> The relatively well bounded nature of the site means that development means that development is readily contained, although the scale and topography of the site means that a new relationship between town and country would be created, extending development into visually exposed land where thus far development has used the topography to limit such exposure. This is particularly the case for land extending towards Stanklyn Lane, in combination with proposed land immediately to the southwest, although further work on long and medium distance visual receptors would be needed.</p> <p><b>Captains and the Lodge - LIMITED CONTRIBUTION.</b> The site makes only a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes, being well bounded with limited visual connection. Development would extend the current built edge of Kidderminster along the A448 but this would not be substantial and would visually be contained by substantial boundary vegetation.</p> <p>In light of the above and with particular regard to land to the north and south of the A448, the Development</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Framework Plan includes significant reinforcement of the western boundary of the site, including the provision of significant amounts of public open space and landscaping, in order to contain the site in visual terms and limit the impact of the development upon the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>However, Taylor Wimpey has considered the release of the site from the Green Belt in the context of the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF and assert that the makes a 'limited contribution' to the purposes of the Green Belt, as explored below.</p> <p><b>1) To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.</b> The site has intermittently strong, defensible boundaries, which would be reinforced by a proposed approximately 30 metre planting buffer along the length of the development. The site would accordingly have a significant landscape buffer, serving to 'round-off' the town of Kidderminster on its eastern boundary. This would represent a strengthening of the existing urban edge, which simply terminates to the east of Kidderminster. To the north, the site is bounded by a railway line, adjacent to Husum Way. Similarly, the site is bounded by a railway line to the south-west, adjacent to Stanklyn Lane. Stanklyn Lane itself also forms part of the site boundary to the south-east. The site would therefore be well contained and not encourage sprawl beyond the period of the Local Plan Review. Accordingly, the release of the site from the Green Belt will not result in the unrestricted sprawl of Kidderminster; it will instead serve to 'round-off' the town's eastern boundary.</p> <p><b>2) To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</b> There is a considerable green gap of over 10km between Kidderminster, Catshill and Bromsgrove to the east/south-east. The entirety of this gap is contained within the Green Belt, preventing coalescence. The site at Comberton Road is located immediately adjacent to the existing built-up area of Kidderminster and is clearly separated from nearby settlements by extensive agricultural land. Therefore, the release of this site will not result in the merging of any neighbouring towns, as a significant Green Belt gap will remain.</p> <p><b>3) To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</b> The creation of strong, defensible boundaries is important in protecting the countryside from encroachment. While it is acknowledged that, in theory, the release of any land from the Green Belt could result in encroachment, it is considered that the site offers the opportunity to provide strong and defensible boundaries which will protect the countryside and maintain the visual and physical separation between Kidderminster and surrounding settlements. This is evidenced by the significant planting of a landscape buffer on the eastern boundary of the site, as shown on the Development Framework Plan. The release of this site from the Green Belt will not compromise the purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>4) To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</b> Whilst Kidderminster is a historic canal town which contains four conservation areas and associated listed buildings, these are not located within close proximity of the site and, as such, the site does not make a significant contribution to fulfilling this purpose of the Green Belt. Several listed buildings exist to the east of the site, in and around the village of Stone, including St Mary's Church. The sensitivity of these buildings will be considered as part of any development of the site. Nevertheless, these buildings are relatively isolated and therefore have a limited contribution towards the setting and special character of historic towns. As such, the release of this site from the Green Belt will not compromise the setting or special character of any historic towns.</p> <p><b>5) To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</b> The release of this land from the Green Belt would not prevent the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The previous Core Strategy and Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan allocated a significant amount of brownfield land for redevelopment. However, the supply of suitable brownfield land is now reducing. Therefore, a Green Belt review is to be undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review, in order to meet its housing needs. The development of the site can be appropriately phased within the housing trajectory to take account of the availability and deliverability of brownfield sites across the District. The release of the site from the Green Belt will therefore not prejudice the recycling of derelict and other urban land. A Preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal prepared by Pegasus Environment provides further consideration.</p> <p><b>Green Belt Summary</b></p> <p>It has been demonstrated that the release of the site from the Green Belt would not compromise the five purposes of Green Belt land as set out within the NPPF and is entirely in accordance with national policy regarding the release of land from the Green Belt. The site therefore makes a 'limited contribution' to the purposes of the Green Belt in the context of the Local Plan Green Belt Review. The site is capable of being well contained within strong, defensible boundaries and will, as a result, minimise encroachment into the countryside while maintaining the clear visual separation between Kidderminster and neighbouring settlements. It would not compromise the setting of the town and would not prejudice the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Therefore, it is considered that the site represents appropriate Green Belt release to deliver residential development in a sustainable location.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO116</a>	Object	<p>My concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The value of properties will be significantly decreased.</li> <li>• There are soak away's to take rain water away which goes directly onto the proposed development.</li> <li>• The land is so much higher than the lower field that some kind of supporting structure will have to be built to prevent our access road from collapsing.</li> <li>• The lower field encompasses the Blakeway stream which regularly floods.</li> <li>• If the new development is built the run off water will cause flooding in Offmore and Borrington.</li> <li>• The fields have a badger set and also bats which are active.</li> <li>• Access to the rear of properties are via an agreement with the farmer. If the land is developed we will have no access other than through the house.</li> <li>• Road access in this area is limited, with this development we will have gridlock on the existing roads.</li> <li>• Hospital is not capable of covering the new population.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP's.</li> <li>• " Dental infrastructure.</li> <li>• " Schools.</li> <li>• We have regular power cuts hence the future demand would be excessive on the existing electricity supply.</li> </ul> <p>An area around the barns to access the rear of buildings for maintenance would be required. Planners continually refuse extensions at the barns as they could be seen a mile away from the A456 and all permitted development rights have been removed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO282</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would like to raise serious concerns about developing land to the east of Offmore. We note that there is no satisfactory access to the fields behind Offmore farm (Old People's Home) in this area at all. Residential roads from Munro Close and Rossetti Close in the north to Silver Birch Drive in the south are not big enough or wide enough to support extra traffic. Even if new roads could be constructed and new</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>routes found, the increase in traffic flow would cause major concerns on the estate with increased congestion, safety and pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact on wildlife would be significant. We currently have at least two different species of woodpecker, frogs and toads, bats, foxes, pheasants and many other bird varieties in these fields as well as other wildlife. Diminishing their territory would mean diminishing their numbers - something we cannot afford to do.</li> <li>• An eastern housing build would be "ribbon development" of its own kind, accessed only from some distant spot north and south of the town, with no "soul" or shops and school attached to it. There would be no easy connection to get to Offmore shops and no room at the already over-subscribed Offmore Primary school.</li> <li>• Like many other people on Offmore we think that an eastwards extension of the town would be patchy, haphazard development at best and a blight on the Green Belt land for generations to come. Any further intrusion in to the Green Belt risks connecting Kidderminster to Blakedown to Hagley to Halesowen and eventually to the outer suburbs of Birmingham. It is a proposal we strongly disagree with.</li> <li>• The alternative proposals for an outer suburb at Lea Castle, with school, shops and transport links would be much more sensible than the retrograde, straggling "sticking plaster" estate stuck on to two established residential areas (Offmore and Comberton) that work well now and are perfectly self-contained already.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO390</a>	Object	<p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic in these areas is already at unacceptable levels and any development would add to the already heavily used rat runs in these areas.</li> <li>• Loss of views and amenity / recreation space for local residents</li> <li>• Any bypass/link road to the east of Offmore would take away current breathing spaces and take up a nature resource and visual beauty</li> <li>• Visual impact of residential development at Baldwin Road (the land is much higher at the rear of Baldwin Road)</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			What benefits this proposed development would bring to the area? Surely what is required is employment opportunities. If you build hundreds of houses on Green Belt land it will only attract those who will not work in the area but simply commute out of the area.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0970</a>	Object	OC/6 Offmore Farm. Some of this is grade 2 agricultural land; and there is grade 1 land nearby. Such land should be retained for agriculture. In including this as a preferred site the Preferred Option is guilty of not applying its own principles in Policy 28D.C. The best and most versatile agricultural land should only be developed if there is no other realistic option
	<a href="#">LPP01894</a>	Object	I wish to object to the planned building of homes and an Eastern By Pass, across the Green Belt behind Offmore. I see no benefit of putting a road through these fields and building houses. There is no room at Offmore Primary and it has been extended to maximum . The cost to put a railway bridge to accommodate the road would be substantial and we are already on a high band of council tax. The eastern by pass would not only obliterate the landscape due to its height, it would be visible and noisy. It would also cause harm to local wildlife including endangered birds such as yellow hammers and sky larks. Tennyson way and Husum way are already used rat runs.
	<a href="#">LPP01991</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any development on Greenfield land, except for sites that have been too badly contaminated, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does not believe that any meaningful communities will be created by developing to the east of Offmore and to the rear of Baldwin Rd.</li> <li>2. Additional pressure on Offmore Primary School which is on a restricted site.</li> <li>3. Concerned that development on land to the east of Kidderminster should not occur until the by-pass has been constructed.</li> <li>4. Suggests the by-pass should start at the Stourbridge Road because Hurcott Road and Baldwin Road are already used as a 'rat run' and would only become much worse.</li> <li>5. The area to the rear of Baldwin Road down to Hurcott Lane is well used and much loved by walkers, dog owners and anyone interested in the countryside. It would be an eyesore if built on due to its elevation.</li> </ol>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2082</a>	Object	<p>Object to the proposed development. Just building houses doesn't solve problems it creates problems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where would all the traffic go? A proposed bypass would cost millions and create traffic problems whilst it was being created and after. Also creating rat runs around local roads.</li> <li>• There are endangered species of birds along the route that is proposed for the bypass</li> <li>• Noise and air pollution would increase substantially</li> <li>• Increase in noise and air/dust pollution during the construction</li> <li>• The land is Green Belt and is used to farm</li> <li>• Loss of views</li> <li>• Devaluation of property prices.</li> </ul> <p>Please reconsider your plans, consider the long term impact/damage to local communities, wildlife habitats.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2093</a>	Object	<p>Objections - east of Offmore.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of wildlife.</li> <li>2. Pressure on local schools/GPs</li> <li>3. Side roads misused as rat runs.</li> <li>4. Traffic congestion</li> <li>5. Sustainable community on Lea Castle better</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2134</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By-pass necessary.</li> <li>• Lack school places/Loss of trees in Husum Way .</li> <li>• Other sites more suitable e.g. Lea Castle with good access to main roads/bus routes –already built on! Catchment area for Wolverley High School. Use land to rear of Ferndale.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2160</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal for building houses to the rear of Baldwin Rd and the Offmore Comberton area. There is perfectly good land going to waste in the old Lea Castle site, why can't that be used instead? The roads</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>surrounding that area are more robust than the smaller roads surrounding Baldwin Road. The effect on the surrounding wildlife in Hurcott village would be devastating, and while I understand we need more housing surely that shouldn't be at the expense of our beautiful countryside and wildlife? Baldwin Rd is already used as a cut through and the majority of cars do not respect the speed limit and use it as a race track. More housing in this area would just increase this and put the families at risk along this road.</p> <p>What are the plans to support the increased infrastructure that would be needed if we suddenly have hundreds of extra families in the area? Kidderminster Hospital is already at breaking point and where would the children go to school? To cope with the increase of traffic, there would be more roads built, more traffic, more noise pollution and no-one policing the speed limits or behaviour of the motorists.</p> <p>It has already been established that the site at Lea Castle has enough space to accommodate a new school, bus services and plenty of houses. So surely this can be considered as a logical area for development?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2248</a>	Object	<p>The local plan presents us with a series of options for development - all of which involve building on areas of what is currently rural or semi-rural land. We are expected to accept that one of these options is inevitable.</p> <p>Green Belt/greenfield land plays an essential role in sustaining the structure of any urban community. Improving air quality, sustaining wildlife, or simply creating the balance of environment for the physical and mental well-being of the population are all basic requirements for any modern town - it is not something that can just be pushed further out on demand. The fact that councils are being given the green light to remove the protected status of such areas is wrong in principle.</p> <p>The plans describe the proposed developments as <b>land to the rear of Baldwin Road (OC/4)</b>. These are fields stretching across to Hurcott which is well known locally as a semi-rural community. It also has important historical significance with its paper-making tradition reaching back to the Middle Ages.</p> <p>This is far more than just another piece of real estate in waiting; for thousands of local residents it is their piece of countryside, for many it is why they chose to live there and why (at the moment) they want to stay there.</p> <p>The area in question is high land – any development here would be seen from a great distance across to the East where the land falls away considerably. The current vista forms part of the rural gateway to Kidderminster– an intrinsic part of the town's character. Planners and councillors should not underestimate the role of these aspects in separating Worcestershire communities from the West Midlands conurbation and in attracting visitors and consumers from the Black Country and beyond.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The prospect of new housing will create stagnation in the local housing market. Buyers will be unlikely to invest in properties knowing that the character of the vicinity is about to change dramatically. The value of these houses will fall so that owners will not be able to get the price they need in order to sell. Contrary to the wording used within the plan – extending the town will make Kidderminster a LESS desirable place to live.</p> <p>Another area earmarked as “Core housing” is the land to the <b>East of Offmore Farm (OC/6)</b>. This farmed land is a key aspect of the local environment and any attempts to develop it will not only add to the strain on infrastructure described elsewhere in this letter, it would dramatically reduce the quality of life of the thousands of families on the estate – as well as adversely affecting the value of their homes. Changing the use of this land would be wrong on historical, political and environmental levels – it should not even be considered.</p> <p>Looking at the maps in the Local Plan document, it is clear that the core housing sites will result in the greatest depletion in Green Belt land and are the most serious threat to the rural buffer that is essential to the character of the town.</p> <p>Building on this landscape would be an affront to the people who live in the community. It would be damaging the lives of existing inhabitants in order to meet an expected quota. Real life quality sacrificed for theoretical need.</p> <p>The local authority’s budget is straining to manage the needs of the existing town population on issues ranging from road maintenance to healthcare. Extending the town on this scale will only worsen the problem.</p> <p>Furthermore we do NOT want an Eastern relief road with the resulting disruption, noise, pollution, corrosion of local character and damage to the environment, it would bring.</p> <p>If an increasing population is the cause of the perceived shortfall in house building more and more houses on Green Belt is not addressing that problem. Neither is it sustainable, for band after band of new developments will eventually deplete the rural spaces between towns to an extent that they are no longer effective as green spaces. Developing the Eastern side of the town will adversely affect the lives of thousands. Surely it would be to the council’s advantage to minimise the number directly affected and therefore the level of opposition that will be directed at them.</p> <p>If there has to be large scale development around Kidderminster, dispersal is preferable to extending an already busy town. This allows new “settlements” to develop their own infrastructure, maintains an element of separation between communities, reducing inevitable problems caused an increased concentration of traffic and population and spreading demand for services (for employment, retail, education, healthcare, transport links etc) across a wider range of towns and communities. It also allows new developments to be designed in a way that</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>has less of an impact visually and environmentally.</p> <p>The council asks if we prefer Option A or Option B. The problem is that, as long as both options include the areas designated as Core housing sites on the Eastern edge of the town neither is going to be acceptable to the majority of people that the proposals affect.</p> <p>Option B is offered as the dispersal option but the swathe of heavy development to the East of Kidderminster makes it anything but.</p> <p>If the council wants to achieve any kind of acquiescence it will need to re-draft these proposals without the core housing sites that appear in the current plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02448</a>	Object	<p>We recently moved from London to escape the crowded, doctors surgeries, crowded shops, crowded roads, and would be really unhappy if this proposal for the Green Belt to the east of Kidderminster, would go ahead, as it would seem so does every local person, the disadvantages outweigh the advantages, I hope you agree.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02470</a>	Object	<p>As a resident that will be negatively affected by the plans to erase a significant amount of the Green Belt land surrounding my home in order to build thousands of new houses that will undoubtedly remain empty for years (£210,000 is NOT affordable, not even close. Maybe in London, but certainly not in the Wyre Forest). I felt it necessary to express my severe displacement with the planned proposal for the land to the rear of Baldwin Road and the Offmore Comberton Area for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The houses being built are presumably meant for young families? But where will their children go to school? The local schools are already overflowing.</li> <li>2. The Green Belt area to the east of Kidderminster plays a vital part in separating the town from the West Midlands Conurbation.</li> <li>3. An eastern bypass would need to be built between the Wolverhampton and Worcester roads, otherwise the roads around Hurcott would be utter chaos.</li> <li>4. This bypass would require at least one new railway bridge, which would be incredibly expensive. No private developers would pay for it.</li> <li>5. The visual concern would be an obvious issue, not to mention the impact on local wildlife.</li> <li>6. The development would create a significant amount of water run-off that could turn Broadwaters into a swamp. I have friends who live in that area who are understandably concerned.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2647</a>	Object	<p>Object to the housing proposals east of Offmore for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offmore Primary School is currently full</li> <li>• There are anti social behaviour issues that need sorting on Offmore. Adding more houses is likely to worsen the issue.</li> <li>• The local hospitals can't support the residents that are already in the area</li> <li>• The local bus service doesn't properly serve the existing community.</li> <li>• There are many speeding cars on Tennyson Way during the evenings, this will only become busier with more housing and cars.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2762</a>	Object	<p>We are writing to express our concerns and disappointment at the proposed development of Green Belt land to the east of the Offmore Estate.</p> <p>We moved to get away from all the building of houses in every little nook and cranny around our home and surrounding areas. This now seems to be happening here in Kidderminster at the cost of other areas that need to be completely renovated, as they are in such a state of disrepair, like the Comberton Estate. Many of the houses and streets are completely in need of rejuvenation.</p> <p>You are proposing to build more houses that we don't seem to need, as there are so many houses still up for sale round and about, instead of maybe helping those areas that need to be updated and are being overlooked.</p> <p>It does seem strange that all the new development has to be on the eastern side of Kidderminster, drawing us ever closer to Blakedown, shrinking the area that separates us from them. If this buffer zone is something that the local government wants to protect then extending towards Bridgnorth or Hartlebury, as another option to consider, wouldn't quite have the same repercussions.</p> <p>While we are not totally opposed to more housing, if needed, we feel that to centralise all the current development plans to one area of the town seems very unfair.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2902</a>	Object	<p>We are opposed to any development of this Green Belt land and firmly believe that there are far more suitable and sustainable options for future development in the area.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b><i>Disadvantages of the WFDC proposals to develop east of Offmore Farm:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land to the east of Offmore is designated Green Belt</li> <li>• This land is prime agricultural land which is farmed productively every year contributing to UK food and grain production and is important for wildlife. The Skylark breeding population has increased there.</li> <li>• The land to the east of Offmore is significantly higher than the rest of the estate so any development would be very visible and imposing upon the rest of the area.</li> <li>• It would have no neighbourhood centre.</li> <li>• Offmore Primary School is full to capacity and is on a restricted site so not suitable for extending.</li> <li>• The proposed Eastern bypass would not be funded by housing developers and would be extremely expensive to construct</li> <li>• The existing roads through Offmore Farm estate are already over used and the proposed development would significantly increase traffic</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2952</a>	Object	<p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Withdrawal from Europe may mean a requirement for more home grown food therefore productive agricultural land should not be used.</li> <li>2. The Green Belt area to the east of Kidderminster separates the town from the nearby village of Blakedown.</li> <li>3. Would impact on the already full Primary School. The Offmore Primary School has no room for further development.</li> <li>4. A new railway bridge would have to be built at considerable expense.</li> <li>5. An Eastern Bypass from the A456 to the A448 would not relieve the terrible traffic at the Horsefair and would cause more noise pollution.</li> <li>6. The land to the east of Offmore is home to protected and increasingly scarce wildlife.</li> <li>7. This land also has a habit of flooding and water run-off would be increased with building on these fields.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP03110</a>	Object	I object to the proposals as per the disadvantages provided by Offmore & Comberton Action Group. I currently reside on Baldwin Road and believe the proposals will have an impact on the area in which we live.
	<a href="#">LPP03134</a>	Object	<p>Objecting to building on Baldwin Road/Offmore/Comberton sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools and infrastructure inadequate.</li> <li>• Greenfield sites.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites should be used - especially in the town centre.</li> <li>• Will ruin the countryside.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03163</a>	Object	<p>The proposed benefits of easier school provision and an Eastern Relief Road do not outweigh the disadvantages of large scale expansion to the east of Kidderminster. Offmore School has further capacity. The Eastern Relief Road would require the construction of an additional railway bridge at a cost prohibitive to any developer. The height of any such road/housing would be considerably higher than current housing making it very visible. Why should the lion's share be taken by the East.</p> <p>It is a misconception that industries and businesses will flock to the town to support this increase in numbers, with the traditional carpet industry declining where will these people be employed? Some units have remained empty for years and the old shopping streets are deserted. We will be no more than a commuter town</p> <p>The existence of Green Belt Land between the current eastern household boundary and Blakedown is crucial in the separation of Kidderminster and the West Midlands conurbation</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03294</a>	Object	<p>There is a small development of 7 homes, that are converted former farm buildings situated at the rear of the Offmore Farm Care Home in an area, known as Offmore Court. This development was completed in the mid 1990's and is surrounded on three sides by Grade A agricultural farmland. The fields surrounding the development have been used on a continuous basis, to grow crops (originally sugar beet, until the Kidderminster sugar beet factory closed down) and latterly wheat, potatoes, carrots etc).</p> <p><b>As and when the development of the fields adjoining Offmore Court takes place we would like to suggest the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That consideration is given to the effect of flooding of the stream which flows from the eastern direction</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and along the edge of the Offmore estate towards Spennells. Currently any rainfall is absorbed by the land but when this land is developed there will be significant run-off as the land available for natural drainage will be greatly reduced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There have been occasions during heavy rainfalls that there has been flooding from the field into Offmore Farm Close.</li> <li>• That the unique nature of the Offmore Court development is respected and an area of undeveloped land should be allowed to remain around the development to enable its unique character to be retained as the buildings have a certain 'group value' and that their setting as former farm buildings should be treated sympathetically in any future Master Plan.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3299</a>	Object	There is only one doctors practice in this area, it is difficult enough to get appointments as it stands. Adding yet more patients to the ever growing list is unsustainable.
	<a href="#">LPPO3419</a>	Object	I object to the proposal for re-development of Green Belt land adjoining the Offmore & Comberton area. I am appalled that WFDC are considering housing on this site when there are more suitable areas yet to be developed. Lea Castle could be used to its full capacity and is much more able to support a sustainable village community and a new primary which could then feed and sustain the nearby Wolverley High School. Offmore school is full and can not be extended. An Eastern bypass would cause additional noise and pollution for Offmore residents. Listen to the concerns of local residents before considering any future development of the Offmore Comberton areas and destroying our local wildlife and green fields
	<a href="#">LPPO3431</a>	Object	If these plans go ahead this will affect me as there will be more traffic up and down Hurcott Road. This will affect many things i.e. doctors, more pressure on hospitals, dentists, schools too. So I strongly disagree with this plan.
	<a href="#">LPPO3470</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to any proposed development to the rear of Prior Close.</li> <li>• There are many species of birds in this area and a number on the BTO/RSPB red list. There's also plenty of other wildlife around including great crested newts.</li> <li>• There is no immediate road access to the rear of Prior Close.</li> <li>• The relief road envisaged is merely an estate road – surely a relief road should be at least three lanes, preferably four – we must look to the next hundred years and the country's continuing increase in</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>population and traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another concern is where the relief road begins and ends. We believe it should include the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge Roads – maybe widening existing roads/lanes but the exit point on the Worcester Road, as currently envisaged, meets an already known accident black spot from Easter Park through to and past the Torton traffic lights.</li> <li>• There is already added congestion along the Worcester Road with the new traffic lights.</li> <li>• We do not wish to become the Wyre Forest District of Birmingham or the West Midlands.</li> <li>• Also, with an increasing population why are you agreeable to land, being farmed each year in year to produce food, to be built on?</li> <li>• Prior Close Green Belt area is entirely secluded except for access by the land owners, farmer and farm workers.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4010</a>	Object	Object to OC/6.
	<a href="#">LPPO4011</a>	Object	<p>I object to the local plan core housing proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm concerned about any development on the east of the Green Belt - this helps to separate the town from the West Midlands Conurbation</li> <li>• An eastern By Pass would need to be built from Wolverhampton Rd to Worcester Road to be of use. This is already an accident black spot.</li> <li>• There are endangered bird species along the route the by pass would have to take from A456 to the A449</li> <li>• A bypass would need to be developed before the land to the east of Offmore could be developed</li> <li>• A new railway bridge would be required to help realise this development, which would be incredibly expensive</li> <li>• The bypass would need at least a 30m tree screen to buffer the noise</li> <li>• I would question whether the linear development would create any degree of community and social cohesion</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offmore school is at capacity with no scope for expansion</li> <li>• Development would be very visible due to the elevation of the land</li> <li>• 10. Industrial development at Hodge Hill would also need a by pass to help avoid congestion</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP05137</a>	Object	The options of plan 'A' and 'B' would cause a considerable volume and build up of traffic congestion not to say the loss of agricultural land would be a bad idea.
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP03116</a>	Object	Concerned that Parish will become even more of a 'through route' if sites east of Kidderminster are developed. Character will be badly affected if Eastern Relief Road is built. County proposals already mean likelihood of increased commuter traffic for station and school has been expanded. We would like an assessment of capacity of A456 through Blakedown. Kidderminster-Blakedown section narrowed to single carriageway for safety reasons and alterations at Hagley junction mean traffic often backs up to Blakedown. Proposals at Baldwin Road and Offmore would add to traffic levels. Employment proposal at Hodge Hill would add traffic at an accident blackspot. Proposed relief road would bring more traffic onto A456 from A448 and A449. Why is this needed when A450 meets A456 at Hagley? Blakedown village centre - concerns re air quality and pedestrian safety. Suggest traffic lights for junction of Belbroughton Road and moving pedestrian crossing to near Station Drive. Proposed eastern relief road would add further pressure to A456 in village. If A448/A450 junction was improved it would divert traffic from centre of Kidderminster and relieve pressure on A456.
	<a href="#">LPP02037</a>	Support	Lea Castle Hospital /Sladen School ideal sites
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP04086</a>	Support	LAND AT COMBERTON ROAD, KIDDERMINSTER. Taylor Wimpey is currently in control of the land to the north of Comberton Road and to the south of the Birmingham to Worcester railway line (sites OC/6 and OC/13N), and a further area of land to the south of Comberton Road (OC/13S), as shown on the Site Location Plan ( <b>Appendix 1</b> ). The northern area is promoted as an infrastructure led residential development with significant green infrastructure, plus land for a primary school and other community facilities. It also provides opportunity for strategic relief road around eastern Kidderminster. The land south of Comberton Road is likely to be delivered much later and completion is likely beyond the plan period. Land will need to be secured for the relief road which is not in control of Taylor Wimpey. Development Vision document shows initial concept masterplan for site. (see

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/6 – LAND EAST OF OFFMORE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Appendix 2). Northern parcel - 1,050-1,300 homes; provision of land and proportionate contribution to delivery of road linking A456 and A448; provision of new pedestrian/cycle links to Tennyson Way and Borrington Road; provision of land for new community facilities including primary school; provision of significant area of green infrastructure; provision of SuDS; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by route of relief road. Southern parcel - longer term provision of 400-500 dwellings; opportunity to help with delivery of new road link between A448 and A449; provision of Green Infrastructure for use by existing residents of Spennells; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by new road. Analysis of evidence base and technical information shows that urban extension is soundly based.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/12 –COMBERTON LODGE NURSERY

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2038</a>	Object	Its got a high flood risk. Building here blocks off the wild life access into / out of the Spennells Valley nature reserves.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/13(N) – STONE HILL NORTH

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04245</a>	Comment	Green Belt and other places are available. Birchen Coppice, golf course.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0971</a>	Object	Different considerations apply to different parts of site. Ridge between Stanklyn and Bell Brooks should be kept open as green wedge. Grade 2 areas should not be developed. Some of northern part is marsh. Irrigation system dating from 17th century. Area to south of Spennells is part of former Stone Common and Hoo Farm. This is grade 2 and should not be used for housing.
	<a href="#">LPP02039</a>	Object	You will be building on parts of the flood plain. Building here will disrupt the east west flow of wild life along Hoo Brook.
	<a href="#">LPP02187</a>	Object	I object to the proposal for re-development of Green Belt land adjoining the Offmore & Comberton area. I am appalled that WFDC are considering housing on this site when there are more suitable areas yet to be developed. Lea Castle could be used to its full capacity and is much more able to support a sustainable village community and a new primary which could then feed and sustain the nearby Wolverley High School. Offmore school is full and can not be extended. An Eastern bypass would cause additional noise and pollution for Offmore residents. Listen to the concerns of local residents before considering any future development of the Offmore Comberton areas and destroying our local wildlife and green fields
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP02219</a>	Support	LAND AT COMBERTON ROAD, KIDDERMINSTER. Taylor Wimpey is currently in control of the land to the north of Comberton Road and to the south of the Birmingham to Worcester railway line (sites OC/6 and OC/13N), and a further area of land to the south of Comberton Road (OC/13S), as shown on the Site Location Plan ( <b>Appendix 1</b> ). The northern area is promoted as an infrastructure led residential development with significant green infrastructure, plus land for a primary school and other community facilities. It also provides opportunity for strategic relief road around eastern Kidderminster. The land south of Comberton Road is likely to be delivered much later and completion is likely beyond the plan period. Land will need to be secured for the relief road which is not in control of Taylor Wimpey. Development Vision document shows initial concept masterplan for site. (see Appendix 2). Northern parcel - 1,050-1,300 homes; provision of land and proportionate contribution to delivery of road linking A456 and A448; provision of new pedestrian/cycle links to Tennyson Way and Borrington Road; provision of land for new community facilities including primary school; provision of significant area of green infrastructure; provision of SuDS; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by route of relief road.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO OC/13(N) – STONE HILL NORTH

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Southern parcel - longer term provision of 400-500 dwellings; opportunity to help with delivery of new road link between A448 and A449; provision of Green Infrastructure for use by existing residents of Spennells; new enduring Green Belt boundary defined by new road. Analysis of evidence base and technical information shows that urban extension is soundly based.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2298</a>	Comment	<p>I am clear in my understanding of the purposes of designating land as Green Belt as defined in paragraph 80 of the government's publication 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF), these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;</li> <li>• to prevent neighbouring towns from merging;</li> <li>• to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</li> <li>• to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;</li> <li>• To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</li> </ul> <p>I would like to offer support to one particular site, that being the land known as Captains and The Lodge, designated WFR/ST/1 and located on the east side of Kidderminster to the south of the A448. The Green Belt Review prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler, which has informed the Local Plan Review, has given a brief analysis of the site and concluded that it offers only a limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt and I would concur. Looking at the five purposes of inclusion of land within Green Belt in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Removal of the site from Green Belt in isolation would still check the unrestricted sprawl of Kidderminster as the relatively small scale of the site will create new limits to development along the outer edge where it will abut the residual and far greater area expanse of Green Belt; rather than being unrestricted, the re-designation of the site will therefore allow controlled expansion of the urban periphery in a location which is predominantly out of general sight. The shape of the site and relationship of it to the existing boundary of the Spennells estate show that it naturally fills a gap between the more intrusive part of the estate to the south and the A448 to the north, again giving natural limits and control to the increased built up area.</li> <li>2. With the exception of villages such as Stone and Chaddesley Corbett, the nearest town on this side of Kidderminster is Bromsgrove, some 8 miles distant. There will be no danger of the adjacent towns merging with the reallocation of this site and even Stone, a good mile distant, remains safe from being subsumed as a result.</li> <li>3. The safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment is effectively the same as checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Whilst Green Belt, a not insignificant proportion of the site can be</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>deemed to be previously developed land; part of the land has extant and exercised permission for the storage of caravans, which in itself already constitutes an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt, and then there is the footprint and residential amenity space associated with the two existing dwellings. Whilst admittedly paragraph 53 of NPPF seeks to restrict development of residential gardens, I rely on the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in the glossary in Annex 2 to the rear of the NPPF which excludes, amongst other things, 'land in built up areas such as private residential gardens'. As the site is currently Green Belt, it cannot be classified as being in a 'built up' area, and therefore the residential amenity spaces associated with the two houses are, by definition of lack of exclusion, previously developed land. Despite this, paragraph 89 of NPPF instructs local authorities to regard the construction of new buildings within Green Belt as inappropriate development with few exceptions amongst which is limited affordable housing to meet local community needs; a need clearly demonstrable in the greater Kidderminster area. The fact that part of the land could already potentially be developed for affordable housing whilst remaining within the Green Belt therefore significantly reduces the potential additional impact of the site being removed from Green Belt designation to allow more general development.</p> <p>4. The edge of the urban environment here is quite abrupt; the relatively high density of the Spennells estate gives a hard edge to the town that the two dwellings on the site currently softens to an extent, albeit there is little visibility into the site save for a public right of way that separates the site from the edge of Spennells. Spennells is also a relatively recent development itself and presents a contemporary urbanism to the arriving visitor as they approach along the A448. Whilst Kidderminster does have an historic core, it is located some distance from this gateway site with a natural chronology of development increasing in age and associated characteristic as you travel more. A new development, of contemporary idiom on this site would therefore be wholly appropriate, and would not detract from the setting and special character of the historic parts of the town centre which are quite remote from the site.</p> <p>5. In recent history, Wyre Forest District Council has had robust policy in respect to town centre regeneration, particularly in Kidderminster, and not without success. Wyre Forest as a district is however disadvantaged in having only three relatively small centres with a high proportion of Green Belt around them creating a natural limit to development that is close to being reached. In my own local authority area, I have seen adherence to the last item of the above list in particular, significantly diminish existing redundant employment land in order to satisfy the needs for anticipated housing provision which policy</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>has dictated 95% needs to be on previously developed land; worse still, I have seen employment land vacated due to the significantly higher land values that subsequent housing designations brings. Clearly, a balanced view needs to be taken to ensure that all demands on available land are able to be catered for, else all we will create are dormitory towns where the residents live, but do not, because they can not , work; a wholly unsustainable approach and contrary to paragraphs 6-16 of NPPF. Whilst development of available and deliverable non Green Belt sites should obviously take precedence, keeping this particular site in Green Belt will contribute little additional influence to urban regeneration within the centre of town given the sterling efforts of the local planning authority to date.</p> <p>Notwithstanding all of the above, it is an invidious task to determine where sacrifices need to be made, as they have to be those with the least worst cumulative impact.</p> <p>In conclusion, I believe the site to be amongst the least worst, if not the least worst, of all the current Green Belt sites and would wholeheartedly support its reallocation for residential development. I understand the land owners of the majority of the site are amenable to the use of the land for residential purposes, so not only is the site ideal for purpose, it also represents a deliverable opportunity. I can understand that the current exercise has aroused emotions amongst those hostile to development and that you may receive several objections to this site being included. However, as it has been demonstrated that additional housing needs to be procured over the next plan period, the exercise of deciding where it should be located needs to be undertaken on a positive 'least worst' principle, rather than the alternative of a negative 'anti-development' attitude.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2461</a>	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why has Captain's and the Lodge been selected as a "core site"? Why was it selected over other proposed sites?</li> <li>• What will happen to the current right of way which runs from the A448 east to west, crossing Kittiwake Drive adjacent to number 35 and running down past Captain's Pool?</li> <li>• Will the current approx. 4 metre width be maintained?</li> <li>• What is the current ruling on minimum distance of any proposed new dwellings to the existing right of way? How many metres away would new dwellings be so that I can judge how intrusive they may be from my property.</li> <li>• Could you give an assurance that any planned development of the Captain's section of WFR/ST/1 would</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>not give vehicular access onto Kittiwake Drive?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kittiwake Drive is narrow with adverse cambers and I believe is unsuitable to higher vehicular use.</li> <li>2. Adjacent to a children's park and increased traffic movements would increase risk to children crossing the road to get to the park.</li> <li>3. The foul drainage system would not have been designed to accommodate outflow from an additional housing estate.</li> <li>4. Under Preferred Options A or B what would be the final disposition of Captain's Pool and its fishing rights? Under current arrangements with the current owners Phoenix Angling members have key access to the pool via the right of way and therefore park their vehicles adjacent to the pool in a designated area.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP0103</a>	Object	<p>I put a strong objection to the plans that have been put forward for core housing sites referred to as WFR/ST/1 the area referred to as captains and the lodge as it will affect where I am living. At the moment I am looking out at fields which was what attracted me to the property in the first place. It would also reduce the price and privacy of my house. The area is quiet and full of nature and wildlife as there are plenty of habitat for them, this would all be destroyed. There would be lots of constant noise and traffic especially entering onto the Bromsgrove road from the area to which I live.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0104</a>	Object	<p>Object to the development ref no WFR/ST/1, the plan is FAR from clear so in this case both options A or B I would object too.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0761</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A - fields adjacent to Spennells. Object to plan A and B (core housing) particularly with respect to Captains and the Lodge. Plans are a terrible option with respect to the Green Belt which will be smothered with houses and will destroy wildlife habitats including Skylarks, Green Woodpeckers, and numerous wildflowers. An adverse effect on everyone's quality of life particularly people who walk through the fields with their dogs, jog or simply walk in the countryside for their physical and mental wellbeing. They will also place more pressure on infrastructure</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sewers in Spennells can barely cope already</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There will be insufficient school places and doctors</li> <li>3. Traffic on Spennells is already a nightmare at peak times- this will make it even worse!</li> </ol> <p>We are going to be directly affected by noise, traffic fumes (increasing risk to health) and access.</p>
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPP01718</a>	Object	In addition we oppose development upon the area described as 'Captain's and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' which has been included in the Draft Plan as a 'Core' area.
	<a href="#">LPP01956</a>	Object	I strongly oppose new houses at Captains and the Lodge. Do not believe that Wyre forest is expanding by such an amount and question the need for so many houses, other than for the council to receive a government payout for each dwelling built. It would put huge pressure on existing roads, schools, shops, doctors and dentists, the police and hospitals. I do not think that the infrastructure is there to support such a huge growth in population. The fields, which are part of the Green Belt for a reason, are enjoyed by huge numbers of people each day of the year. It inhabits a wealth of wildlife which would be disrupted. I believe that affordable housing could be built in other areas of Kidderminster and that enough land lies derelict on brownfield sites to cater for the population growth
	<a href="#">LPP02085</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More traffic onto A448, an already busy road</li> <li>2. Development by Captains Pool would have adverse environmental effects and increase unwanted public access.</li> <li>3. Loss of wildlife</li> <li>4. Please amend status of WFR/ST/1 to greenfield not brownfield.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP02090</a>	Object	<p>Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of wildlife habitats and nesting sites on Captains Pool and surrounding areas. Too many houses will destroy the nesting places for the wildfowl which live and visit the pool. Currently there are coot, moorhens, ducks, geese and a visiting pair of great crested grebe.</li> <li>• Effect on visual amenity that is Captain's Pool. Small mammals and also ducks and other birds and bats</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>have been seen in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area used by walkers</li> <li>• Pollution to the pool by way of litter which is harmful to the wildlife.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02267</a>	Object	<p>We oppose the adoption of the Local Plan, both Options A &amp; B including the Core Areas of The Captains and the Lodge because :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There should be no erosion of the productive Green Belt land as there will be an increased need for the UK to provide more food production rather than import food once we have left the EU.</li> <li>2. Loss of Green Belt will further endanger wild life, both flora and fauna.</li> <li>3. Loss of Green Belt will also reduce the natural area for people to exercise, as the current areas have many public paths.</li> <li>4. Proposed building on areas designated as natural flood plans seems fool hardy, as there is plenty of local evidence showing the damaging effects this can have on other areas. I.e. Bewdley, Upton on Severn, Tewksbury etc;</li> <li>5. Loss of Green Belt will add to the global warming effects that are projected.</li> <li>6. The increase in population predicted in the new plan will not be able to be employed within Wyre Forest and will thus need to commute to Birmingham and West Midlands, and Worcester. The Wyre Forest has seen a reduction in manufacturing over the last 5 to 10 years in trades that rely on large numbers of workers. Any new businesses are more likely to be high tech and requiring less personnel.</li> <li>7. Due to item 6 above, roads will become more heavily congested, causing more health problems due to greater levels of engine exhaust emissions.</li> <li>8. The existing trunk road system in and around the Wyre Forest area is currently running at full capacity with no real plans evident to address the situation.</li> <li>9. Increased population will need more health facilities both at GP level and Hospital. Wyre Forest has seen Kidderminster Hospital services progressively reduced and this would need to be reversed. Likewise more GP surgeries would be required and the concern there seems to be a national shortfall in GPs. Whilst the Government states that more will be trained, the Royal College of GPs has revealed that some 20% are</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			likely to leave. It is not clear in the Proposed Local plan if the areas required for additional medical facilities are included in the plan or would be additional to it. 10. Current public transport is very poor and needs substantial investment to serve the current population levels let alone increased population.
	<a href="#">LPP02339</a>	Object	<p>We are against part of the development of the site labelled Captains and The Lodge (WFR/ST/1) for reasons explained later.</p> <p><b>1 Population Growth</b> - In the decade following 1991 the population remained static with an increase of 1.1% in the following decade and a further increase of 1.1% 2013 – 2015. Overall there has been an increase of 2.2% in 26 years or less than 0.1% per annum. It is now widely accepted that population growth in the UK is now reducing as an effect of the referendum. (2.2) Currently the Options submitted outline a requirement of 5400 units (becoming 6000) or 300 units p.a. of which just 90 units p.a. will be affordable. There is no evidence whatsoever that there is a need for this number of units which appears to be based upon a population growth in the period concerned well in excess of 7% or considerably greater than has been the case in recent years. Indeed planning dept. officers at the recent Heronswood School presentation accept that currently the population of Wyre Forest is falling.</p> <p><b>2 There Is No Significant Natural Interest in Spennells Fields</b> - Rather than meet the required objective of enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation, Option A will destroy an area which the report incorrectly states has no natural interest. As an owner and breeders of award winning show dogs, in recent years we have walked in Spennells Fields more than 200 times each year. The fields are teeming with wildlife with over 90 species of birds being identified on Captains Pool and a further 20 species in and around Spennells Fields. Many of the birds listed in these records are Red and Amber listed (Birds Of Conservation Concern 4) including on the Red List Lapwing, Merlin, Skylark, Starling, Ring ouzel, Fieldfare, Song thrush, Redwing, Mistle thrush, House sparrow, Yellow wagtail, Grey wagtail, Linnet, Yellowhammer and the Corn bunting. In addition to the bird life there are badgers and foxes present (the boundary to the south of Captains WFR/ST/1) comes within 2m of a very large fox earth. Foxes are protected under a series of wildlife protection laws against poisoning, gassing, asphyxiating, maiming, stabbing, impaling, drowning, clubbing and most forms of snaring, with anyone convicted of carrying out such acts liable to 6 months imprisonment and/or a £5,000 fine per animal. The fields and hedgerows of this area are where the animals forage. Grass snakes are widely distributed in the area of Spennells fields and in 2016</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>there was signage warning walkers that adders were in the area. Four species of bats are identified in and around Stone Hill South (OC13). These include Long Eared Bats, Pippistrelles, Soprano Bat and Daubentons Bat. A large number of moths and butterflies have also been noted in the area widely now known as Spennells Fields.</p> <p><b>3 The Infrastructure Demands Are Inadequately Addressed.</b> If all the development takes place as in Option A, there would not be the pupil numbers required to build a new primary school for a number of years. Heronswood Primary does not have the capacity to expand exponentially during this time. Secondary schools in Wyre Forest are underperforming BUT if option A is adopted the secondary school in the Wyre Forest with the least opportunity to expand is King Charles, where the upper school site is landlocked. Other schools have greater possibilities for quality expansion of resources and so it would be sensible to distribute the new units around the area as in Option B. Hospitals throughout Worcestershire are in Special Measures. This issue should be addressed before either Option is adopted. It is also becoming increasingly difficult to obtain a doctor's appointment. This matter also requires rectification if and when Wyre Forest expands further. Open Space and PRow's do not as such feature in our community facilities plans in the detail we would expect, and yet this is the reason that the area of Spennells Fields is so admired. It is a natural community asset which must not be lost as would be the case in Option A. If Spennells doubles in size how could traffic enter and exit the estate? The results of the complete adoption of Option A will be unbearable for current residents of the area. Policing costs also appear greater in Option A and it is also probable that doubling the size of Spennells Estate would promote anti-social behaviour. With a modified Option B development (making greater use of Blakedown and Wolverley) across the Wyre Forest will maximise the use of current resources and as a consequence reduce demands on the infrastructure of one area.</p> <p><b>4 There is a failure to take a holistic view of the housing need alongside that of the Southern/ Eastern bypass and the development of the Railway Station.</b> The Plan states 'The recent completion of the Hoobrook Link Road (opened Sept 2016) will help ease delays along the A451 Stourport Road corridor' Has this been a planning failure? The opening of the link road despite assurances to the contrary has led to dreadful traffic backing up that at times creates gridlock on the A449 roundabout at its junction with Wilden Lane. Similarly the Southern Eastern Bypass does not receive the attention it merits in the Plan. The planning officers present at Heronswood Primary were unable to shed any light on the route but whatever route is selected it would still further deplete the Green Belt to the south of the Spennells Estate with each kilometre of road requiring a minimum of 5 acres of land. Is this route necessary? Most traffic travelling via Hagley to Bromsgrove, Droitwich or Worcester will take the A450 to Mustow Green. This route could be upgraded but the issue of Birmingham traffic westward bound via Bewdley</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is not resolved by a southern/eastern bypass. The Plan states 'The opportunities to increase car parking provision at Kidderminster Rail Station are limited and so improving parking provision at the alternative stations (Blakedown) will be valuable as an alternative means of providing for anticipated rail growth in the Wyre Forest' Why then has Blakedown been omitted from the proposed developments? It is a total nonsense to improve Kidderminster Station to the tune of £5 million+ when the car park is landlocked and cannot be extended. It is also illogical to call upon a percentage of Kidderminster commuters in the next 15 years to drive to Blakedown to park when there could be a development in Blakedown in order to prevent the additional traffic on the A456. This has a detrimental impact upon the green issues the plan seeks to resolve. It is illogical to require residents to travel to a station outside the town when some housing in that area would reduce miles travelled and therefore reduce pollution.</p> <p><b>5 Option A will not address the need for affordable homes.</b> WF Council require 30% of new homes to be affordable. Yet the Local Plan Review suggests that WF is an area with a household income that is below average. The percentage of affordable homes therefore needs to be greater in order to attract a greater proportion of younger families to Wyre Forest and to allow these families to purchase a property and to make Wyre Forest a desirable place to live. The Campaign for Rural England has produced a report stating that dwellings built on green land often do not meet such criteria. Based upon planning consultant Glenigan data shows demonstrates that just 16% of houses built on Green Belt land since 2009 outside local plans were classed as 'affordable'. A point which applies to all development is the capacity of large companies to avoid even a 30% target as they have greater resources to call upon than local planning officers who are working with small teams on limited budgets.</p> <p><b>6 There will be a major and significant loss of amenity</b> to the residents of Spennells should Option A be adopted, and no details are given relating to the compensatory amenity that residents will enjoy. Proposals within, or conspicuous from the Green Belt, must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, by virtue of their siting, materials or design. The openness of the Green Belt is its most important attribute. By placing a very large proportion in this one area as detailed in Option A this openness will be lost. It would be further compounded if the bypass were also to go ahead as this would require a large buffer on both sides of such a route in addition to the area required for four carriageways and a central reservation. The removal of these open spaces in largely one area will have a detrimental effect upon active lifestyles of Spennells residents and damage the biodiversity of an area it seeks to enhance. The visual amenity and unique landscapes of Spennells Fields will be lost forever' and the southern and eastern routes into Kidderminster damaged.</p> <p><b>7 Employment Opportunities.</b> There is no evidence that the suggested enhanced employment opportunities will</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>be delivered. This is a worthy aspirational goal but currently the opposite appears to be the case in the Wyre Forest, with yet more closures being announced in the traditional industry. The Population Growth Figures which are excessive can only be achieved should this aspirational target be achieved. The closure of many units in Worcester St. following the building of Weavers Wharf appears has created a void in the town centre. The consideration of urban living spaces in this now abandoned area could aid the regeneration of Kidderminster town. The siting of a cinema in this area could also be beneficial leaving the former site of WF Glades available for living space. The distribution of housing growth around the area will in turn make Kidderminster a more desirable location in which to reside. My wife and I moved to Spennells as there is good access onto the A448 and we do not have to travel through the town centre to reach it. A spread of development around the town will be more appealing to potential incomers as a variety of development produces better access to other areas.</p> <p><b>8 Watercourses.</b> Whilst the major watercourses of the Severn, Stour and Canal are detailed in the report, the series of pools leading to Stanklyn Pool and onto Captains Pool receive little attention. This area in the early 1990's was classified as a site of ecological interest forming part of the linear landscape leading to Spennells nature reserve. We have addressed this issue further in our consideration of developing site OC/12.</p> <p><b>9 Loss of Green Belt and Arable Land and Hedgerows.</b> Although both Options appear to use roughly the same amount of Green Belt land, the amount used of around 2% is double that which the Government recommends. With Option A this is compounded should the southern/eastern bypass go ahead as this will consume considerably more of the Green Belt to the south of Wyre Forest. The rural nature of Stone Parish will be destroyed. Spennells Fields also provide a green space enjoyed by many of the residents of the current Spennells estate. This space is essential for the well-being, air quality and health of the population. There are also numerous PRow in the Fields the character of which would be destroyed should Option A proceed. These assets have for decades been used and enjoyed by residents. Furthermore it is not only the development of the fields themselves to consider but also the accompanying destruction of the hedgerows which are an environment for many forms of natural life. Spennells Fields are also used intensively for the production of both cereal and vegetable crops. A stated objective in the plan is to prohibit the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Development will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it cannot be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land. The case to develop this land has not been made.</p> <p><b>Captains Issues (OC/12).</b> In June 2004 following an unpermitted attempt to develop the southern side of Captains</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Pool an application was made by the landowner to obtain retrospective planning permission (Ref 676 2004 29 June 2004). At this time the land used for caravan storage was, I believe, increased and the southern boundary built in the ancient woodland. Substantial damage was done to the woodland and although this was subject to a repair order no rectification ever took place. The damaged part of the woodland as a result is now overgrown with Himalayan Balsam. The stream running from what is known locally as Fishermans Pond (the pond between Stanklyn Pool and Captains Pool), that is the supply stream for Captains Pool, has been compromised. During an appeal on 9/3/2010 (APP/R1845/A/09/2118087) Alan Wood on behalf of The Planning Inspectorate refused an appeal to develop the site of Captains on the grounds of Inappropriate Development, Openness, Visual Amenity, Highway Safety and a number of lesser considerations. All these considerations remain appropriate and it would require very substantial investment to overcome some but not all of these factors. Woodlands are addressed within Policy 10D. The ancient woodland to the south of Captains was badly damaged when there was an attempt to develop the area before any permission had been approved. As the subsequent retrospective appeal was dismissed the woodland should have been returned to its previous form. This was never done. Para 15.2 The need to maintain and replenish ground water supplies, reduce flooding and increase the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems and in line with the NPPF and NPPG the Council will steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. It must be noted here that the southern area of Captains site has been infilled and hard packed to provide for caravan storage. As a result the feeder stream for Captains Pool has turned the area to the immediate east of the three existing barns into swampland. The algae on this stagnant water can be clearly seen on Google earth as a light green between the barns and the copse around the stream between the Fishermans Pond and Captains Pool. This land appears to be at greater risk of flood than other areas in the town where it is suggested building cannot take place due to flood risk. The southern boundary of the site has been developed and pushed into the ancient wood which existed there, and a large fence around 2m high erected. The fence is within 2m of perhaps one of the largest fox earths in the Wyre Forest area. The stream from Fishermans Pond to Captains Pool in this area has hard standing on both sides in preparation for the new caravan storage area. This area was classified in the 1990's as a sight of ecological interest that formed part of the linear landscape of local importance joining Stanklyn Pool to Spennells Nature Reserve. The site has been compromised and should be returned to its previous state in order to preserve the linear landscape as it appears on the both Option A and B of the proposed developments. <b>Summary.</b> Councillor Hart has expressed a wish that no Green Belt should be lost if at all possible. Councillor Hardiman opines that all brownfield sites should be the primary route to address the initial need. These are most sensible opinions which if carried forward would ensure that any</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>inadequacies in the PG figures or failures to meet the employment targets would not see Green Belt used unnecessarily and would minimise the need for any incursion into the Green Belt and thus prevent urban sprawl. The use of all the fields suggested in Option A is not a stand-alone decision as the development of a southern/eastern bypass would have a compounding effect in this one area. The demise of Worcester Street following the building of Weavers Wharf should be addressed and with imagination can create both opportunities for affordable housing units and aid the regeneration of the town centre. The building of a cinema on the site of Wyre Forest Glades needs to be further considered as the site could be suitable for apartments. The doubling in size of Spennells estate will place an unacceptable proportion of the new housing in the Wyre Forest, an area which does not have the infrastructure which can be developed, whereas an amended Option B including both Blakedown, and Wolverley and a development of Lea Castle are better served by the existing infrastructure in terms of transport and schools than is the case in Option A. The doubling in size of Spennells may well increase anti-social behaviour in the area. Unless planning conditions are enforced with vigour the plan would not develop the required number of affordable homes. It is widely accepted that many large building companies often do not deliver the infrastructure promised in their original plans. Therefore whatever plan goes forward it must contain watertight conditions that ensure development companies do not renege on any undertakings made.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2408</a>	Object	<p>As AS/10, WFR/ST/2, OC/13 and WFR/ST1 all of which lie at the rear of Spennells estate. My reasons are that the land is greenfield and should remain so. Also the extra traffic on the already congested A449 from Hoo Brook would become intolerable. Added to the extra number of new inhabitants the already struggling schools in the catchment area would not cope, Heronswood Primary school has no scope for expansion and is already having to use portacabins. The local infrastructure is sufficient but would not be able to handle an influx of the number expected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2439</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the council plan to possibly build up to 2000 new houses in the Spennells area, this includes Captains Lodge and opposite side of A448 Bromsgrove Road. Objection is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spennells estate is already big enough you will have to provide more schools as Spennells, Comberton and King Charles Schools would not be able to cope with possibly 2000 extra families, not forgetting shops etc also.</li> <li>• The roads on this side of town are choked at peak times of the day already, you can't say that you will build an eastern bypass because this has already been turned down by Ministry of Transport. On this side</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>of town at 8.00am there are queues at Comberton Hill, Low Hill, oldness Corner (Black Bridge) and Mustow Green.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you relieve this situation?</li> <li>• Kidderminster is not a growing town, a lot of businesses are closing, especially carpet related companies or moving to other areas in the country. I would suggest you wouldn't require anything like 2000 new houses over the next 15 years i.e. 2019-2034.</li> </ul> <p>Please don't pile more misery on the residents of Spennells. I hope common sense will prevail. The council should use common sense and don't do anything at the moment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2510</a>	Object	<p>I wish to state my objection to plans to release land at the rear of Spennells, Captains Pool and The Lodge, from the Green Belt for housing development (Option A). The Green Belt was set up explicitly to prevent urban sprawl and protect rural or agricultural land. If we allow land to be released from the Green Belt rather than look at alternative options, eventually Kidderminster will link with Summerfield, then Hartlebury, Ombersley and then eventually Worcester. Where do we draw the line? Housing developers are so certain land will be released from the Green Belt they are purchasing it for vast sums of money prior to consultations, and decisions by Planning Departments. The message to developers must be clear – Green Belt is protected for a reason, and will stay that way. Developers must look to build on brownfield sites and previously developed sites, rather than build on Green Belt land because it is a cheaper option for them and generates more income for the Local Council. The massive environmental impact in the face of climate change needs to be considered. Rural areas provide a means of generating oxygen and reducing carbon dioxide, prevent flooding and provide food resources. Indeed, the fields at the rear of Spennells have been regularly planted with crops year after year in the twenty-one years I have lived here. Loss of this agricultural land means a loss of this food resource, resulting in a larger carbon footprint to bring in food from elsewhere. It also means a loss of employment to the workers whose jobs it is to maintain this arable land. Wildlife of many species live in the hedgerows around this land which will be forever destroyed if it is allowed to be developed. Public rights of way across the land provide safe leisure facilities for the people of Spennells and it rare not to see families of cyclists or walkers, enjoying outdoor family time on any given day of the week. In addition to this there is the added pollution that extra cars alongside the extra homes will undoubtedly bring, causing increased traffic congestion to an already poorly designed road network on the Estate. Any traffic incident which causes local delays on the A449 or A448, results in the residents of Spennells</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			becoming trapped on the Estate, as traffic cannot flow onto Spennells Valley Road from the only two exits on the Estate. More homes will only increase this problem. Given the Government's commitment to protect the Green Belt, and reduce the impact of climate change I urge you not to allow Wyre Forest Green Belt to be depleted for short term gain. We must look for alternative more environmentally sustainable solutions.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2550</a>	Object	Development here will automatically mean more traffic on the Bromsgrove Road. People who choose to live here are more likely to use the A448 as their local road and to commute to work via Bromsgrove and out to the Motorways. This poor quality, narrow and speed restricted A448 is already over loaded and congested, the Mustow Green roundabout in the evening is a nightmare regularly adding between 10 and 15 minutes to the evening commute. One of the attractions in living on the Spennells estate is that it borders on open country and affords easy access to country footpath through green fields, especially for joggers and those who own dogs and need to walk them. These footpaths encourage healthy outdoor exercise in all age groups. If they are lost then the option of pounding the pavement outside yet more houses is not nearly as appealing. There are plenty of sites in and around the town centre which could be restored into high quality housing. Also there are brownfield sites which should be considered first before taking the easy option of building on the Green Belt and taking yet more valuable agricultural land out of production. Do we really want to encourage more people to live in Kidderminster with the town centre the way it is at the moment? The town centre is a disgrace, it is depressed and an embarrassing place to take friends and family around when they visit. There are no decent shops, family run shops are driven out and the place is full of charity shops, empty shops and banks. There seems to only be one direction the town centre is going and that is down.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2569</a>	Object	I <b>OBJECT</b> to the planning of Spennells fields and Captains Pool. This will have such a negative impact on the surrounding area where residents use the fields as a community facility to walk dogs etc. There are plenty of other sites within Kidderminster that are derelict that can be used for this and wouldn't have an impact on people's life. It will destroy the approach into Kidderminster if you develop near Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive and also the area close to Captains Pool, a beautiful part of Kidderminster where an ugly housing estate will be placed, I feel this will want to make most residents move on and out of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2653</a>	Object	I object strongly to the proposed development on existing Green Belt land in Spennells, Captains and the Lodge, and surrounding areas. The premise we need 600+ houses is entirely flawed and based entirely on erroneous data. We simply do not need that many houses as the population of Kidderminster has been largely static for

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>several years and those that we do can be accommodated in existing Brown Field sites without laying waste to valuable Green Belt. This is without even mentioning the impact on traffic volumes of all these houses in one place plus the extra demands on local infrastructure. Once gone these valuable green areas are gone forever, therefore every effort should be made to utilise land that is lying derelict and unused first. Many of which are an eyesore and attract criminal behaviour. Hundreds of people use the fields to the south of Spennells and adjacent to Stanklyn Lane every week for recreational purposes, if this land is built it will be a monumental disaster to all those walkers, joggers, cyclists and dog walkers and many children who get their first taste of real countryside and even more so to the loss of habitat for all the wildlife that live in and feed in these fields. Having access to green areas is vital to peoples well being as has been well established in various studies. At the moment we have a large flock of swifts visiting the fields to feed on the abundant insect life, plus the ever present skylarks. There are several large well established badger setts in this area, not to mention bats, rabbits, foxes and myriad native bird life, all of which would lose this valuable green area. It is just wrong to look at a large green field site and say lets build on here because it's convenient for the building company and ignore all the brown field sites because they are a bit more inconveniently spread out over a wider area of Wyre Forest. Therefore I strongly suggest that the existing Housing Plan should be scrapped and a better environmental solution considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2716</a>	Object	<p>I am opposed to both of the options that Wyre Forest District council have proposed for the following reason: Removal of the fields will greatly reduce the spaces local people can go walking, jogging cycling, walking dogs etc. There has been no thought to the immense increase there will be in traffic. There is already severe congestion around Heronswood Road, adding 1700 extra properties is going to greatly add to this, not to mention the extra noise and fuel emission pollution that will be created.</p> <p>Where are all the extra schools going to be built, along with the extra dentists, doctors and other facilities that will be needed? Is there a plan to incorporate these into either of the options? I believe there are around 1200 empty houses in Kidderminster. Why are these not being utilised along with the empty buildings that there are in the Kidderminster town centre? I would have thought some of these empty buildings would be ripe for conversion into flats. This would cut down on people needing to use cars and thereby reduce pollution. There are already around 300 houses being built on the new Silverwoods development (ex British Sugar Factory). Does this not take off the pressure for the need of another 1700 homes?</p> <p>This area on the map, is referred to as Captains &amp; the Lodge WFR/ST/1 and is described as a core housing site. At present we have been advised this area will have 135 houses built on it.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I am most dismayed to hear this and would like to list a few of the birds and other wildlife that can be found in this area. – Please see separate page –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First of all the Leylandii hedge: If the land is used I would like to keep the hedge and existing fence. At present this hedge houses many types of birds and other wildlife. I am not just referring to the Spring/Summer breeding season. This has been home to all manner of wildlife for many years now and to lose this hedge would be a disaster environmentally.</li> <li>• Secondly, Captains Pool itself. I presume the lake itself is being sold. Currently Phoenix Fishing Club tell us that they have a lease on this pool/pond for another 3 years. Under the terms of their lease they have to maintain this area and also maintain the water to a high standard, which is I believe inspected every 12 months. Please advise how this is going to be maintained and who will be responsible for it?</li> <li>• Amongst the mammals listed on the other page are badgers. There is currently a Badgers Sett on the far side of the lake. How is this going to be looked after?</li> <li>• We also have a few types of bats that are often seen flying around on many evenings. I hope the site will be carefully checked to make sure their nesting areas are protected and not disturbed.</li> <li>• There is a boat shed on this site. There is a lot of wildlife that goes in and out of this boat shed despite doors on the front. Will this be checked to make sure this is not a nesting area?</li> </ul> <p>The construction of any new housing on the Spennells area anywhere near the lake will be catastrophic to the environment from which it will be difficult to recover and these lovely creatures will never return. Where does the urban sprawl end and how much more of the countryside do we need to lose before the damage caused is irreversible?</p> <p><b><u>BIRDS OF CAPTAINS POOL AND AREA WFR/ST/1</u></b>  <u>Breeding Residents:</u> Coot, Mallard, Moorhen, Canada Goose, Great Crested Grebe, Finches, Tits, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Treecreeper, Nuthatch, Starlings, Song Thrush, Mistlethrush, Blackbird, Yellowhammer, Sparrow Hawk, House Sparrow, Hedge Sparrow, Pigeons, Doves &amp; Corvids.  <u>Winter Visitors (Oct-April):</u> Goosander, Siskin, Redpoll, Blackcap, European Starlings, Fieldfare, Redwing, Brambling, Goldcrest, Teal.  Other birds seen are Grey Heron, Gulls, Shoveler, Pochard, Kingfisher, Tufted Duck, Mute Swan, Wagtails- Pied &amp;</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Grey, Little Egret, Tawny Owl and Buzzards.</p> <p><b><u>MAMMALS</u></b></p> <p>Hedgehogs, Moles, Common Shrew, Water Shrew, Field Vole, Yellow Necked Mouse, Wood Mouse, House Mouse, Brown Rat, Grey Squirrel, Rabbit, Fox, Badger, Pipistrelle Bats, Soprano Bats &amp; Daubenton's Bats.</p> <p>There are around 20 butterfly species and around 75-85 species of bird resident, breeding and passing through that can be seen at Captains Pool. The above list is just a few.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2750</a>	Object	<p>I am objecting to the Draft Local Plan A concerning the fields adjacent to Spennells and Plan A and B concerning the Core Housing Site on the area referred to as Captains and the Lodge. It would be wicked to see the peaceful surrounding countryside smothered with houses. The fields adjacent to the Spennells are used not only by dog walkers but people who walk or jog for their health and mental wellbeing. We really appreciate having the opportunity to stroll along the fields and watch the variety of birds that flit about, some nesting in the fields, and listen to the skylarks as they swoop in the sky. What a shame it would be for them to lose their habitats along with other wildlife that lives here. We've also had a wonderful field of poppies here, photographed by hundreds of people, which would never be seen again. Building more houses would mean pressure on hospitals, doctors, schools, transport and so on. How would the schools cope and where would the extra resources come from? Add on to this the overload on drainage and sewers. There is enough traffic on the estate already with congestion on the roads in and around the Spennells being especially bad in the mornings. We do not want increased traffic with more traffic noise and exhaust fumes which are a risk to health. With reference to the Core Housing site this backs on to a peaceful cul-de-sac and residents are very concerned about access to the houses and the noise problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2757</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Plan A plus area described as Captains and the Lodge i.e. WFR/ST/2, WFR/ST1, AS/10, OC/13. I wish to object based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect of the planned development would create loss of Green Belt which should protect our countryside from Urban Sprawl and even though existing Rights of Way are supposedly protected there is a great danger that these areas will be eradicated by housing development. The benefits to mental health and physical well being are at serious risk as the development will eradicate the fields used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle etc. This on top of the effect on the wild life habitat which is continually being eroded.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planned development which will nearly double the size of Spennells would have a dramatic effect on the ability of local schools and medical centres to cater for the increased requirements of the increased population which cannot even cope with the existing residents.</li> </ul> <p>The Council must re-evaluate their plans and concentrate on building on brownfield sites which will have the added benefit on regenerating the existing Town Centre.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3129</a>	Object	Object to site being included in the Core Housing Area, at most should be included under Option A Housing sites. Should not create a huge area of housing onto Spennells. A token open space such as a park would not be sufficient to sustain the population. Sustainable development should meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. More housing may meet some needs, without sufficient open space and demarcation between areas an urban sprawl is created with all the problems associated with it. Even with Section 106 funding it would be insufficient to provide suitable amenities or recreational open areas for such a large vicinity of housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO3170</a>	Object	I am very much against the loss of Green Belt in the Kidderminster area, particularly in areas adjacent to large housing estates. It provides areas for healthy exercise, particularly walking and jogging, which, given the rise of obesity in Wyre Forest, is essential for the health of the citizens. Also the Green Belt is a haven for a variety of wildlife both in the fields and hedgerows and it is wrong to destroy their habitat. Nowhere is this more evident than the fields at the top of Spennells and it would be a tragedy to see them built on. I am concerned over the proposed development of Captains and the Lodge, Bromsgrove Road. I understand that it is proposed to access this development from the A448. That's fine providing there is no vehicular access from the development into the existing Spennells estate. If there were it would create a linkage from the A448 into a quiet residential area posing a very real danger to children who play on the streets as well as unacceptable levels of noise and pollution. I was assured at the drop in meeting that this will not happen, but I would strongly recommend that if this proposal goes ahead that this is explicitly stated and guaranteed. I am concerned that the proposed plans that we are being consulted on do not specify the type of housing proposed on any of the sites. At the drop in meeting I asked about this and was told it would be dependent on proposals made by developers. I firmly believe that the council should take the lead in this, rather than be reactive to the developers' plans. In your planning documents you correctly point to an ageing population. However if you look at all the new builds in the areas surrounding Kidderminster there are very few, if any, bungalows being built, mainly because they are less profitable for the



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			developers. This is where the council could and should specify a significant quantity of good quality bungalows which would provide an incentive to senior citizens to vacate larger family homes for young families.
	<a href="#">LPP03487</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object strongly to both options A &amp; B. Although these schemes are being presented as an either or choice, each includes development in the area referred to as WFR/ST/1 designated as a “Core Housing Site”. The main reasons for my opposition which can equally apply to both plans are a follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Loss of Green Belt status:</u> DCLG states that “this Government is committed to protect the Green Belt” and “only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter Green Belt boundaries”. Are projected local expansion needs really exceptional enough to warrant this land grab and won’t the infringement of these guidelines make it easier to commandeer more land in the future? The awareness that 98% will somehow be preserved seems unlikely to happen when tempting offers are made by developers.</li> <li>• <u>Increased pressure on Local Services:</u> Both options A and B will impose extra strain on hospitals, doctors, dentists and schools, in addition to the water, gas, electricity and sewerage provision required. Some of these services are struggling to cope already and GPs may even vote soon to stop registering new patients. The local plan review leaflet says only that new facilities may come forward, but even if they do, it will take considerable time and upheaval to install them. Shopping has become poor, the bus service to and from Spennells is substandard and any new residents will no doubt have at least one or two cars. An Eastern Relief Road may be built, but is this really something to welcome? More countryside destroyed, more noise and traffic fumes and soon yet another road will be needed as traffic expands to fill the space allocated to it.</li> <li>• <u>Increased risk to health:</u> Whichever option is adopted it is certain that the atmosphere will become even more unclean with more noise and congestion affecting both pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• <u>Loss of use of fields &amp; footpaths:</u> Captains and The Lodge (WFR/ST/1), Farmers Fields 1 (AS/10), 1 (WFR/ST /2), And 3 (OC/13). Being unable to use and enjoy these fields and the footpaths bordering them, full of trees and flowers and home to birds and other wildlife, will diminish the health and well-being of residents and other visitors. It is a safe area to walk.</li> </ul> <p>I object to both Options A &amp; B for these reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03619</a>	Object	I want to draw issues to the environmental damage that will be caused when building core housing by Captain’s

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Pool. The fields are home to many species of RSPB red listed birds. Birds nesting there such as Skylarks, and Corn Buntings to name only a few of many are depleting in numbers and need to be protected. The RSPB recommends a 200 Hectare exclusion zone around these nests so they can continue to breed safely and increase their numbers. With all the houses that the LP recommends building on core sites and option A, this will see the demise of these birds in the Wyre Forest district which is why the LP needs to be revisited and reworked. As the LP states around 6000 houses need building by 2034, how does the WFDC plan to offset the carbon footprint created by building these houses and the extra cars (10000 approx) which will be on our roads? Air pollution is a rapidly growing problem as seen around the world as well as in the UK. This is caused by over population and the need for cars to get around. So why over estimate by far in the LP, the amount of housing needed thus creating more air pollution? The Spennells is a designated nature reserve and more housing, cars and people would affect the area severely. Tree Protection Orders are in force over the Spennells and its surrounding areas. What will become of these? Are they going to be ignored and the building companies pay a nominal fine for cutting them down? Once again as in its title, it's "Wyre Forest District Council" with a <b>TREE</b> as its emblem. Should that not now change to a <b>HOUSE</b> if the LP goes ahead? This is why the LP needs to be reviewed and reworked to help the environment. It states on the WFDC website that the council is committed to providing well maintained parks and facilities for all to enjoy! If we encourage the building on Green Belt land then there will be no more well maintained facilities for anyone to enjoy!</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03738</a>	Object	<p>I would respectfully request that other sites are considered before destroying this particularly quiet, leafy area of Kidderminster. The area around the Captains Pool is particularly beautiful and is a great resource for dog walkers, walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Surely a development of this area would also be detrimental to the Spennells Nature Reserve? This would be a real shame and something we would never be able to replace.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04039</a>	Object	<p>I would like to submit objections to <b><u>WFR/ST/1 Core Housing Site</u></b></p> <p>Please note my strong objection to the building on this site known as "Captains and the Lodge", I have lived very close by for nearly 29 years. The following points must be considered in relation to this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TPOs on the woodland - mentioned and detailed above</li> <li>• there are at least 3 types of bats roosting in the woodland and in the boathouse</li> <li>• there are herons nesting on Captains Pool at the far end to the footpath, they have been there for over</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>30 years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• many types of water birds grazing on the grassland from Captains house down to the pool. There are 92 recorded different types of birds in this area across to Stone</li> <li>• the only current access onto the A448 will be hazardous as this main road is 50 mph speed limit. One planning application on this site has already been rejected for this reason</li> <li>• there is no footpath on the Captains and The Lodge side of the A448 for children to walk safely to Comberton or King Charles schools</li> <li>• there is swamp land at the easterly corner of Captains Pool ( as viewed from the footpath along the pool ) that contains newts, frogs and toads</li> <li>• skylarks are nesting on this site in the fields adjacent to Bromsgrove Road</li> <li>• development will be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt</li> <li>• there are badgers setts on this site</li> <li>• there are dormice in the fields where skylarks are</li> <li>• the development will home in the region of 400 extra people and there are not sufficient local amenities, doctors, schools, hospital, shops etc.</li> <li>• both Captains and The Lodge contain restrictive agriculture related covenants, these need to be considered</li> <li>• development on this site would conflict with Policy GB.6 of the LP which states that proposals within the Green Belt must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt. I attribute significant weight to this factor</li> </ul> <p>I object strongly to this Core Housing development WFR/ST/1. If you don't accept a reduction in the housing demand numbers, then I still object to Captains &amp; The Lodge being in the draft Local Plan, for the reasons stated above</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04295</a>	Object	<p>I am whole heartedly objecting to Option A and also to any core housing around the Captains and the Lodge. Nothing better than to walk the fields or take them for a long bike ride. The tranquil surroundings, nature and friendly people we pass all add to amazing, safe and stress free well being. We love to see the amazing variety of breeds of birds in the fields as well as the ones that visit our own garden, also bats we have frequently seen at dusk. We love the skyline through the fields, watching sunsets and on clear nights the star constellations. All of</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this will be marred with obscene buildings and light pollution. Not what I want my children to then be deprived of. The traffic would be another issue. The volume of traffic would be disruptive. Imagine an average of 2 vehicles per household on top of the vast amount already. The pollution, build up and safety of us and our children would all be jeopardised. The thought of extra housing on top of the sheer size of Spennells estate is mind blowing. The local schools, doctors and dentists can not deal with this. The waiting lists to sign up for any of these are already problematic let alone then trying for an appointment. It seems as though figures have been miscalculated and are in fact less required than estimated so I don't see why all of the brown belt land can't be used for maisonettes or apartments before hitting this beautiful countryside. There are appalling buildings empty and making Kidderminster look a disgrace like crown house and the majority of Worcester street. This could provide so much more to the town itself if these are converted and updated. If the town is left the way it is any longer I'm sure there will be plenty of property as people would move anyway, there is nothing here for people. It can't possibly just be for the growing population of Kidderminster, it's the overspill from surrounding cities. Where does it end? How much land is going to be eaten up? There were promises of protecting the Green Belt areas and I'm sure as you have seen from the amount of objections and the amount of time and effort gone into objecting to this you can see how much this means. Please please reconsider and re plan. Let us keep these fields for all our sakes and especially children to have the freedom of this natural playground.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04432</a>	Object	Oppose development at Captain's and the Lodge WFR/ST/1.
	<a href="#">LPP04439</a>	Object	I wish to object to build housing on the Green Belt area known as Captain's Pool and The Lodge.
	<a href="#">LPP04553</a>	Object	<p>I object most strongly to the development of the area identified as WFR/ST/1 Captains &amp; the Lodge on the Kidderminster East map in Appendix A. The map in Appendix A clearly shows the development of WFR/ST/1 Captains &amp; the Lodge as being a Core Housing Site and therefore to be developed in both Option A and Option B, which is in direct contradiction of the statement in para 31.1 that "under Option B the built development would not extend south of the Bromsgrove Road". Development of this area of land would have a severe negative impact on the environment and wildlife around Captains Pool pond and impair the views of St Mary's church, Stone. An important concern is that if developed without the adjacent area of OC/13 Stone Hill South the only feasible access to this area for construction traffic and residents would be through either Kittiwake Drive or on to</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			the A448 Bromsgrove Road significantly increasing the hazards on either road. It should be noted that access on to the A448 from the adjacent area of the existing Spennells estate is explicitly prohibited in the deeds of the Spennells properties precisely because of the hazardous nature of this stretch of road. This land should only be considered for development as part Option A.
	<a href="#">LPP04585</a>	Object	<p><b>Captains Issues (OC/12).</b> In June 2004 following an unpermitted attempt to develop the southern side of Captains Pool an application was made by the landowner to obtain retrospective planning permission (Ref 676 2004 29 June 2004). At this time the land used for caravan storage was, I believe, increased and the southern boundary built in the ancient woodland. Substantial damage was done to the woodland and although this was subject to a repair order no rectification ever took place. The damaged part of the woodland as a result is now overgrown with Himalayan Balsam. The stream running from what is known locally as Fishermans Pond (the pond between Stanklyn Pool and Captains Pool), that is the supply stream for Captains Pool, has been compromised. During an appeal on 9/3/2010 (APP/R1845/A/09/2118087) Alan Wood on behalf of The Planning Inspectorate refused an appeal to develop the site of Captains on the grounds of Inappropriate Development, Openness, Visual Amenity, Highway Safety and a number of lesser considerations. All these considerations remain appropriate and it would require very substantial investment to overcome some but not all of these factors. Woodlands are addressed within Policy 10D. The ancient woodland to the south of Captains was badly damaged when there was an attempt to develop the area before any permission had been approved. As the subsequent retrospective appeal was dismissed the woodland should have been returned to its previous form. This was never done.</p> <p>Para 15.2 The need to maintain and replenish ground water supplies, reduce flooding and increase the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems and in line with the NPPF and NPPG the Council will steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. It must be noted here that the southern area of Captains site has been infilled and hard packed to provide for caravan storage. As a result the feeder stream for Captains Pool has turned the area to the immediate east of the three existing barns into swampland. The algae on this stagnant water can be clearly seen on Google earth as a light green between the barns and the copse around the stream between the Fishermans Pond and Captains Pool. This land appears to be at greater risk of flood than other areas in the town where it is suggested building cannot take place due to flood risk. The southern boundary of the site has been developed and pushed into the ancient wood which existed there, and a large fence around 2m high erected. The fence is within 2m of perhaps one of the largest fox earths in the Wyre Forest area. The stream from Fishermans Pond to Captains Pool in this area has hard standing on both sides in preparation for the new caravan</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			storage area. This area was classified in the 1990's as a sight of ecological interest that formed part of the linear landscape of local importance joining Stanklyn Pool to Spennells Nature Reserve. The site has been compromised and should be returned to its previous state in order to preserve the linear landscape as it appears on both Option A and B of the proposed developments.
	<a href="#">LPP04641</a>	Object	The schools argument is flawed, as despite increased house building the Council have already closed several schools. If there is such a requirement, it would have been easier to keep the existing schools open. To use Green Belt because of wrong decisions in the past is not within the justification requirements of the National Planning Guidelines There have never been any No Doctors surgeries on Spennells. From an environmental view point and to protect the endangered Corn Bunting Option A must not proceed.
	<a href="#">LPP04675</a>	Object	In addition I oppose development in the area 'Captain's and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' which has been included in the Draft Plan as a 'Core' area, the Easter Park business development and the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site at Heath Lane.
	<a href="#">LPP04683</a>	Object	In conclusion, I would like to oppose development at Captains and the Lodge.
	<a href="#">LPP04779</a>	Object	See response 2462.
	<a href="#">LPP04868</a>	Object	Captains Pool should also not be developed.
	<a href="#">LPP05007</a>	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposed development of the Green Belt fields designated 'Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park AS/10', 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2', 'Stone Hill South OC/13', and 'Captains and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' (marked Option A and a Core area on the Draft Local Plan).</p> <p>In support of my objection I wish to make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The population of Wyre Forest district has hardly grown in the past 25 years, so the quantity of houses that has been projected as being necessary has been over-estimated or even exaggerated. Brownfield</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>sites and regeneration of Kidderminster town centre could provide sufficient land for new housing without resorting to taking Green Belt. Green Belt should only be taken as a last resort and we have not reached that point yet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The infrastructure is not in place to support a huge increase in the number of households in the area. Our medical establishments are already at breaking point, our schools almost full. Our road network cannot support more vehicles.</li> <li>• An immense area of wildlife habitat would be lost which currently supports a number of rare species of animals and plants. Currently the fields are in use – they are not left barren.</li> <li>• The Spennells fields area is a valuable natural open space which has a positive effect on people's physical and mental wellbeing. The public footpaths and bridleways across these fields are used by walkers, dog-walkers, joggers, horse-riders, photographers and birdwatchers and people of all ages and levels of fitness. This is a convenient location for taking exercise without first having to jump in a car.</li> <li>• If these fields were to be given over to housing, tarmac roads and driveways, what would happen during periods of heavy rain? How would drainage be managed to avoid causing flooding in the lower-lying area of Stanklyn/Summerfield?</li> </ul> <p>Once our Green Belt has gone we cannot get it back. Once a habitat has been lost we cannot get our flora and fauna back. I urge you to make the right decision – a decision which leaves Spennells fields Green Belt land intact.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5125</a>	Object	<p>The Captains Pool is classified as brownfield despite in reality being a field full of plant life, trees, wildlife, etc, when there are real brownfield sites around Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley that are just buildings or former buildings. The plan itself presents the Core build sites as non-negotiable and pressures residents to support Plan A as the "preferred" plan, discouraging anything but picking A or B or objecting to any part of the Core, such as the Captains Pool build behind Spennells. The area including the Green Belt and Captains Pool which would be built on or affected by the build is inhabited by wildlife such as foxes, badgers, bats, buzzards, barn owls, hedgehogs, toads, frogs, grass snakes and others. It is also valuable agricultural land, among the best in Worcestershire, of which there is a shrinking amount in Britain.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1002</a>	Support	<p>WFR/ST/1. This might possibly be an appropriate extension to the existing developed area, but we would not like to see development further along Bromsgrove Road, so as to maintain a strategic gap between Kidderminster and Stone.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP03829</a>	Support	<p>Aware that the review includes proposals to take certain land out of protected Green Belt designation for the purposes of urban extension, I would like to make the following representation: I am clear in my understanding of the purposes of designating land as Green Belt as defined in paragraph 80 of the government's publication 'National Planning Policy Framework' (NPPF), these being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas</li> <li>• to prevent neighbouring towns from merging</li> <li>• to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</li> <li>• to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</li> <li>• to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</li> </ul> <p>I would like to offer support to one particular site, that being the land known as Captains and The Lodge, designated WFR/ST/1 and located on the east side of Kidderminster to the south of the A448. The Green Belt Review prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler, which has informed the Local Plan Review, has given a brief analysis of the site and concluded that it offers only a limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt and I would concur. Looking at the five purposes of inclusion of land within Green Belt in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Removal of the site from Green Belt in isolation would still check the unrestricted sprawl of Kidderminster as the relatively small scale of the site will create new limits to development along the outer edge where it will abut the residual and far greater area expanse of Green Belt; rather than being unrestricted, the re-designation of the site will therefore allow controlled expansion of the urban periphery in a location which is predominantly out of general sight. The shape of the site and relationship of it to the existing boundary of the Spennells estate show that it naturally fills a gap between the more intrusive part of the estate to the south and the A448 to the north, again giving natural limits and control to the increased built up area.</li> <li>2. With the exception of villages such as Stone and Chaddesley Corbett, the nearest town on this side of Kidderminster is Bromsgrove, some 8 miles distant. There will be no danger of the adjacent towns merging with the reallocation of this site and even Stone, a good mile distant, remains safe from being subsumed as a result.</li> </ol>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. The safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment is effectively the same as checking the unrestricted sprawl of built up areas. Whilst Green Belt, a not insignificant proportion of the site can be deemed to be previously developed land; part of the land has extant and exercised permission for the storage of caravans, which in itself already constitutes an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt, and then there is the footprint and residential amenity space associated with the two existing dwellings. Whilst admittedly paragraph 53 of NPPF seeks to restrict development of residential gardens, I rely on the definition of 'Previously Developed Land' in the glossary in Annex 2 to the rear of NPPF which excludes, amongst other things, 'land in built up areas such as private residential gardens'. As the site is currently Green Belt, it cannot be classified as being in a 'built up' area, and therefore the residential amenity spaces associated with the two houses are, by definition of lack of exclusion, previously developed land. Despite this, paragraph 89 of NPPF instructs local authorities to regard the construction of new buildings within Green Belt as inappropriate development with few exceptions amongst which is limited affordable housing to meet local community needs; a need clearly demonstrable in the greater Kidderminster area. The fact that part of the land could already potentially be developed for affordable housing whilst remaining within the Green Belt therefore significantly reduces the potential additional impact of the site being removed from Green Belt designation to allow more general development.</p> <p>4. The edge of the urban environment here is quite abrupt; the relatively high density of the Spennells estate gives a hard edge to the town that the two dwellings on the site currently softens to an extent, albeit there is little visibility into the site save for a public right of way that separates the site from the edge of Spennells. Spennells is also a relatively recent development itself and presents a contemporary urbanism to the arriving visitor as they approach along the A448. Whilst Kidderminster does have an historic core, it is located some distance from this gateway site with a natural chronology of development increasing in age and associated characteristic as you travel toward the historic core reflecting the natural expansion of the town over the last 150 years or more. A new development, of contemporary idiom on this site would therefore be wholly appropriate, and would not detract from the setting and special character of the historic parts of the town centre which are quite remote from the site.</p> <p>5. In recent history, Wyre Forest District Council has had robust policy in respect to town centre regeneration, particularly in Kidderminster, and not without success. Wyre Forest as a district is however disadvantaged in having only three relatively small centres with a high proportion of Green Belt around them creating a natural limit to development that is close to being reached. In my own local authority</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/ST/1 – CAPTAINS & THE LODGE

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area, I have seen adherence to the last item of the above list in particular, significantly diminish existing redundant employment land in order to satisfy the needs for anticipated housing provision which policy has dictated 95% needs to be on previously developed land; worse still, I have seen employment land vacated due to the significantly higher land values that subsequent housing designation brings. Clearly, a balanced view needs to be taken to ensure that all demands on available land are able to be catered for, else all we will create are dormitory towns where the residents live, but do not, because they can not, work; a wholly unsustainable approach and contrary to paragraphs 6-16 of NPPF. Whilst development of available and deliverable non Green Belt sites should obviously take precedence, keeping this particular site in Green Belt will contribute little additional influence to urban regeneration within the centre of town given the sterling efforts of the local planning authority to date.</p> <p>Notwithstanding all of the above, it is an invidious task to determine where sacrifices need to be made, as they have to be those with the least worst cumulative impact. In conclusion, I believe the site to be amongst the least worst, if not the least worst, of all the current Green Belt sites and would wholeheartedly support its reallocation for residential development. I understand the land owners of the majority of the site are amenable to the use of the land for residential purposes, so not only is the site ideal for purpose, it also represents a deliverable opportunity. I can understand that the current exercise has aroused emotions amongst those hostile to development and that you may receive several objections to this site being included. However, as it has been demonstrated that additional housing needs to be procured over the next plan period, the exercise of deciding where it should be located needs to be undertaken on a positive 'least worst' principle, rather than the alternative of a negative 'anti-development' attitude. I look forward to being able to review all of the consultation responses as the process moves forward to its next stage.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO FPH/27 – ADJACENT EASTER PARK

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04684</a>	Object	I would like to oppose the business/ industrial Buildings at Easter Park (as those already there have never been fully occupied and are an eye sore).
	<a href="#">LPP04869</a>	Object	I strongly object to the further development of Easter Park Business premises, as they are never fully occupied and stand as empty buildings on a main road into Kidderminster, coupled with the empty VOSA building further creating the impression of a run down and economically poor town.
	<a href="#">LPP05074</a>	Object	In addition I oppose development in the area 'Captain's and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' which has been included in the Draft Plan as a 'Core' area, the Easter Park business development and the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site at Heath Lane.
Stone Parochial Charity	<a href="#">LPP01158</a>	Support	We are in full support of the proposal and the land is available at short notice. Land is currently underutilised and is of low agricultural worth and has little attractive merit.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO39</a>	Comment	<p>There are three major problems with this proposal:</p> <p>a. Nesting Skylarks which have been nesting in the fields behind the Spennells estate for as long as we have lived here (36 years).</p> <p>b. Access to the site - Although a new road is proposed, when will it be built before or after the houses? Spennells already becomes gridlocked easily as there is only one way on and off the estate, via Spennells Valley Road, which easily becomes blocked. One morning it took 2 hours to get off the estate.</p> <p>c. Because the Council sold off the land originally allocated to become a middle school near the existing school in the 1980s, there is no spare space to extend the school. Will there be a proposal to build another school?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1869</a>	Comment	Proposed development in Spennells fields. I object to "Option A" as it will reduce the Green Belt in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2493</a>	Comment	<p>I do not believe either Option A or Option B listed on the preferred options are acceptable or viable. I also do not believe that the core options for housing around Spennells estate should be utilised either.</p> <p>It was an exciting new estate, one that was bound to grow in time, but a beautiful estate, surrounded by beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Taught my children to ride their bikes on the public footpath on Lapwing field, memories that will last a life-time.</p> <p>The road infrastructure is struggling to support the current residents.</p> <p>The shops on the estate have become busier and busier and the school has large class numbers, which was one of the issues that caused the school to drop into special measures a few years ago.</p> <p>The surrounding countryside is beautiful and should not be allowed to be built on, I've lived in urbanised areas, and once that countryside has gone it can't be bought back. Wildlife destroyed, safe walks gone, clean air no longer able to be breathed, peace and quiet abolished.</p> <p>I cannot see why, with so many empty buildings and land around Kidderminster, they are not utilised before the</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>decision to use Green Belt land is made.</p> <p>I don't believe there are enough jobs in the local area to require extra homes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2501</a>	Comment	<p>Green Belt land has special protected status. This special status is being potentially undermined by local authorities all over the UK with what appears to be the support of central government. In this particular case, I am speaking of the proposed development of the Green Belt land on the edge of Spennells Valley, Kidderminster. If this special status is to have any meaning at all, then central government should state that any proposals should not undermine the existing status of Green Belt land. Options that should be included for and prioritised should be new out-of-town and brownfield development. This would encourage the regeneration of our town centre and out-of-town developments that would not compromise Green Belt land and thus retain the integrity of our town boundaries. There may well be additional development costs relating to this type of approach, but the medium/long term benefits would be greater. We cannot just keep allowing development to keep eating into our precious British countryside. Our shared environment is worth a lot more than mere money when it has such a dramatic affect on the quality of people's lives.</p> <p>The Green Belt Land adjoining Spennells is a significant part of life for the many people who enjoy access to this space. Horse riders, cyclists, joggers, walkers etc. enjoy the benefits that this beautiful space provides. The natural wildlife is a joy to see. A sprawling new housing development is going to do absolutely nothing for the quality of people's lives in this area and in turn put massive stress on an infrastructure that is not going to cope with the proposed levels of development.</p> <p>Try to be more imaginative than just looking at the cheaper options. The character of our towns etc is very much defined by our precious Green Belt land and people's best interests are not going to be best served by wiping out this valuable natural resource.</p> <p>We join everyone who voices their strong objections against this proposed development in the strongest of terms. We are fully aware of all of the political and financial influences at work here. Just do the right thing. Looking after our cherished environment is one of the most positive actions that we can all take.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2652</a>	Comment	<p>At no time did I ever think builders would try and build on the beautiful fields with all its wildlife plus the peace and quiet it brings to our estate.</p> <p>The thought that you are considering building on the Green Belt that protects our estate is unthinkable as I always thought I and generations to come would have this beautiful country side to live in.</p> <p>As the estate started to grow in size it was a struggle to get off the estate. The roads around the estate were always gridlocked. This is what Spennells is like NOW so what on earth is going to happen if you build even more houses.</p> <p>There are so many non Green Belt areas you could look at first.</p> <p>Mental illness is so widely spoke about in our lives as the big vote catcher yet when it comes to putting it into practice, like protecting our countryside so people like myself can by just walking and taking in its beauty remove all the stress of the day and help us cope.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2675</a>	Comment	<p>Prefer option B as it uses less Green Belt land. There are plenty of unused Brownfield sites in Kidderminster such as the magistrate's court and the Woolworths site to build additional housing upon.</p> <p>Apartments will serve the needs of affordable housing for the desired residents.</p> <p>I strongly object to any form of additional traffic which will increase congestion around the areas of Stourbridge and Hagley caused by the huge volume of houses.</p> <p>Would place a huge strain on both the local road and train infrastructure. Will considerably increase the amount of commuters on the rail network to Birmingham and as such cause overcrowding and delays impacting along the train line.</p> <p>I strongly object to any proposed bypass that would increase traffic on the A456.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2732</a>	Comment	The proposals, particularly Option A, would permit development on large areas of Green Belt land. Urban sprawl

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>would encroach on Hurcott Village, Stone, Summerfield and Torton. Green Belt should stay Green Belt. If Green Belt is developed it is gone forever.</p> <p>Seems somewhat immoral to past applicants who have had applications refused, or have not even applied for approval to carry out their wishes, due to the Green Belt policy.</p> <p>A very low percentage are affordable homes for first time buyers.</p> <p>Fields lying to the South and Southeast of Spennells are arable agricultural land and have been used to produce food crops almost annually for the past 36+ years.</p> <p>It will have a huge impact on road congestion in these areas.</p> <p>Brownfield sites in the town should be used to provide homes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2886</a>	Comment	Kidderminster 'Spennells' area, we know the council wish to build a further ring road, so the preconception is what the building will automatically go ahead regardless of any objections
	<a href="#">LPPO3012</a>	Comment	<p>1. The area designated <b>core</b> seems already to have been fixed and agreed. We were being asked to give opinions about choices peripheral to this.</p> <p>2. The brunt of the plans for extensive <b>core</b> building has again been centred on the Spennells area extending the loss of Green Belt on the east side of town for a second time and undoing all the people and nature have done to mend this environment since the Spennells development began.</p> <p>3. Already this side of town has real traffic problems at commuter times at many junctions. Residents experience this every day, and are now being expected to choose between two options, both of which must lead to greater concerns for road safety, congestion, access to emergency services, and air pollution.</p> <p>4. Existing small roads will inevitably carry a far greater number of cars, affecting many people's enjoyment of walks</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and precious wildlife.</p> <p>5. Surely firm ideas and financial support for a viable and appropriate road system should be in place to reassure us that such huge new development will not further reduce our quality of life.</p> <p>6. Claims that the development would make Kidderminster into a better place to live, with jobs, new homes, new or improved education facilities and an invigorated economy were mentioned, but I did not hear anything concrete at the drop-in session I attended.</p> <p>7. The marked decline in Kidderminster centre's status as attractive and economically vibrant will also not support such claims.</p> <p>8. Allowing housing to straggle into farmland makes building easier and creates building jobs for the short term, but in the long term could create irrevocable damage and I therefore can only object to <i>both</i> proposals for this area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3036</a>	Comment	<p>1) The alternative proposal of allowing the Green Belt site by Spennells to be developed is unnecessary and just too drastic to be considered. If the change in status of the land was allowed and given the housing density that would no doubt be used, it would eventually more than double the size of Spennells. Spennells is already a big estate but it was built with many grassy areas and walkways and is surrounded by the nature reserve, Captains Pool and the fields. Consequently, Spennells has become a pleasant place to live with being close to Kidderminster with all its amenities and still feeling out in the beautiful countryside. This satisfaction will change if Spennells is surrounded by a sprawling new development.</p> <p>2.) Watching the areas that are already being developed there seems to be little evidence of sensitive planning; the houses are being thrown up very close together. In five years time the new estates will not be pleasant places to live in or to have near by. The attitude seems to be let's jam as many as we can onto the sites. I suppose for the developer it is more houses equals more money, but as expressed above it seems that we do not need all these houses in this area.</p> <p>3.) The wonderful countryside around Spennells is far too valuable for the environment and as productive farming</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>land. Will future generations thank us if we destroy it?</p> <p>4.) The big developers will only be interested in developing Green Belt sites and no doubt will be employing the best lawyers who will endeavour to exploit any legal loopholes, but what is morally right must win.</p> <p>5.) Surely for Kidderminster to be a happy prosperous town the residents need to want to live here. Permanently replacing the rural aspect of the town with undesirable buildings and the increased pressure on services and infrastructure will not encourage people to want to live here.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3346</a>	Comment	<p>I do not however agree to the huge figure with which Wyre Forest District Council have concluded that is needed and especially to the usage of the Green Belt that would be detrimental to the area and one that could never be replaced.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells are a habitat for a large number of wildlife.</p> <p>The suggestion of needing such a vast building of homes sounds to me ludicrous. If that was the worst scenario then we now have an ageing population and more single people than ever residing in homes but this would suggest that smaller homes and housing association new builds are needed and in a more central location, not the four bed type that is suggested.</p> <p>Let's not forget the effect this colossal proposed building expansion will have on the whole infrastructure, amenities and facilities of the Wyre Forest area. Schools, doctors, roads, hospitals, not forgetting the useless bus service are already hugely under pressure.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3348</a>	Comment	Option A to the South of Kidderminster. There would be development right up to the district boundary.
	<a href="#">LPPO3497</a>	Comment	The Green Belt behind Spennells provides a rare opportunity for those that live in the area to enjoy the benefits that the outdoors has to offer. The footpaths are easily accessible to all involved, those that enjoy walking and jogging. If this area gets built on, the areas on the southern side of the road is all private land and I am unaware of the area

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>being as accessible to go walking.</p> <p>I would strongly urge brownfield sites within Kidderminster to be considered. For the people of Spennells to lose such a valuable area to go walking, I firmly believe that the cost-benefit return is disproportionate.</p> <p>I would urge consideration for other, non greenfield sites to be considered as a priority.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3739</a>	Comment	<p>The large-scale expansion to the east, and particularly the south-east of Kidderminster raises, quite a lot of concerns.</p> <p>Here are a few points I'd like to raise from my own observations of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are new businesses and enterprises <u>definitely</u> going to be set up in Kidderminster to provide jobs for the new residents?</li> <li>• In as much as there are plans to build new houses there should be matching plans for <u>actual</u> schools and <u>actual</u> doctors' surgeries.</li> </ul> <p>o Will these people be able to find doctors?</p> <p>o How do you know that school provision will be delivered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The balance of urban/rural life could be adversely affected by rapid development once it gets going.</li> <li>• It must not be forgotten that Spennells Valley is a nature reserve. Should there be extra houses built we would need to see plans for green spaces being interspersed. I don't see any provision in the plans for those. Doubling the size of Spennells would adversely affect the lives of many people who chose to live there because of access to fields for their own mental welfare, and being able to walk their dogs, etc.</li> <li>• Could the development options be less concentrated and spread around the whole of Kidderminster, not just the south-east? Is this to justify building a relief road?</li> <li>• I have never been convinced that a relief road would help the congestion in Kidderminster. The A450 already allows traffic coming from the north-east to bypass the town on the east and to join the A449 to</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			travel onwards towards Worcester, or to access the town on the west side. To create another main road joining the single carriage way A449 at a busy section – on the approach to Hoo Farm Industrial Estate – would encourage even more traffic to join the existing bottle-neck before going on towards West Kidderminster, Stourport or Worcester. I think a lot more thought needs to go into where such a relief road would spill out onto, and going on from there how the total road network around that part of Kidderminster might be improved to accommodate so many extra residents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3847</a>	Comment	<p>Habitats providing life to bats, dormice, crested newts (as well as land providing homes to skylarks - prohibited) aren't allowed to be interfered with and built upon.</p> <p>Disrupting breeding and resting habitats of these species, which is what would happen should you choose to ignore local concerns and plough ahead with Option A regardless, is against the law and can warrant an unlimited fine and up to 6 months in prison. As at least 2 of the species I've provided have been documented living amongst the fields adjacent to Spennells (with evidence of the wildlife should you require it), I urge you to reconsider building sites to avoid breaking EU and wildlife law.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3</a>	Object	<p>Spennells fields should not be built on. It should become a SSSI as it is a habitat for nesting Skylarks which are in decline and I understand a protected species. Also home to Linnets, Owls and Sparrow Hawks. Any building would threaten the breeding of these birds and would threaten the existing right of way. It is an area of recreation where many people get back to nature by walking these fields.</p> <p>Development would impact severely on the already overcrowded school, health provision and existing retail car park provision.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5</a>	Object	Objects to development at Spennells Green Belt. Field is used for local crop growth. Questions where money is coming from to support capacity increases at hospital, schools, police, fire etc.
	<a href="#">LPPO8</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development on the Spennells Green Belt land at the end of Turnstone Road. There are ample brownfield sites which can be used within Kidderminster, before looking at ruining Green Belt land.</p> <p>Need to consider the impact on traffic, schools, infrastructure, good quality land, wildlife and the general fitness and</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			wellbeing of the local residents.
	<a href="#">LPP09</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient infrastructure in relation to roads, schools, sewerage system and local retail provision.</li> <li>• Development will have adverse impact on local global warming and pollution in general. More carbon dioxide will be produced with a loss of trees and green areas that produce oxygen.</li> <li>• House values on Spennells will decline</li> </ul> <p>Hopes new homes can be provided in several areas in the Wyre Forest and not just on the Spennells and particularly the Green Belt.</p> <p>Build more housing on brown field site like the old Glades site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP010</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crossing the road for school is already hazardous at Captains Pool Road / Heronswood Road / Turnstone Close. More homes would result in more traffic and a worse situation.</li> <li>• The fields at Spennells are home to wildlife including Skylarks which are a part of the Worcestershire Biodiversity act and require full protection of their habitat under farmland birds.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP011</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development on Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area is used for recreational walking and this interaction is vital for both building community spirit and offering a lifeline to those who do not normally see anyone to talk to.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion is already bad in rush hour. Adding more dwellings will exacerbate the situation</li> <li>• The fields are home to a multitude of wildlife</li> <li>• Development would join Spennells to Stanklyn Lane. These are two separate communities.</li> <li>• There is no space at the School for additional pupils</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO12</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development on the Spennells fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school is full</li> <li>• Roads on and off the estate, even with extra filter roads, would be congested.</li> <li>• The fields offer a wealth of natural habitat and wildlife.</li> <li>• The fields make Spennells a special place to live</li> </ul> <p>There are other areas in the District that should be built on regenerated. Exhaust all other areas first. There are areas of the town that are run down - don't spoil the most beautiful parts.</p> <p>The fields should remain as Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO13</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Spennells. It is an area of natural beauty and enjoyed by many people and dogs. Has lived on the estate since the 70s and it has grown enough. There are a lot of other sites which could be utilised before destroying countryside. The town centre should be redeveloped.</p> <p>I also understand WFDC are amongst the worst council's in England for selling off Green Belt areas. Don't let the ground be developed; it may make you a more popular council with your local people.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO14</a>	Object	<p>Development would have an adverse effect on wildlife and the local community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO16</a>	Object	<p>Objects to Option A - field off Stanklyn Lane and Stone Hill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links between the parish of Stone and the edge of Kidderminster do not need to be made stronger. This would increase traffic and pollution.</li> <li>• Stone is surrounded by beautiful green land.</li> <li>• Land at the rear of Spennells is used by local residents daily for walking and valuable family time outside.</li> <li>• School classes would become larger with more difficulty in getting first choice school.</li> </ul> <p>Building between two pools - Captains Pool and Stanklyn Pool is awful.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO17</a>	Object	Objects to change in the status of the Green Belt at Spennells. Uses land to walk everyday and has done for the last five years. It has a beautiful outlook already ruined by Easter Park, which has been mostly vacant since it was built. Green Belt land should stay Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO19</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposed housing development plans from Spennells to Stanklyn Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be detrimental to the local community as it will put even more strain on the road network and the overall infrastructure in general.</li> <li>• Traffic is already very congested at many times of the day both into and out of Kidderminster on the Bromsgrove Road as well as the Worcester Road not to mention reaching out beyond onto the A449. The thought of more access to homes driving more traffic is unbelievably short sighted. Is any form of traffic monitoring is undertaken on any of these roads at peak times to assess this clearly?</li> <li>• Have plans considered in any way the additional strain already on the provision of education and public services in the town or can we look forward to the redevelopment of Kidderminster General Hospital?</li> </ul> <p>This proposal has to be one of the worst this town (where I have lived all my life) council has yet proposed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO21</a>	Object	<p>I write in connection with the planning application for houses to be built on the Green Belt site Spennells. I have looked at the plans and know the site well.</p> <p>I wish to strongly OBJECT to the development of houses and industrial units on this site.</p> <p>Infilling will ruin the character of Spennells and estate development will overwhelm an already large estate.</p> <p>The siting of the development is particularly ill-considered: it's on a Green Belt site used by myself and many hundreds of people/ residents for dog walking, running, cycling, horse riding along the Public footpaths. It would diminish the striking countryside that is on our door step. Many residents who don't drive but have dogs are in walking distance of the fields and can walk their dogs in a beautiful SAFE environment.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There is no need for this kind of development on Spennells, the estate is big enough.</p> <p>There WILL be an issue of extra traffic on the estate, residential streets will bear the brunt of the traffic influx, and this will also cause more of a safety hazard to non car drivers. As Councils are under pressure to increase public transport and reduce the number of cars on the road the proposed site will definitely increase the amount of cars on an already busy estate. There WILL be an issue with the local school - Heronswood becoming over subscribed which will in turn affect our children's education. The local shop which is a nightmare at peak times WILL be affected as more people will try and shop there which WILL cause people to shop elsewhere as the store will no longer be a convenience store and in the long run trade will plummet.</p> <p>The proposed site will NOT increase industry and jobs in the area. The Easter Park industrial site still has empty units and there are empty units on Hoo Farm industrial estate. We have enough industrial sites in the local area including Wilden Lane. There are not enough jobs for the amount of residents in Kidderminster let alone introducing another few thousand houses bringing in new residents from outside the area.</p> <p>There are still residential units being built on the Silverwoods site, surely this is enough for the town. You must consider the adverse effect it will have on preserving the existing NATURAL environment. There is a massive amount of wildlife habitats, trees and woodland. The area is not WASTED space but valuable OPEN space enjoyed and used by not only residents on Spennells but residents from Offmore, Comberton and surrounding areas.</p> <p>I understand that this will be noted as an OBJECTION to the building on the Green Belt land of Spennells.</p> <p>Additional August 2017:</p> <p>We have a very high obesity population and taking away the Green Belt where people can walk, jog and bike ride in a safe environment is ludicrous.</p> <p>We will have the issue of raised noise pollution, traffic pollution and the destruction of wildlife. There is proof of Skylarks, bats, badgers in the fields behind Spennells all of these animals are endangered it doesn't matter that the builders/ councils say we will accommodate them it's rubbish - the wildlife will disappear, you are destroying their</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>homes.</p> <p>Kidderminster has a fairly low crime/drug rate. Bringing outsiders from Birmingham into Kidderminster will increase the crime rate and this in turn will affect our youth living in Kidderminster.</p> <p>There is evidence that large estates have increased crime/drug levels. Doubling the size of Spennells is outrageous and will in turn put even more pressure on a struggling police force.</p> <p>Building so many houses will in turn affect our schools which are already getting over subscribed. This will put a strain on our children's future and our local children are the future.</p> <p>Doctors / hospitals will not cope and they are not coping now, I do believe that Kidderminster, Worcester and Redditch are in special measures. How are you going to cope with that?</p> <p>I do believe that a report from Michael Gove about Brexit states that we need to produce our own fruit/ vegetables. How will we do that if you take away the thriving fields that we have? The fields at the back of Spennells have been full of barley!!!</p> <p>There are no big industries left in Kidderminster therefore jobs are hard to find, if you bring more people in to the town this will affect our growing youth as the outsiders will try and take the few jobs that there is.</p> <p>You talk about Birmingham residents commuting, I from experience can tell you now that this will not last, they will get fed up with travelling and they will want our jobs.</p> <p>Has the M.O.D site at Summerfield been approached - surely there is an exclusion zone there?</p> <p>Attempts to attract retailers to Kidderminster have failed in the past. We need to spend the money on regenerating the town first. For example the old Littlewoods site, Woolworths the Glades and many more empty buildings need</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>regenerating first.</p> <p>The consultation is flawed no evidence.</p> <p>Bringing H.G.VS near to houses is a danger. Health and safety issues - noise pollution, air pollution.</p> <p>I would like to know why there has been no consultation for Blakedown, Chaddesley or Wolverley.</p> <p>I totally object to both options A and B but prefer option B. Spennells fields should not be built on.</p> <p>I use the fields on Spennells everyday to exercise and walk my dog. It is a safe area for my children to walk, bike ride and get fresh air without having to bike ride on the already busy Spennells estate. I can let my children go out on to the fields knowing they are safe, you take this away you are taking away their freedom.</p> <p>Why are you getting rid of this beautiful Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO22</a>	Object	<p>I oppose and reject the proposed plans you have outlined to use Green Belt land at the rear of Spennells and Stanklyn to build a further 1700 residential homes.</p> <p>My reasons for this rejection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spennells is built up, and at peak times suffers traffic congestion, almost doubling the size of the estate will create chaos at peak times as the current layout of roads within Spennells will not be changed. A through road will not change the roads that are already congested on a daily basis. Adding to this it will create further congestion and increase air pollution as the amount of green space and trees would have been destroyed.</li> <li>2. Area is enjoyed by walkers, exercisers, birdwatchers &amp; nature photographers. The area attracts a wide variety of species and wildlife; Rare birds may nest within the area too. Destroying this Green Belt space will have a devastating affect on the community and the natural wildlife. We will never get this wildlife back once it is destroyed.</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>3. Green Belt land is in place to stop urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with. Look at using disused derelict buildings like those in park lane (by Matalan), old indoor market, old Woolworths and crown house. These are ripe for regeneration for low cost housing and should be regenerated before destroying Green Belt land.</p> <p>4. I cannot see justification in placing such a large proportion of the new homes required in this area alone and on this Green Belt land. Option B, is more evenly distributed throughout Kidderminster.</p> <p>Think of more than just cost. Think of impact on the environment, existing communities, natural habitats and infrastructures.</p> <p>5. Adding this number of houses in one area will put huge pressures on already overly subscribed services like local schools, Doctors, and hospitals. How will this be addressed if we are adding 1700 new homes in this one area alone?</p> <p>6. We don't seem to be able to fix pot holes properly as the funding is not available, clearly, more homes will equal more cars, more pot holes, pollution and congestion! Kidderminster is congested enough as it is, one through road will not solve this, destroying out Green Belt will not solve this.</p> <p>7.Look at all the empty derelict buildings first, regenerate buildings that are empty and vandalised, do not destroy what bits of beauty we have in this town left to enjoy. You have other options.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO24</a>	Object	Objects to development at Spennells/Stanklyn Lane:
	<a href="#">LPPO32</a>	Object	Objects to the building development plans over the fields near Stanklyn Lane and Spennells. Fields are used by many dog walkers and people who just want to go out and enjoy the scenery or go on bike rides. Please listen to these objections and do not go ahead with these plans.
	<a href="#">LPPO33</a>	Object	Objects to any planning for housing on Green Belt land at Spennells. Despite the road improvements on Worcester Road there are still extensive traffic jams at peak times, pressure would be placed on School services, and land valuable for drainage would be lost.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			There is no sensible place to build a road to exit the new development.
	<a href="#">LPPO34</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development on land to rear of Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt should be protected from development until all other possible sites available have been exhausted.</li> <li>• There would be a detrimental effect on wildlife.</li> <li>• It is a much valued site for local residents who use the footpath for exercise and socialising- much research has shown the positive impact of green open spaces and clean air in terms of physical and mental health and wellbeing.</li> <li>• Poor access at Turnstone Road - already has to accommodate road traffic from around 150 dwellings. Adding another 100 houses would potentially increase the amount of traffic by another 75% causing additional congestion, air and noise pollution. Would also impact on the already congested two roads in/out of the estate.</li> <li>• Concerns re new drainage for storm and sewerage. The field currently acts as a valuable soak away. Replacing this with large areas of hard standing will potentially cause serious problems with regard to flooding for homes adjacent to the area. Also concerned about increase in the amount of light pollution.</li> <li>• Development raises serious questions with regard to local infrastructure and services- schools and nursery provision, healthcare, and leisure services.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO41</a>	Object	Objects to development at Spennells. The field is good agricultural land. Also used regularly by walkers, joggers, horse riders and child cyclists. Field is also home to wildlife. Use brownfield sites and derelict buildings rather than taking away countryside and agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO42</a>	Object	<p>Concerned about development at Spennells for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of buffer to Easter Park</li> <li>• Effects on wildlife if habitat removed</li> <li>• Field is used for leisure by residents - walking</li> <li>• Development proposed will double the size of the estate</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spennells is a community with a sustainable mix of housing types and the residents are entitled to their share of green land</li> <li>Infrastructure would be necessary as existing facilities could not cope</li> <li>It would be better to create a smaller sub estate on the opposite side of Stanklyn Lane</li> </ul> <p>Smaller developments around the town of Kidderminster would share the load. This proposal is too much and too radical a change of use of farming land to be justified.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO46</a>	Object	<p>Object to the development at Spennells. Already enough houses in this area - infrastructure cannot cope. Leisure Centre is not easily accessible and the fields are used for valuable exercise and wellbeing.</p> <p>Once the Green Belt is taken it is gone forever. We are losing more and more farm land - the fields are used for farming purposes and are good quality land.</p> <p>There is a static population - the housing planned far outweighs the need.</p> <p>Land being 'banked' by developers should be used along with empty buildings.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO52</a>	Object	<p>It is not beneficial to build the majority of all the housing needed in one place, it will put too big a burden on our resources, we already have to get two buses to get to the leisure centre which was put out of town in the other direction, you then closed down the leisure centres in Stourport, now we have a big problem with parking and crowdedness at the new centre, AND YOU WANT TO ADD ANOTHER 5000 PEOPLE TO THIS EQUATION!! in your local review document you have stated that we are facing a health problem with 27.7 % of the adult population being obese and a massive 35.7% of under 6 year olds being obese, we have come in at practically the <b>worse levels in England</b>, and you want to take away the open spaces that these people use and replace with paths</p> <p>I see that Wyre Forest comes in the bottom 10 of the worst councils that land grab Green Belt according to the Campaign to Protect Rural England.</p> <p>Spennells is a really nice place to live and that is BECAUSE it is surrounded by fields and green spaces, I use the fields</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>for my <b>general health and mental well being</b> to take this away from me and everyone else will have a huge detrimental effect on the community.</p> <p>The only people benefiting are the developers and the council as I note that you are getting a £9000 per unit incentive to build from central government.</p> <p>Our local NHS is failing before adding another 5000 people to the area Not to mention diminishing ambulance cover; It is already difficult to get an appointment with your GP now.</p> <p>It has been proved that adding new roads actually does not alter traffic flow and any new road will congest just the same, new by-roads just start to feed off it and then we are living in a spaghetti junction road network.</p> <p>Fast forward 50 years..... All new residents now elderly..... How do we support their ever increasing needs on top of the increasing aging population generally! And that's before we even consider the impact on drainage, resources and local wildlife. What about OUR quality of life!!!</p> <p>The new "affordable housing" will bring in a huge housing benefit bill for you in the future as rented houses attract this element of society.</p> <p>I was under the impression that Wyre Forest has signed up to a carbon emissions programme? This huge development goes way beyond any health foot print we should be trying to make! More cars more fumes. I suffer with asthma so what is the air quality going to be like on Spennells with the MASSIVE build you intend to push on to us ? Does MY quality of life mean nothing?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3503</a>	Object	I have grave concerns about the potential loss of Green Belt land behind Spennells estate. There is a lack of infrastructure to cope with the increased population. Corn buntings, a protected species, nest in the fields adjacent to Stanklyn Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO55</a>	Object	Objects to development at Spennells. Brownfield sites should be used and empty / derelict buildings.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Reasons for opposing Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too much traffic congestion already</li> <li>• Traffic will cause air pollution</li> <li>• Noise pollution</li> <li>• Wildlife will be affected</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO57</a>	Object	I wish to register my strong opposition to using Green Belt land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane for new housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO58</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to fervently oppose option A. My reasons for doing so are as follows;</p> <p>As a resident of Spennells I am aware just how much recreational use the fields provide; joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, bird watchers, cyclists, photographers, elderly people who enjoy the company of people walking there and I feel that the fields have been vital for me to exercise daily. During my time walking the fields I have met an elderly gentleman with an oxygen tank and a woman recovering from a heart attack who uses the field to ease herself back into exercise. I want my child to appreciate how food is grown and be able to go for a walk without the need of a car. If option A goes ahead the South side of Kidderminster will be hit unnecessarily hard it is for this reason I think Option B is preferable.</p> <p>I fail to see how the local infrastructure can sustain the amount of houses proposed! The closure of Glades Leisure centre and a smaller Leisure centre out of the town centre is evidence enough that the town fails to accommodate the existing residents let alone any additional people! Lack of jobs means that new residents of Kidderminster will be commuting to work which not only increases emissions; it fails to boost the local economy. Kidderminster hospital cannot accommodate a birthing suite - with residents of Kidderminster having to travel to Worcester to give birth. Unless plans to re-extend the hospital are in the pipeline I do not see how Kidderminster can sustain any more housing!</p> <p>In order to meet housing targets I appreciate housing needs to be built, I feel that there are plenty of brownfield</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>sites that could be used in preference - for instance in the centre of town! I appreciate this is more costly to the local council but we really do have to protect the Green Belt at all cost, with rising obesity levels, reduction in emissions and reduction in food miles being the governments prerogative I don't see how you can justify building on green and with so many brownfield sites available.</p> <p>In conclusion, I appreciate the local council have targets they need to meet and costs to keep down but this is grade 2 agricultural land, the best quality land Wyre Forest has to offer, the fields are a recreational resource are invaluable means that I strongly oppose option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO60</a>	Object	<p>One of the main reasons we moved to Spennells was due to its beautiful countryside surroundings, as well as the town being close by. We were absolutely horrified when we heard the plans may be brought forward to build houses on the GREEN BELT land directly behind the Spennells which lies at the end of Turnstone and Imber road and other surrounding fields. Not to mention the by-pass!!</p> <p>Spinals, with 2000 homes, is already a very large estate, with only two exits onto Spinals Valley Road, more houses on the beautiful Green Belt fields will put more pressure on our already full schools and nurseries, this will have a major impact on class sizes and our children's education.</p> <p>Extra buses and traffic will cause a safety issue for children in the area; parents are encouraged to let their children play out, how can they when they know their child could be in danger by the ever increasing traffic!!</p> <p>It can already take 30 - 40 mins to leave the estate some mornings, as only two exits onto Spennells Valley Road. Extra traffic and congestion would have a massive impact on everyone; working people would move away and make the area less desirable.</p> <p>The impact on the drainage as the fields are a valuable soak away. Our hospitals are also at breaking point, unable to provide the care for needed.</p> <p>Valuable agricultural land that would be taken away, destroying the beautiful landscape, but most importantly our local wildlife habitats will be destroyed as well... badger sets, skylarks and bats and many more animals live on these</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>fields, what will happen to these animals?</p> <p>I understood that WFDC cared about the Green Belt country side, if you are prepared to rip up our Green Belt, then you have no feelings for the wildlife, people's welfare, health or feelings.</p> <p>The impact would be unforgivable considering there are other areas in Kidderminster which are not Green Belt, which houses could be built on.</p> <p>Many people use the fields, walk their dogs, social interaction and for exercise. We should encourage people to be living this kind of life style, bearing in mind loneliness; depression/anxiety and obesity are on the increase in Great Britain. What about the increase of air pollution, due to so many houses being built in one area.</p> <p>If I have to choose an option for the proposal, then please choose option B, please do not destroy our areas of natural beauty that our neighbours and residents love so much.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO62</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the possible removal of Green Belt status to land at the back of Spennells Estate.</p> <p>The fields are a well used community asset with walkers, dog walkers and cyclists, an amenity which can only be a benefit for physical and mental health of all who use it. That includes families, people of all generations and people of varying physical ability.</p> <p>These fields also provide an easily accessible opportunity to get an appreciative sense of nature and wild life. A fantastic amenity particularly for children. From being able to watch the crops grow from seed, to seeing a vast variety of wild flowers, birds, butterflies and insects.</p> <p>Access to Spennells is already at certain times very congested. There is no other viable access to those fields so the congestion and therefore pollution would increase.</p> <p>As I understand it there are options to develop ONLY next to Spennells, or to spread the developments across</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Kidderminster. I urge you NOT to remove such a valuable amenity that is close to so many people, and spread the new housing across the town.
	<a href="#">LPPO63</a>	Object	<p>I would hereby like to register my objections to the above proposed plans. There are numerous reasons why I wish to object.</p> <p>1 The area already lost a lot of wild life habitat in the building of the present Spennells Est. Trees destroyed that were supposed to be protected, replaced by new trees but which take years to mature if they can survive the vandalism. Going ahead with this plan will mean a loss of a lot more wild life including wild flowers which support insects, that support the numerous wild birds that currently nest in the area plus all the birds that regularly visit in the summer. From common Sparrows, Crows and Blackbirds to skylark, pheasant, partridge, flocks of what I am told are corn bunting. Currently there are lots of Swifts/Sand Martins or similar catching insects on the wing. We hear the Cuckoo and every Spring and Autumn the Geese collect to feed on seeds. A Buzzard too. There is a Badger Set, and we have watched a Vixen playing with her litter of cubs. Plus other creatures that live underground like rabbits, voles, field mice and moles. All part of the wild life food chain.</p> <p>2 Then there is the infrastructure.</p> <p>Spennells School which is already struggling to cope with the numbers after closure of several schools. King Charles 1 School which also struggles to cope with the numbers.</p> <p>Hospital which can barely cope with the current number of patients.</p> <p>Doctors which we already have to wait up to a fortnight to see.</p> <p>Roads. Traffic queues off both ways out of Spennells, the Worcester Road, Bromsgrove Road, Wilden Lane. All made even worse by the new Stourport bypass which will be even worse still once all the properties are occupied on the Sugar Beet Site.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Neither Stanklyn Lane nor the Spennells Est. roads are fit to cope with the heavy building site traffic.</p> <p>Bus Service - what can I say?</p> <p>Why take farm land when there are so many derelict and unused places?</p> <p>Where are all these people going to work? The biggest employers, Carpets, Sugar Beet, Cattle Market, Sealine, Ceramaspeed, everything Kidderminster was famous for all gone. I suspect most will have to travel elsewhere to work. More traffic and pollution and longer queues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP065</a>	Object	<p>Please register my objection to the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposal for such a huge development will be detrimental to the locality, in terms of loss of Green Belt land, subsequent loss of wildlife habitat and a valuable outdoor amenity to local people.</p> <p>It will create an increase in traffic and pollution, on already congested and damaged roads. It will put further strain on local schools, and especially on local hospitals, already in special measures, and struggling to cope with the present population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP067</a>	Object	<p>I wish to express in the strongest possible terms my objections to the proposed/ requested development of the Green Belt land stretching between the A449 and A448:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an area of significant designated RSPB importance with an abundance of species infrequent elsewhere, including a healthy population of Bramblings and Skylarks, which are rapidly depleting nationwide, and a number of birds of prey. The development will also impact on the wildfowl population on Captain's Pool which currently includes Kingfisher, Grebe, Heron, Wild Swans and more</li> <li>• These fields also boast a diverse population of mammals including Monk jack deer, badgers, stoats, voles, shrews and wood mice</li> <li>• The area is used to the full by dog walkers, ramblers and lovers of wildlife and birds. It is an area providing physical and mental well being for many people and wildlife alike</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are many other Brownfield sites in the Kidderminster/ Stourport area that could be developed instead</li> <li>To develop for the few would be to deprive the many of this beautiful, precious English countryside.</li> </ul> <p>Please <b>DO NOT</b> allow this to go ahead and deprive humans and animals alike of this precious and irreplaceable environment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO68</a>	Object	<p>I formally object to the proposal to build on Green Belt land on the southern edge of Spennells or on any of the Green Belt land in Kidderminster.</p> <p>I moved to Kidderminster purely to live close to fields only to find they might be taken away. By walking my dogs in the fields I now have many friends.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I use the Green Belt areas for regular exercise for me and my dogs - morning and evening around work. This greatly aids my mental health and well being. Where would I be able to walk and exercise two border collies safely if you took this land away? I do not have room in my car for them both and surely we should not be encouraging more people to use cars to drive to places to exercise - this defeats the object of reducing pollution etc? Where would all the Spennells residents drive their dogs and children to do this??? The nature reserve isn't big enough.</li> <li>2. I often see families and children alone exercising in the Spennells Green Belt area. Taking this away would mean that they would remain indoors. It is fantastic to see groups of children cycling and exploring around the fields - a safe environment. Please do not take this away from them.</li> <li>3. There are bats and this needs to be explored as they are a protected species - before any decisions are made. <a href="http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/planning.html">http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/planning.html</a>. Residents will need to see evidence that the surveys have taken place. I often walk at night and there are many bats.</li> <li>4. There are skylarks, yellowhammers and linnets and other red listed birds in the fields. The RSPB certainly need to be consulted in the development plans due to the high number of skylarks in the fields at the moment and the impact on them.</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>5. Have the butterfly conservation been informed as <a href="http://butterfly-conservation.org/3263-8480/walking-with-butterflies-in-the-wyre.html">http://butterfly-conservation.org/3263-8480/walking-with-butterflies-in-the-wyre.html</a> "A three year project funded by the <a href="#">SITA Trust</a> to reconnect the Wyre has successfully restored areas of coppice to provide habitat for the nationally scarce <a href="#">Pearl-bordered Fritillary butterfly</a>. It has also improved connectivity across the Forest to increase the chances of butterflies and moths colonising new areas in the future." Species have been seen in the fields in the Spennells and this needs to be researched before any decisions are reached. Residents will need to see evidence that the necessary surveys have taken place as species have obviously made their way from the Forest to the Nature Reserve/Spennells.</p> <p>6. There are areas in Kidderminster town centre that are not Green Belt that you could build on notably right near to the train station which would appease everybody. A far more suitable area for new build.</p> <p>If all of these factors are ignored I will certainly be taking these protests to a higher level.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP069</a>	Object	I would like to file my objection to the Housing development on the back of Spennells. There's so much nature that will be destroyed. The development will have a massive impact on the environment
	<a href="#">LPP070</a>	Object	I object to the planning of a new housing estate in the fields at the back of the Spennells estate in Kidderminster We have lived on Spennells for 21 years and love the views and enjoy the natural walks the fields offer the estate We strongly object to the plans and would expect to be in the majority I hope the strong feelings felt by all that reside on the estate put a stop to plans that would destroy the obvious benefits the fields have provided residents for many years
	<a href="#">LPP072</a>	Object	<p>I must fervently object to the council's proposal to build new homes on the Green Belt land to the south of Spennells.</p> <p>The area is naturally beautiful and used by hundreds of people including myself each day as a perfect and safe area to walk our dogs. Destroying this area will damage local habitat and increase noise and pollution.</p> <p>Please do not build on this land!</p>
	<a href="#">LPP073</a>	Object	Proposed option A building of housing on Green Belt land adjacent to Spennells, I believe would be a disaster for the

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>local community and wildlife.</p> <p>Firstly, the Green Belt land in question produces a variety of good, healthy crops year after year.</p> <p>Secondly, many residents and Kidderminster people use the fields for leisure activities including walking, running and cycling and gives children especially an education of the countryside in different seasons.</p> <p>Thirdly, the impact on wildlife would be terrible as many birds currently nest and feed in the area and would therefore vanish from our skies and gardens forever.</p> <p>I am therefore totally opposed to this option and believe various run down land areas and brown field sites should be built upon as a priority.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO74</a>	Object	<p>I have reviewed the draft plan and wish to lodge my objection in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>A brief overview of my objections are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development will rob residents of the fields and open space which the local community currently enjoy to walk, jog, cycle, dog walk etc and would have detrimental effect to the general health and wellbeing of the community.</li> <li>• This proposal is damaging to the environment</li> <li>• The area doesn't have the infrastructure to support such a development and will lead to traffic congestion and pollution on our already congested roads.</li> <li>• Given the alternative options currently available in the town centre which would reduce traffic/pollution, these other options should be pursued.</li> <li>• This development will put unnecessary pressures on the schools, hospitals, and other facilities which are already under pressure.</li> <li>• The loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl will threaten existing public Rights of Way</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal will cause destruction of the wildlife habitat of the area.</li> </ul> <p>Please confirm my objections have been lodged with the appropriate body and will be taken into consideration.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO75</a>	Object	Objects to development on Green Belt at Spennells. The land is used by residents for safe recreational walking. The roads around the estate are congested both in the early morning and in the evening without adding more traffic.
	<a href="#">LPPO76</a>	Object	<p>I oppose the proposed development of Green Belt land on Spennells fields near Stanklyn lane. Any proposals to build on the land would have a detrimental affect on the local area.</p> <p>The roads around Stanklyn lane and Spennells are already congested and unable to cope with the current amount of traffic. Further housing would exacerbate the problem, adding more pressure to Stanklyn lane and its two major junctions. These are already hazardous to turn left from and pose more danger with busier roads.</p> <p>The fields are a valuable asset to the local area with much wildlife living there. There are currently skylarks, linnets and other red-created birds nesting in the vegetations.</p> <p>The fields are a good flood plain for soaking away surface water. In heavy rain our drive and road can flood and this would be made worse by the removal of the field. Local residents use them for walking and dog exercise. They are vital for community spirit. Green Belt is much valued especially around a busy town such as Kidderminster and its housing estate. Loss of Green Belt status protects our countryside from urban sprawl.</p> <p>Local schools are already over subscribed; additional residents would put more pressure on these local services, and increasing pressure on our hospitals, doctors, dentists etc. The bridge at the top end of Stanklyn lane is very narrow and there have already been accidents there. It would not be suitable for HGV vehicles and extra traffic adding more danger to the situation.</p> <p>Stanklyn lane is only 30 mph at the end on which we live and yet we get cars already using it as a cut through to avoid gridlocked roads of the a449 and stone hill. They must be travelling at over 60mph causing a danger to residents as the try to get off drives, cross the road etc. Adding more traffic again would aggregate this problem.</p> <p>There is no need for more housing in the Stanklyn lane area. There are lots of local affordable housing that remains unsold.</p> <p>The fields are currently farmed and well Used. Why use good quality, productive agricultural land? Why use another area of Green Belt when it is unnecessary. Housing would totally spoil the character of the local area and feel of Stanklyn lane. People from all over Kidderminster use these fields to walk dogs, ride and let their children play safely. Please don't remove them.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			Please note my objections and do not allow the building of 1,735 new homes of option A of the plan. Instead they could be placed more in the town centre thus reducing commuting and pollution. We urge the government to build on the brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO77</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed development of Green Belt land on Spennells. Any proposals to build on the land would have a detrimental affect on the local area.</p> <p>The roads around Stanklyn lane and Spennells are already congested and unable to cope with the current amount of traffic. Further housing would only exasperate the problem, adding more pressure to Stanklyn lane and its two major junctions. These are already hazardous to turn left from and pose more danger with busier roads.</p> <p>The fields are a valuable asset to the local area with much wildlife living there. There are currently skylarks, linnets and other red-created birds nesting in the vegetations.</p> <p>The fields are also a good flood plain for soaking away surface water. In heavy rain our drive and road can flood and this would be made worse by the removal of the field. Local residents use them for walking and dog exercise. They are vital for community spirit. Green Belt is much valued especially around a busy town such as Kidderminster and its housing estate. Loss of Green Belt status protects our countryside from urban sprawl.</p> <p>Local schools are already over subscribed; additional residents would put more pressure on these local services and increasing pressures on hospitals, doctors, dentists etc.</p> <p>The bridge at the top end of Stanklyn lane is very narrow and there have already been accidents there. It would not be suitable for HGV vehicles and extra traffic adding more danger to the situation.</p> <p>Stanklyn lane is only 30 mph at one end and yet we get cars already using it as a cut through to avoid gridlocked roads of the A449 Stone hill. They must be travelling at over 60mph causing a danger to residents as the try to get off drives, cross the road etc. Adding more traffic again would aggravate this problem.</p> <p>There is no need for more housing in the Stanklyn lane area. There are lots of local affordable housing that remain unsold.</p> <p>The fields are currently farmed and well used. Why use good quality, productive agricultural land? Why use Green Belt when it is unnecessary. Housing would totally spoil the character of the local area and feel of Stanklyn lane.</p> <p>People travel from all over Kidderminster to these fields to walk dogs, ride and let their children play safely. Please</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>don't remove them.</p> <p>Please note my objections and do not allow the building of 1,735 new homes of option A of the plan. Instead they could be placed more in the town centre thus reducing commuting and pollution. We urge the government to build on the brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP078</a>	Object	<p>I object strongly to any further enlargement of Spennells area for further housing for the following reasons:</p> <p>The new road from Stourport Road has caused severe traffic problems at busy times of the day! It has caused even more traffic along Spennells Valley Road and it is almost impossible to get off Spennells Estate in the morning, with people going to work and children being dropped off at school. Sometimes the jam is right back along Heronswood Road as far as the school! There is going to be a bad accident there one day as people take chances to turn right at the T Junction. A set of traffic lights is badly needed here.</p> <p>Secondly, this new road has badly affected the main road from Worcester and also Wilden Lane. Up to four mile traffic jams of an evening can be as far back as Ombersley trying to get round the island at Hoobrook. Further traffic from building more houses off this road will make the situation even worse. This increased traffic will result in even more higher emissions of exhaust fumes from stationary vehicles with resulting increased risk to health.</p> <p>This Green Belt land is greatly valued by local residents and lots of people use this land for walking, jogging, cycling and dog walking. It is a safe environment to walk children without having to cross any roads and is also a haven for local wildlife.</p> <p>This would also put a strain on our local schools that already seem to be underfunded and always asking parents for money. The classroom sizes are already big enough.</p> <p>There are lots of green spaces around Kidderminster where the building of new homes would not be detrimental to present residents. In particular, Lee Castle is a vast green space crying out for something to be done with it. It would require no new road layouts. There is already a road onto this development and easy access via traffic lights onto the main Wolverhampton Road and Stourbridge Road. There is also lots of space around this area for further expansion if needed for a new school, local shops, etc. This side of Kidderminster does not have the same traffic</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>problems as the Worcester/Bromsgrove side.</p> <p>Further housing could be distributed on brownfield sites within Kidderminster that would enable run down areas to be spruced up. The Horsefair particularly springs to mind. This area is a terrible eyesore and an embarrassment. It needs to be flattened and could be used for further housing. The present shops should be encouraged to move to the many empty units in the town centre.</p> <p>Spread housing evenly around the area, taking traffic and the local environment into consideration. Don't bring one particular area to its knees!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO79</a>	Object	I object to the development of the whole area of Option A. The wildlife will lose their habitat and there will be a negative impact on local schools and roads. Please reconsider this proposal.
	<a href="#">LPPO80</a>	Object	Object to development at Spennells. The fields are used by many for safe recreational walking, jogging and dog walking. Development would mean detrimental effect on wildlife and loss of agricultural farmland. Development should be on brownfield sites not Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO82</a>	Object	<p>There needs to be massive consideration given to the detrimental impact upon the local area that the proposed development of Spennells Field would have.</p> <p>Currently, Spennells is a great place to live, with just the right level of amenities. More homes would stretch these facilities! The car park facilities around Tesco express etc are often full, but manageable. More residents will see this overflow - something that we often experience when the school is used as a polling station... cars overhanging junctions, parked in the bus stop, parked on the main road and most importantly making it difficult for adults and children to cross the road safely.</p> <p>Currently, we have good schools which are full. Where will the new residents sent their children? THERE ARE NOT SURPLUS PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES IN THE AREA! The government cannot afford to build a new school. Equally, no school can afford to expand on its own. Secondary schools will fill locally, not least as Hagley has experienced huge developments too. The Hagley developments will see school children from Kidderminster no longer able to get places at this school.</p> <p>The local roads... where do I start! Access in to Kidderminster is a joke! I queue every evening to get home from work. I often travel excess miles to avoid Mustow Green island or the dreaded A449. This adds to my carbon</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>footprint and given the extra cars that the additional houses will bring will further be detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>Concern for the mental health of locals. I am not sure I'm prepared to put up with the impact of such development on my own doorstep. Disruption and noise whilst the development is completed and then the loss of recreational land.</p> <p>I really do urge you to re-consider this poor proposal!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO83</a>	Object	<p>May I lodge my objection to the proposed plans to build on the southern side of Spennells although I agree Kidderminster has to expand, as do all UK towns, this development as a whole seems far too ambitious and I hope a more modest proposal can be put forward.</p> <p>The fields bring a lot of enjoyment to the community and to lose them all in one go would be huge loss not to mention the environmental impact.</p> <p>We hope you come to the right conclusion, many thanks for your time.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO84</a>	Object	As a resident of Spennells I wish to object against further expansion of the estate.
	<a href="#">LPPO85</a>	Object	<p>This is a formal objection to the proposed development to the Green Belt area bordering the existing Spennells Valley housing estate part of option A.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the impact upon existing local amenities servicing this area, including schools and retail facilities as well as residents.</p> <p>Spennells is serviced locally by one primary school and a small complex of convenience outlets. Additional properties will add to the amount of traffic entering the centre of an already busy estate increasing the amount of vehicles and therefore pollution (impacting upon health of local residents) and congestion through the existing estate as well as the demands placed upon valuable services such as schooling. I would be grateful if you would clarify the local authority's stance on children being able to walk to school and whether if insufficient provision of local education facility within realistic walking distance from a family home sits in line with the local authority's core values and</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>principles.</p> <p>I note reference to an additional access point to the proposed development area. I believe that as a desk exercise this would satisfy current legislative requirements, however, I believe in reality that at peak traffic commute times the existing infrastructure of the Spennells Estate would be used as a 'rat run' for commuters wanting a short cut from the Worcester side of Kidderminster looking to access the town centre or Birmingham trunk roads. An expectation that commuters will happily sit in traffic at peak times and not be tempted to cut through a 'quiet' estate is completely unrealistic.</p> <p>This area is a well used and valuable, green natural recreational space which is well used by many local residents including myself and my family in an otherwise urban environment.</p> <p>I am disappointed by the local authorities approach to provision of homes which appears to be to take the easy option of building on valuable green space rather than utilising existing sites of brownfield and ex-commercial premises in order to meet the demand. I would formally request a detailed housing need analysis for the Spennells Valley estate area.</p> <p>I note that the more affluent Stanklyn Lane is proposed to be somewhat distanced and shielded from the proposed development area. I feel this purely creates a further divide between a relatively close lying community and certainly does not promote an ethos of building coherent and sustainable communities.</p> <p>I look forward to your reply to the above raised points.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO86</a>	Object	Strongly opposes the development of these fields at Spennells
	<a href="#">LPPO87</a>	Object	<p>We would like to protest in the strongest possible terms against the proposed development along the southern edges of Spennells.</p> <p>We object for many reasons , the main one being that there are many brown sites currently available including unused school sites such and Sion Hill and Sladen as well as many unused industrial sites . The proposed</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			development would mean loss of amenity, loss of farmland and the loss of valuable habitats for many creatures including endangered bird species. Local infrastructure would be unable to support such a development creating additional pressure on roads, schools and medical services which are already struggling to cope. Green Belt was created to prevent all these problems - what is the point of having it if it can be disregarded in such a cavalier fashion -it would be much more sensible to look for other sites already within the urban zone first.
	<a href="#">LPP088</a>	Object	<p>I am responding to your proposal to expand Spennells Green Belt land in Kidderminster to build 1735 homes and I understand that Persimmon Homes have already purchased the land.</p> <p>I think it is vital that we have new homes in Kidderminster, especially homes that are affordable for young people like my own children. My objection to the proposed Green Belt solution is;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kidderminster is already infamous for closed shops and buildings that are eyesores. Much of the old town would benefit from regeneration it seems a waste of naturally beautiful land that surrounds Kidderminster to be used up unnecessarily. Demolished Leisure centre land, old Woolworths, Crown House and many streets that are abandoned and would make excellent modern housing. This is a common dilemma that is easy to solve - regeneration not Green Belt destruction.</li> </ul> <p>Other reasons that are pertinent in just this case are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Double the traffic at already key bottle neck points by Homebase and junctions off Stanklyn Lane.</li> <li>Impact on wildlife and widely used public paths and rights of way.</li> <li>Safety of young children on an already busy estate.</li> <li>Spaces in schools.</li> <li>Drainage to existing and new homes.</li> <li>Local service provision like Kidderminster Hospital.</li> <li>Loss of productive land.</li> </ul> <p>I do hope that this not already a "done deal" and you will genuinely consult and review.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO89</a>	Object	<p>I strongly protest against the expansion in the fields adjacent to Spennells estate.</p> <p>The new bypass road is under used, no real definition between Kidderminster and Stourport. Housing next to the sports centre will make this even worse. I do not want to see the same between Stone and Kidderminster. No need for a bypass from the Worcester road. New road is currently used as a bypass and is not busy even in peak time. Traffic needing to bypass to Stourbridge already goes through Mustow Green, they will not travel nearer to Worcester to use the bypass. Introduction of a bypass will increase air pollution.</p> <p>Council do a very poor job of maintaining the common areas of common land within Spennells. The council seems intent of culturing nettles and even Japanese Knotweed on the estate, with the traffic pollution the air quality here is be significantly reduced.</p> <p>Derelict factory buildings in the town near Morrison's, near Matalan and Sion Hill School to name a few are embarrassing. The old post office is an eyesore and should be redeveloped.</p> <p>Affect the recession of 2008 the towns of Welshpool and Stafford were hit hard losing industry and started to decline similar to Kidderminster is now. Welshpool seems to have done little and the town is dead. Stafford invested and is a thriving cosmopolitan town busy even on a Sunday with Cafes and coffee shops spilling onto the streets. If you do not invest in the town, it will continue to die.</p> <p>No investment in industry and no jobs will see an increased rise in unemployment. No one will want to come and live in your new houses. People with jobs will leave. Invest in the town, and its jobs.</p> <p>Worry about housing if the population increase does arise and please cut down all the nettles on Spennells.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO90</a>	Object	<p>I object to option A of your new local plan review.</p> <p>I am 25 years of age and therefore the "next generation"! This is my heritage you are destroying! I very much still enjoy going into the country side which is on my doorstep at present and is GREEN BELT! I need this for my well</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>being and good mental health, being hemmed in the middle of a giant housing estate will depress me.</p> <p>MANY different animals and birds thrive on this piece of land, with evidence of otters on the fields by Captain's pool, we have three nesting sites for bats in the trees surrounding the fields and also there are many red listed birds such as skylarks, linnets and corn-bunting nesting and feeding on these fields.</p> <p>With the future of fossil fuel uncertain I believe that there will come a time when importing food and travel abroad will become extremely expensive, After all, at current rates of production, oil will run out in <b>53 years</b>, natural gas in 54, and coal in 110. Getting rid of fields that are used year in and out to grow crops in is nothing short of stupid! There will come a time in England when we will need these fields to grow food for our population , you only have to cast your mind back to the 1940s when people had to use their back gardens and parks to grow food.</p> <p>To put the WHOLE of the build on one side of town is in my opinion unworkable, you are going to put for too much pressure on the schools and the road systems already in place, a relief road will not take away the congestion in traffic on the smaller roads around Spennells, nearly doubling the amount of houses here will cause chaos! With each house comes at least two cars, it doesn't take a genius to realise how bad the pollution and congestion will be, and all in one area!!</p> <p>To get an appointment with our doctors at present is a nightmare, 1735 houses in one area will push this to extremes.</p> <p>I am aware that a large building company has already purchased one of the fields, how did they know that this was coming! I am aware many people around Spennells have already objected and I hope this will have an impact upon your proposals. Everyone I speak to does not want this build to happen, the very reason the people live on the Spennells estate is that we are not joined to Kidderminster and enjoy the openness of the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO91</a>	Object	<p>Object to the plan of building on the fields. Children walk here &amp; take the dogs. They love the nature what a shame to take that all away from them. You encourage parents to get our kids out into the countryside &amp; now you're taking that away from them.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO92</a>	Object	<p>Proposed development in Green Belt around Stanklyn Lane and Spennells would destroy the only spot in Kidderminster where Green Belt is available for leisure, exercise, dog walking etc. This is also one of the rare places nowadays where that amenity is available to all via a walk, not by car. What is wrong with brown sites (eyesores) within the Kidderminster area that no longer serve any useful purpose as the employers have now gone. What also of Lea Castle site! What about sites of Schools that you have already shut down.</p> <p>As soon as you start releasing Green Belt, where do you stop, do you want to live in a Brierley Hill lookalike? Where are these people are supposed to work, or visit the dentist, doctor, Hospital (already deemed to be totally inadequate in official survey) Where will the kids go to school, presumably far enough away to bring hundreds more cars on to the already crowded roads around the town, more POLLUTION to live with.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO93</a>	Object	<p>We moved to Spennells specifically for the enjoyment of the surrounding open spaces, green fields, wild life and tranquillity.</p> <p>We are very concerned to learn of the proposed development / Local Plan Review which is currently out for consultation.</p> <p>We are, in principle, opposed to both Options A and B, but in our opinion <b>Option B would be the preferred option.</b></p> <p>We summarise below our reasons for this preference and general concerns about the prospect of housing development in Wyre Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current trends indicate that there is little chance of employment development in Kidderminster itself or the surrounding environs. Many jobs are due for imminent loss in the carpet industry and retail opportunities diminish daily with the closures of shops and retail outlets.</li> <li>• This will almost inevitably result in Kidderminster becoming a commuter town. At the moment, most people who live in the town work fairly locally, unlike those in Bromsgrove, Worcester and other significant towns.</li> <li>• The implications for traffic movement are enormous. One has only to see the queues of traffic at Mustow Green to envisage the consequences of additional commuting. Other major routes and junctions are also hideously congested. Measures to improve the infrastructure of roads and traffic flow seem akin to moving the deckchairs on the Titanic - for example, the junction of the new road from Worcester Road through to Stourport Road is controlled by traffic lights. These result in queues back across the island at Hoobrook which cause all manner of problems.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is arguable whether people who commute to work invest a real commitment to the community of a town. Redditch is a soul-less collection of houses; Bromsgrove is rapidly following with the latest overdevelopment. Kidderminster is still quite a busy, thriving town for shopping and there is a real sense of community among its residents.</li> <li>• I am a former Head teacher and I am painfully aware of the impact of the influx of people on the stability and success of schools. Schools become overcrowded and oversubscribed. Schools serving new build areas - even new ones - bear the brunt of mobility and funding issues.</li> <li>• Health provision in the area is currently precarious with the Worcestershire Trust in Special Measures and having an uncertain future. Primary care is of a high quality compared with other areas, but is struggling to maintain its service with the shortage of GPs and the increasing demands.</li> </ul> <p>We hope that the above will be taken into serious consideration. This project is not solely about housing. It is about the quality of life, health, well being and education of the current and future residents of Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP094</a>	Object	<p>I would like to register my objection to the Spennells Expansion plans on the ground that the new development lead to the loss of Green Belt which protects our countryside and have significant consequences on the wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Alternatively, the council can build on the Brownfield sites within Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP096</a>	Object	<p>The main reason we moved to Kidderminster was the location of the Spennells estate a "rural" setting in a town surrounded by open countryside.</p> <p>The open countryside we overlook from the rear of our house is why we are still in the same house 38 years later. This open countryside at the back of our house is now under severe threat due to proposed building work on Green Belt land along Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>I know that you have been informed of countless reasons why this land should remain as Green Belt land and I wholeheartedly support and agree with every reason put forward.</p> <p>My opposition to the proposed building work is simple; I love where I live because of the proximity of the fields off Stanklyn Lane. Fields that I use for recreation and also fields my 4 year old grandson loves to watch though our</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>bedroom window as the tractors go up and down ploughing and harvesting.</p> <p>Easier to rip up more of our glorious countryside instead of redeveloping disused areas within the existing boundary of the town. Green Belt land is being devoured all too frequently and is being lost forever to wildlife, farming and places of enjoyment for many.</p> <p>We have to preserve our precious countryside and that is why I ask you, the Planning Committee, to seriously consider what you as individuals will be destroying for ever by allowing building to take place on the Green Belt adjacent to Spennells.</p> <p>Please, do the right thing and keep the countryside for everyone.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP097</a>	Object	<p>The council should respect that principle without which we would have urban sprawl. Exactly what would be created by the doubling in size of the Spennells estate?</p> <p>The Green Belt is mostly agricultural, the rest wild parts for us to come close to nature important for all but especially the children.</p> <p>Regenerate Kidderminster build homes within the town. Build in as many Brownfield areas as you can to spread the load on the infrastructure roads, hospitals, schools, Doctors which can hardly cope now.</p> <p>Spennells Road, Mustow Green and the viaduct roundabout are already blocked solid at rush hour, 2000 plus extra people making their way onto Kidderminster and Birmingham would do nothing for the problem and create a lot of pollution.</p> <p>The fields in question are important for crops, provide over wintering for birds, skylarks nest there because the grass is not cut until later in the season giving time for the young to fledge this is a species already in trouble around the country. There is something magical standing in the field and hearing the whistle of the train, passengers view is much better looking onto fields and crops and not the rear of people's homes.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Where will all the water go from the roads and houses will someone down the line pay the price and be flooded? Runners, walkers, kids, dogs and their owners all get fresh air, fitness and exercise from the fields, meet and pass the time of day chatting, all good therapy for the stressed, bothered, old and lonely.</p> <p>Plan A is my main concern, Green Belt land was created to stop urban sprawl and protect our countryside and you appear to be ignoring this fact in Plan A by doubling the size of Spennells Estate.</p> <p>Congestion and pollution caused by another 2000 families going to and from work and all emanating from the same area.</p> <p>Brownfield is better but could cause some local problems. More consultation on whichever plan is agreed would be good or a referendum of all residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO98</a>	Object	<p>Objection to WFDC OPTION A draft plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of the green fields at the rear of Spennells would be an absolute travesty, these fields are a hive of activity for an abundance of wildlife and local people,</p> <p>To add such a huge number of homes to an already busy network of roads and overstretched services has been ill thought out.</p> <p>Increased pressure on local schools, doctors and roads will have an enormous impact. Far better to distribute additional housing evenly to lower the stress in any one particular area. Your own statistics show population growth in Kidderminster is static how do you propose to fill these homes and where are all these additional people going to work?!</p> <p>Dozens of sites all around Kidderminster that should be developed primarily. The land to the rear of Spennells is not sitting idle it lends itself to agricultural usage. To add such a huge number of homes in this area would certainly add to congestion on this side of the town, greater emissions, noise, dust and a greater risk to health all concentrated in one area.</p> <p>I urge the council to consider the future of Kidderminster and have the foresight to protect our valuable green fields,</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the town centre has moved leaving large expanses of empty shops that could be cleared for better usage, for example, affordable housing and social housing developments, we have an abysmal bus service provider.</p> <p>The council in its wisdom moved the leisure centre from the town centre to the other side of town so now you really have to have a car if you want to go as it is a task to get from one side of town to the other without changing buses.</p> <p>An excellent bus service and adequate school places, doctors surgeries and local councillors that actually listen to their constituents should all be in place before proposing such a huge development in any one area!</p>
	<a href="#">LPP099</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Proposal to use Green Belt land to east of Kidderminster (Adjacent to Spennells and Offmore)</u></b></p> <p>My objection to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>Traffic.</b> Traffic leaving and entering Spennells area at peak times is already at capacity. Leaving Heronswood Road onto Spennells Valley Road between 7.30am and 9am any week day morning is very difficult. The tail back from the Bromsgrove Road end often reaches back to Heronswood School, where more congestion is created by parents dropping off children at school and nursery. Since the creation of the new road from Stourport the amount of traffic using Spennells Valley Road, as a short cut to Bromsgrove Road or across Offmore to the Birmingham Road, has increased significantly. The same problem arises at the Hoobrook end of Heronswood Road where traffic joining Chester Road South and then Worcester Road is backed up along Spennells Valley Road. Residents of Spennells often feel trapped at these times and any additional traffic to this area of Kidderminster will not be welcome.</p> <p>The area also becomes gridlocked at evening time particularly if travelling from Worcester, which can take up to 1 hour due to tail backs from Hoobrook as far as Ombersley on occasions and regularly as far back to the Mitre Oak. The major cause of this appears to be the traffic lights on the new road to Stourport, as again the situation has deteriorated since their introduction.</p> <p>Any major housing development in this area, irrespective of where access is, will intensify traffic problems causing increased risk to health caused by higher emissions of exhaust fumes.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Bus and Train Services</b> There needs to be a <b>major</b> change in how bus and train services serve the people of Kidderminster. At present it is not possible to catch a bus from Kidderminster Town centre to Spennells after 6pm, and the last train from Birmingham to Kidderminster is 10.57pm.</p> <p>It may surprise some councillors but a great number of people who live in Wyre Forest actually travel to and work in Birmingham. If their train arrives after 6pm, they either have to arrange for someone to pick them up or take a taxi or leave their car at the station car park. The station car park is now full after 9am during the week leaving the alternative to park on nearby streets, pay expensive all day parking or park on Severn Railway car park, which closes early.</p> <p>Any major development <b>anywhere in</b> Wyre Forest will increase these problems and needs to be addressed.</p> <p><b>Schools</b> Local schools will have to be enlarged putting more pressure on staff with larger classes etc. and will increase traffic outside schools. At present it is not safe outside Heronswood School or King Charles lower school in Borington Road due to heavy traffic.</p> <p><b>Loss of Green Belt</b> The loss of local Green Belt, threatening existing public Rights of Way. With the large number of properties already in existence on Spennells and Heronswood Park being the only open public space, after the council decided to close the smaller play areas, the adjoining Green Belt is pleasant for walkers, dog walkers and the like and is a great area for wildlife.</p> <p>Rather than double the size of Spennells alternative areas must be built.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO102</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed houses to be built on the Spennells Green Belt fields. Why build houses on countryside where birds nest etc? Bad enough when Wilden top was reduced to flat fields and two beautiful woods were demolished, they could have had both woods and flatland, birds of prey used to nest there.</p> <p>Enough land which has nothing to offer to use for building without destroying a beautiful area which is used by a lot of residents, it is Green Belt. There are a lot of elderly residents who have chosen to live in a quiet area. This is bound to change and have an effect on them if they are surrounded by new houses. I suppose they are to build</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>housing association homes as well as private? Spennells school could not cope with additional need. What about the traffic, this will cause havoc.</p> <p>We pay council tax and should be able to have a say on our area and what happens to it. Local council is concerned with council tax that each house will be paying. This area is very populated as it is without ruining it for the tax payers who already live here.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO105</a>	Object	<p>Concerning plans for house builds on Spennells, I am incredibly angry and frustrated as we have bought a small dwelling on Stanklyn lane which we are renovating to get a nice house in a very relaxed area, we bought this house in 2014 and we were not aware of any plans for this, our solicitors did not give us any surveys that this would ever and was in the pipelines, yet I feel it had, as the build is adjacent to the side and rear back of our property</p> <p>I hope a noise survey and traffic survey will be implemented, as there are no speed restrictions on the lane and I feel the traffic will be compromised and speeding WILL be a problem.</p> <p>I hope there will be more schools built, doctors and hospitals for the number of people moving in, pressures on these services will be horrendous.</p> <p>Wildlife that will be disturbed, fox burrows, badgers setts and birds will be affected, there is a bridle way at the top of Spennells which I use, will this be affected?? Of course it will!!!</p> <p>I will not be happy to be looking out my new home to see huge buildings staring back at me, noise and pollution around my home, this is an absurd plan and only people who want a nice big salary out of this are bothered.</p> <p>Elderly people walk down the lane to get there only exercise which will be dangerous for them as the traffic will be busy and frightening for them, there are no continuous pathways down Stanklyn lane so how can we be safe walking as we walk on the roads as the traffic is very quiet most days, also hospital waiting lists will be affected, I'm a nurse and I know this will be, we will also have loss of flood planes if the fields are removed and sewage will be a big problems too, has this been taken into consideration????? I will want to be compensated for the inconvenience this</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>will cause and will be calling on my solicitor for support.</p> <p>House valuations will be compromised and a once sought after area will be a noisy, polluted area like a busy town where I lived, countryside will be no more, how sad that these plans are to be and nobody cares about the countryside anymore, I'm sure there are plenty of other areas nearer the towns that could be built on?</p> <p>I will be demanding a pollution and noise survey as soon as these plans if so are final!!!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0106</a>	Object	<p>I want to formally object to the plans for housing on the Spennells fields. I have lived on Spennells for twenty four years and it continues to be where my family have their roots and where my children spend the majority of their time and walks on these fields occur often - the thought that they will be deprived of that is so sad. The fields were an integral part of my childhood and where I was first introduced to the vast nature that occupies those fields. I can appreciate there may be a need for more housing, but the plans are far too extensive and rob the area of its natural beauty and appeal. I also worry about how the local schools will cope, particularly Heronswood - generally in Kidderminster, many schools are over-subscribed and I cannot see how this new development would improve this predicament.</p> <p>I feel that this new development would be an awful way to use such beautiful land and I am truly sad that my children will perhaps not get the chance to have the same appreciation for living in a place where countryside and its nature are so easily accessible.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I truly hope the concerns of residents are kept in mind.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0107</a>	Object	<p>I formally state my objection to the plans for housing on the Spennells fields. I have lived on Spennells for twenty four years and it is the place where my family have their roots and where my children spend the majority of their time and walks on these fields occur often - the thought that they will be deprived of that is so sad. The fields were an integral part of my childhood and where I was first introduced to the vast nature that occupies those fields. I can appreciate there may be a need for more housing, but the plans are far too extensive and rob the area of its natural beauty and appeal. How will local schools cope, particularly Heronswood - in Kidderminster, many schools are over-</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>subscribed. I cannot see how this new development would improve this predicament.</p> <p>I feel that this new development would be an awful way to use such beautiful land and I am truly sad that my children may not get the chance to have the same appreciation for living in a place where countryside and its nature are so easily accessible.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and I truly hope the concerns of residents are kept in mind</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO108</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the plans to build on Spennells fields, which are on Green Belt Land. These fields are used by walkers, dog walkers, cycle, and various other reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic and higher emissions.</li> <li>2. Schools, and hospitals being overrun</li> <li>3. Also the effect on wildlife</li> <li>4. Loss of good quality land</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO109</a>	Object	<p>I would like to add my objections about further proposed building plans on the Spennells Estate. I think it would be ruinous, detrimental, and spoil a very pleasant place to live. It is well cared for by residents and our Local Councillors, who have a group of Volunteers, who go out Litter Picking, to help keep everything neat and tidy.</p> <p>I have lived here over twenty years, it is one of the better housing estates in Kidderminster, in very pleasant surroundings let us keep it that way.</p> <p>There are plenty of Disused Factory buildings around Kidderminster that are being left to go to ruin, why is it not possible to do something with those?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO110</a>	Object	<p>I read with horror 'Option A' of the Wyre Forest Local Plan Development Consultation that it is considering removing the 'Green Belt' status of the fields at the back and side of the Spennells housing estate, which will enable the fields to be sold for development with the loss of these lovely well farmed productive fields for ever. I have been a resident on Spennells for 32 years and I would like to object to this proposal in the strongest manner, this would be a</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>tragedy for the residents of Spennells and surrounding area. I walk across these fields 6 or 7 times a week in all weather conditions and experience relaxation and pleasure from these walks and it keeps me both physically and mentally fit and keeps my weight under control. During these walks I often meet others usually with dogs, some come from Offmore Farm or further away. Walks de-stress and clear my head.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the traffic situation as getting off the Spennells estate between 7.30 to 9.00am can be a nightmare as is trying to get out of Kidderminster under the viaduct towards Worcester. This situation would be made far worse if the area was further developed, likewise in reverse between 5.00 and 6 pm. This situation appears to have been made far worse since the opening of the much needed new link road, with traffic regularly backing up to the Black bridge lights.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO113</a>	Object	<p>We have lived on Spennells for over thirty years, a very pleasant place to live. Any swallowing up of land between the edge of Spennells and the houses on Stanklyn Lane will have the following two very serious effects.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The pleasant rural aspect of living in Stone will disappear and</li> <li>2. The proximity of the open fields will disappear and will have a detrimental effect on residents' quality of life.</li> </ol> <p>This land is agricultural and should not be used for house building. Loss of habitat for numerous species of wildlife. Potential to build many dwellings on Sion Hill School and also Lea Castle hospital sites. Aware of the need to provide more homes in Kidderminster but we do urge you to consider Option B as proposed in the review.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO121</a>	Object	<p>I wish to put on record my total opposition to 'option A' I believe if the development goes ahead it will affect the quality of our life.</p> <p>Please consider carefully:</p> <p>Impact on drainage in the area as the fields are a valuable soak away. In my time on Spennells heavy rain "run off" from the fields behind my house have flooded our garden resulting in us having to install additional drainage... The development up to the rise of the bill will exacerbate this run off flooding water even further.</p> <p>Proposal A would see housing located partly on the brow of a hill and so spoil the aesthetics of the surrounding countryside. The land is designated Green Belt and should not be used so to prevent relentless urban sprawl.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Building on Green Belt should be the last possible option.</p> <p>There will be extra congestion in traffic exiting from the only two exits onto Spennells Valley road. At the moment there are traffic queues at peak times.</p> <p>There will be extra pressure on our already full school and nursery. In particular there is a traffic problem at the moment with parking for parents taking their children to nursery/school.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife that feed and live on the fields. There are many Skylark nest in the fields that should not be disturbed. Skylarks are on the red endangered list In this country. The RSPB I suspect will have an interest in this. What right have we to take away their habitat?</p> <p>Foot paths around the fields are used by people for exercise and interaction with neighbours and friends met on the walks seven days a week. The consultation document describes the land in option A as poor for agriculture and poorly maintained. I have looked out for years on healthy crops such as mixed cereal, sugar beet and oil seed rape. Other land in option A has been used for monthly agricultural auctions and as a horse gallop.</p> <p>I understand that the Option A is the easy option and one likely to be preferred by developers but it is us who have to live with the consequences of the impact on the quality of our lives. I am sure that If the proposal option A goes ahead it will be a major source of regret in the future that the decision was unwise and not thought out.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0125</a>	Object	<p>Formally object to the proposals option A to expand housing around the Spennells estate area.</p> <p>I have major concerns about the effect this will have on not only me and my family- but the whole of Spennells estate.</p> <p>I visit the fields daily to either walk my dog, take my children on bike rides and nature walks and also exercise and keep healthy after working in the city. It keeps me sane and mentally healthy to be able to walk in this countryside at the end of a busy day...literally 2 minutes from my home. Your plans will destroy this...adding pollution.</p> <p>My children go or have been to Heronswood primary school. Our new intake has already increased to 60 per year</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>which will now continue as the children move through the years. The school is at bursting point; limited amount of playing fields for the kids...the school simply will not cope if Spennells almost doubles. The facility is simply not there.</p> <p>The stores by the school just about manage to maintain the kids hanging around....I dread to think what will happen with more children on the estate.</p> <p>My boys regularly play and ride bikes around the fields...and I allow them to as they are close by....if you get rid of this...the countryside will be too far out for the children to safely reach and play.</p> <p>Many other sites in Kidderminster that could be used...half of the towns centre are unused retail shops...surely these areas should be considered?</p> <p>Green Belt land is a valuable and necessary area we should be protecting and I am disgusted that these options to build are being considered.</p> <p>I chose this area for direct access to the fields for me and my family. The plans will devalue my property and ability to sell on.</p> <p>The road infrastructure will add pollution and noise...traffic is already horrendous travelling to the high school to town and this will increase severely.</p> <p>There are so many reasons why I strongly object to these proposals.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY OUR COUNTRYSIDE.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO126</a>	Object	<p>Formal objection to the proposals option A to expand housing around the Spennells estate area.</p> <p>I have serious concerns about the effect these proposals will have on our daily life and most importantly worried</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>about the detrimental effects they will undoubtedly have on the whole of the Spennells estate.</p> <p>We visit the fields on a daily basis, for dog walking, taking our children on bike rides and nature walks, jogging and exercise to keep healthy. Beautiful nature spot, literally on our doorstep, is a gift which we are desperate not to lose. Proposal will bring problems of pollution and overcrowding.</p> <p>Our children go or have been to Heronswood primary school. Our new intake has already increased to 60 per year which will now continue as the children move through the years. The school is at bursting point. Limited amount of playing fields...the school will not cope if Spennells almost doubles in size. Facilities are not there to cope with increased numbers.</p> <p>The stores by the school already have problems with kids hanging around....will worsen if the proposed building works go ahead.</p> <p>Our boys regularly play and ride bikes around the fields...and we allow them to as they are close by....if you get rid of this, the countryside will be too far out for the children to safely reach and play.</p> <p>Many other sites in Kidderminster that could be used...half of the town centre is made up of unused retail shops...surely these areas should be considered?</p> <p>Green Belt land is a valuable and necessary asset we should be protecting and I am disgusted that it is being considered as an option to build on.</p> <p>We specifically bought our house in this area for the direct access it offers to the fields. The plans will devalue our property and negatively affect our ability to sell.</p> <p>The road infrastructure will add pollution and noise. Traffic is already horrendous when travelling to the high school and to town and this will increase severely if the number of residents increases so dramatically.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There are so many reasons why I strongly object to these proposals.</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY OUR COUNTRYSIDE.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO127</a>	Object	<p>Oppose option A in the current planning review. I believe the following issues will occur with the implementation of option A;</p> <p>The fields upon which the new housing will be built are used extensively by local people to walk, jog, walk dogs, cycle, ride horses, etc. The loss of this site would diminish the mental health and physical well being of the people who use the field.</p> <p>Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes will result in risk to health and further reduce the air quality. Alternatively building housing in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution.</p> <p>Local schools being stretched further with fewer resources per student.</p> <p>Increased pressure on doctors, dentists, hospitals and opticians.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO190</a>	Object	<p>I want to put on record my total horror and opposition to “option A” going forward. I live on the edge of Spennells and overlook land that is outlined in option A. I do not want to see this development go ahead as it will affect our quality of life. More specifically,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am disappointed that the plan names option A and Option B which suggests that option A is the preferred</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>option of the planners. There are two options, one to use green field sites or alternatively to use existing other sites located throughout the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is designated Green Belt and should not be used so to prevent relentless urban sprawl. Building on Green Belt should be the last possible option.</li> <li>• Proposal A would see housing located partly on the brow of a hill and so spoil the aesthetics of the surrounding countryside. (look at the Brierley hill flats as an example of bad planning, on the top of a hill, that can be seen as far away as the Clee hills) Option A, in my view is nothing short of environmental vandalism.</li> <li>• In my time on the Spennells estate, heavy rain “run off” from the fields behind my house, has flooded our garden and around the house up to damp course level, on a number of occasions, to the extent I have had to install additional drainage. I am concerned that development up to the rise of the hill will exacerbate this run off flooding water even further.</li> <li>• One of the pleasures I have in the summer is the sound of Skylarks singing. There are many Skylark nests on this field that should not be disturbed. Skylarks are on the red endangered list in this country. What right do we have to take away their habitat? I suspect the RSPB will have an interest.</li> <li>• The land in option A, I can attest for the last 35 years, (despite being described in the consultation document as poor agricultural land that is poorly maintained) has always grown healthy crops. These crops being mixed cereals, sugar beet, and oil seed rape. Other land in option A has been used for monthly agricultural auction and as a horse gallop. Numerous dog walkers also use the rights of way on these fields to exercise their pets and themselves. The pathways are in constant use throughout the day seven days a week.</li> </ul> <p>I understand that Option A is the easy option and one likely to be preferred by developers, but it is us who have to live with the consequences of the impact on our quality of life. Please don't blame the government; we have a choice let's make the correct one, protect the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0193</a>	Object	<p>I oppose the proposed option site for future housing around the Spennells area. On the grounds that.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are surely "brown fields" sites that can be developed, more difficult to build on, but will not occupy Green Belt land.</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Empty retail town centre buildings can be converted into much needed flats.</p> <p>3. The increase in local traffic around Stanklyn Lane and Bromsgrove Rd will result in major road traffic jams around the surrounding junctions.</p> <p>4. Public services/ amenities and other infrastructures will have to be expanded greatly to cope with the increase in population, at great cost to the public purse.</p> <p>5. The water run off from these new properties that will occupy virgin land, which is a natural soak away, will probably result in far more extensive flooding in Spennells Valley.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to object.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO194</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the development of the whole area of OPTION A nearly doubling the size of Spennells.</p> <p>This would lead to a larger loss of Green Belt which in the face of climate change has an increasingly significant role in storing carbon and preventing flooding and is a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection.</p> <p>The fields are farmed for crops and provide annual nesting grounds for declining bird species such as Skylarks and other wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The fields are used extensively to walk, jog, walk dogs and ride horses, with mental health on the increase the loss of these fields would have a detrimental effect on all who live in this area not to mention physical well being especially as the district has one of the highest levels of obesity.</p> <p>Existing rights of way threatened i.e. Bridal paths Increased traffic noise and pollution resulting in increased risk to health putting pressure on local medical services.</p> <p>Option A is too large a development for one area, whereas Option B would be a better solution as less Green Belt</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>would be used, not concentrated in one area but dispersed across the district so less impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Rather than encroach upon our countryside we urge the council to develop and regenerate town centre sites including unused shop premises which should be considered as a priority in all three Wyre Forest towns.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0197</a>	Object	<p>All of these sites use Green Belt Land and I quote the following from the Wyre Forest Site Allocations and Policies Local plan adopted 2013:</p> <p>“Agricultural Land Quality</p> <p>7.110 Within the District, land quality is generally very high in the area running from east and south-east of Kidderminster eastwards to the District boundary. Other significant blocks of high quality land <i>can</i> be found to the north of Kidderminster and around Rock</p> <p>Policy SAL UP14</p> <p>Agricultural Land Quality</p> <p>Development of the best and most versatile agricultural land will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the development cannot be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Development on agricultural land should not prejudice the viability of farming operations on any remaining land.”</p> <p>The Green Belt In the sites quoted above are farmed by a tenant farmer, and shortly <i>after</i> the photographs shown In the report Amec Foster Wheeler Environment &amp; Infrastructure UK Limited chose to use, when the fields were fallow, was subsequently fully planted with cereal crops, which are now close to harvesting, These fields are classed as Grade 2 Agricultural land and since I took residence in 1979 have always been planted with either cereal or in the past sugar beet crops.</p> <p>These fields also have footpaths and permitted paths running around and thru them, which are used by the public, some having walked thru the Nature reserve at the front of the Spennells estate</p> <p>The loss of this Green Belt will be detrimental to the environment and there be the loss of the mental and physical wellbeing of the many people who visit the area from local and adjacent communities to enjoy the amenities these fields provide.</p> <p>People benefit from being able to go to a rural setting, see and observe local wild life, birds, wild flowers, and various</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>creature/birds habitats. You can do all this whatever your age and mobility and without having to pollute the environment by using a car. Children learn how agriculture works to provide crops which we need; With the number of homes that are proposed to be built under this review is the infrastructure of Kidderminster itself going to be able to cope with the increase in population?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out local Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded and our Worcester Hospital is in special measures</li> <li>• Doctors surgeries are now saying that their patient lists are full,</li> <li>• National Health Dental Surgeries have full patient lists.</li> <li>• Local schools are full or have limited places available. If places are not available close to your home Children have to travel to where places are available, which in many cases necessitates the use of a car, causing air pollution</li> </ul> <p>I believe children living on the new development called Silver Birch located on the Stourport Road are commuting to Heronswood School located on the Spennells Estate.</p> <p>I am against any use of Green Belt land, however Option B appears to use slightly less Green Belt for a very similar number of dwellings to be built.</p> <p>I feel that we would be better to use every available piece of land already within our boundaries before contemplating the use of any of our Green Belt in either plan A or B.</p> <p>I quote from a Press Release from the Government In February 2017— Page 5 Green Belt</p> <p><b>“Government announces ambitious plan to build the homes Britain needs</b></p> <p>From: Department for Communities and Local Government, The Rt Hon Gavin Barwell and The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP</p> <p>Part of: Housing white paper, Rented housing sector and House Building</p> <p>Published: 7 February 2017</p> <p>“Green Belt</p> <p>Ministers have reaffirmed this government’s commitment to the Green Belt - that only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter Green Belt boundaries after consulting local people and submitting the revised Local Plan for examination, and set out for the first time all the actions local authorities must take before considering the Green Belt.</p> <p>The plan for ‘Urban Regeneration’ includes: strengthening national planning policy to create a ‘de facto’ presumption in favour of housing on suitable brownfield land and to drive up density levels in high demand areas while ensuring that developments are well-designed and respect the character of the local area.</p> <p>Also taking action to radically increase brownfield development and to bring life back to abandoned sites. That</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>means high quality housing for families in town centres, breathing new life back into our high streets, turning abandoned shopping centres into new communities and increasing density of housing around transport hubs to build homes that people want to live in.”</p> <p>The proposed expansion using plan A will be an</p> <p>People benefit from being able to go to a rural setting, see and observe local wild life, birds, wild flowers, and various creature/birds habitats. You can do all this whatever your age and mobility and without having to pollute the environment by using a car. Children learn how agriculture works to provide crops which we need; With the number of homes that are proposed to be built under this review is the infrastructure of Kidderminster itself going to be able to cope with the increase in population?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out local Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded and our Worcester Hospital is in special measures</li> <li>• Doctors surgeries are now saying that their patient lists are full,</li> <li>• National Health Dental Surgeries have full patient lists.</li> <li>• Local schools are full or have limited places available. If places are not available close to your home Children have to travel to where places are available, which in many cases necessitates the use of a car, causing air pollution</li> </ul> <p>I believe children living on the new development called Silver Birch located on the Stourport Road are commuting to Heronswood School located on the Spennells Estate.</p> <p>Having read the review I am against any use of Green Belt land, however Option B appears to use slightly less Green Belt for a very similar number of dwellings to be built.</p> <p>I feel that we would be better to use every available piece of land already within our boundaries before contemplating the use of any of our Green Belt in either plan A or B.</p> <p>I quote from a Press Release from the Government In February 2017— Page 5 Green Belt  <b>“Government announces ambitious plan to build the homes Britain needs</b>          From: Department for Communities and Local Government, The Rt Hon Gavin Barwell and The Rt Hon Sajid Javid MP          Part of: Housing white paper, Rented housing sector and House Building          Published: 7 February 2017          “Green Belt          Ministers have reaffirmed this government’s commitment to the Green Belt - that only in exceptional circumstances</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>may councils alter Green Belt boundaries after consulting local people and submitting the revised Local Plan for examination, and set out for the first time all the actions local authorities must take before considering the Green Belt.</p> <p>The plan for 'Urban Regeneration' includes: strengthening national planning policy to create a 'de facto' presumption in favour of housing on suitable brownfield land and to drive up density levels in high demand areas while ensuring that developments are well-designed and respect the character of the local area.</p> <p>Also taking action to radically increase brownfield development and to bring life back to abandoned sites. That means high quality housing for families in town centres, breathing new life back into our high streets, turning abandoned shopping centres into new communities and increasing density of housing around transport hubs to build homes that people want to live in."</p> <p>Option A is an extremely large expansion of housing and roads on the eastern side of Kidderminster, which will be a large urban sprawl. The Spennells Estate will connect to Summerfield and be extremely close to Stone.</p> <p>Overall I feel that the plan is unethical, and environmentally disastrous. You have to consider the environment you create for living. It must be greater than a house and a road on which to gain access to your place of work. It must be a place you can live and enjoy life with your family, be contented, happy and relaxed in an environment of peace and tranquillity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO199</a>	Object	<p>I would like to lodge my objection to the reclassification of the Green Belt and the proposed options for development A &amp; B on fields adjacent to Spennells. Clearly to locate such a massive development in one location is a huge mistake. Whilst one has to plan for the future it would be more appropriate to identify a number of separate locations spread around the area. Further reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.The proposal is next to a designated Nature Reserve. Huge residential and industrial development would have a severe detrimental impact on the habitat of the fauna and flora and deface the natural environment.</li> <li>2. The area is used by local people for recreational and dog walking along with other activities such as cycling and jogging. This is important since the existing area has no other community benefits whatsoever and further development would exacerbate this unsatisfactory situation.</li> <li>3. Increased traffic flow would be inevitable and result in unsociable noise which at times is already a nuisance from the nearby A (Kidderminster— Worcester Road). I.e. speeding motor cycles and constant traffic hum' particularly at busy times. There would be increased air pollution from exhaust gases which is a health hazard.</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>4. I would express concern at the potential impact of surface water run off generated by rainfall causing localised flooding and the distress that this would cause. It would have a detrimental impact on house prices when trying to sell a property. Maintenance of downstream channels and culverts would also be a problem. They are probably inadequate and never designed to accept the increased flow.</p> <p>5. Development would result in loss of valuable productive agricultural land.</p> <p>6. Brownfield sites in the area should be developed before virgin land is encroached on. There seems to be numerous disused buildings in Kidderminster that could be utilised which apart from accommodation would greatly improve the aesthetic appearance of the town. It certainly needs it.</p> <p>7. There will be further pressure on the current medical services (doctors, hospital. dentists etc) and also the local school</p> <p>8. In view of the relative static population in Kidderminster It is questionable if the proposed development is necessary anyway. Who exactly is it for?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO221</a>	Object	<p>I walk along the footpaths in the fields round Spennells, enjoying the outlook and watching the countryside change with the seasons. Many people walk the paths through the fields for the good of their health. There are people with various complaints, including an elderly gentleman with asbestosis, who rely on this facility.</p> <p>From January onwards there are Sky Larks singing away, cheering folks up. They must nest somewhere.</p> <p>We have so few facilities in Kidderminster. The site will be seen from a large distance. You must have brown field sites that could be used so that housing could be in small blocks.</p> <p>Easter Park has still got vacancies; this has taken years to fill. I am told that there are also vacancies on the Hoo Farm estate.</p> <p>Kidderminster is not a beautiful town and you are about to spoil it again.</p> <p>I know this is an easy option but please think hard, once our beautiful landscape is gone it will never come back.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO222</a>	Object	<p>We object strongly to Spennells expansion including OC/13 WFR/ST/2 WFR/ST/1 AS/10.</p> <p>We object on grounds of:</p> <p>1 loss of Green Belt. Beautiful fields and hedgerows loss of current public rights of way.</p> <p>Brown sites should be used</p> <p>2 increased traffic noise and air pollution. Reduction of mental health and well being. Loss of leisure space</p> <p>3 loss of wildlife habitat for example skylarks and linnets</p> <p>4 increased pressure on public services e g schools doctors hospitals</p> <p>5 loss of agricultural land which helps feeds the nation</p> <p>We don't want urban sprawl we do want the council to develop and regenerate the town centre.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO223</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to option A.</p> <p>The fields provide a real sense of community to the people of Spennells &amp; local areas due to the social aspect of how many people use them to either walk dogs or meet with friends &amp; walk socially. Using this Green Belt land for housing development would have a massive negative impact on the local community.</p> <p>I know the huge impact destroying these fields will have on our local wildlife population.</p> <p>Having easy access to these fields have really helped children in their development &amp; understanding of community.</p> <p>I feel option B would be more suitable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO224</a>	Object	<p>We strongly object to the building of 1,735 homes.</p> <p>The whole of option 'A' is Green Belt land; impact on habitat for the nature contained therein will be catastrophic.</p> <p>UK Skylark population has diminished by 50% over recent years yet it is proposed to reduce their habitat.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The housing will diminish views from the properties overlooking the fields from Spennells and Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Bridleways and public rights of way are heavily used by many from Spennells. Taking these pathways and views away from existing residents will negatively impact on all who use them.</p> <p>This proposal will be visually overbearing, is inappropriate and totally out of keeping alongside a present large development. Especially when considering there are a number of brown field sites that need to be utilised.</p> <p>We have no doubt that the proposal also includes road links onto Spennells estate. This will cause noise, pollution and level of traffic that the estate was not designed for. Furthermore, any link to the A448 will again cause chaos to roads permeating away from the town, in particular Mustow Green.</p> <p>There appears to be no mention of infrastructure required to meet the needs of residents living in the proposed new homes. Spennells has a small but very much needed supermarket, a pharmacy and take away restaurant(s). These shops are already well patronised and parking is often at a premium. Any increase in traffic will place strain not only on road infrastructure but parking and the shops themselves.</p> <p>Fundamentally, to even consider utilising this Green Belt land we feel is unacceptable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO225</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal to build on the Green Belt adjacent to Spennells. My reason are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Plenty of Brownfield sites available.</li> <li>2) These should be built on first before using any Greenfield sites.</li> <li>3) Spennells already well populated area, further housing would add to pressure on local schools and shops etc.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO226</a>	Object	<p>The Spennells Estate is big enough already. Previous mistake was allowing large scale unsuitable and ill-considered development.</p> <p>Further development with expansion into the Green Belt undermines the original thinking behind the design of Spennells and its Nature Reserve. Residents and others take advantage of the outdoor amenities provided by the existing Rights of Way and access to the fields off Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Not be possible without bulldozing the whole area to create an infrastructure which will cope with such an increase in occupation. Already impossible sometimes to access the Spennells Valley Road, traffic queuing down the Worcester Road beyond the traffic lights at the Droitwich turn on the A449.</p> <p>Siting the total development in Spennells is a quick fix easy option.</p> <p>Planning a dispersed option would better enhance Kidderminster in general.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO227</a>	Object	<p>I express my concerns.</p> <p>I moved to Spennells for the quality of life and beautiful surrounding countryside. This area had lakes, nature reserves and open countryside to exercise, relax and enjoy. Safe place traffic wise. My Children had good schools, safe areas to play and learned about the environment and nature. We walk around Spennells fields &amp; countryside. We watch the seasons change and the creatures that live there, Sky larks, finches, Owls and Buzzards &amp; the Green Wood Peckers and other red-listed birds all live here too and have been here longer than all of us. The Councils are obligated to supply housing but I do not accept obliterating our area is the best answer.</p> <p>I urge the Council to do what's right for the Town and its people.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO229</a>	Object	<p>Please look alternatives rather than expanding Spennells.</p> <p>Green Belt around Spennells is an essential habitat for skylarks their numbers have increased. Their habitat should not be destroyed and consequently their survival.</p> <p>The area is an unspoilt rural setting, fresh air, meeting others experiencing similar, definitely helped my getting back to work and recovery from depression.</p> <p>Traffic getting in and out of Spennells is sometimes gridlocked, and have a negative effect on air quality and safety in the area.</p> <p>Please listen and act on comments of people who care about the health and wellbeing of the residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO231</a>	Object	<p>I formally object to the LPR especially with regard to proposed building of houses and a relief road to the side of Spennells Estate. I base my objections on the following :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This stretch of land is Green Belt land and is therefore protected</li> <li>2. This stretch of land contains 2 pools, woods, a bridle path and public rights of way which in their own rights are</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>protected.</p> <p>3. This stretch of land is used for walking, running, dog walking, horse riding, fishing, bird watching and other leisure activities</p> <p>4. National trends show house demand to be flat lining therefore there is no justification to build more houses.</p> <p>5. No infrastructure to support an additional 6000 families and associated transport, schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals, Police support, Fire support. We have downgraded most of our public services and our town centre is half empty.</p> <p>6. The so called relief road has been poorly consulted and there is no justification to build one if the 6000 homes are not built. We have reduced the main route out of Kidderminster to a single carriageway and the same with the Worcester Road. If you want to improve communications then widen them again. Simply building another road is not the answer.</p> <p>7. Where is work for another 6000 jobs coming from? Most of the available brownfield sites are down to failing industry. You have just allowed a massive build on the old sugar beet factory are all those houses taken up? Could the new leisure facilities cope, no one can find a parking spot there.</p> <p>8. The people on Spennells do not want this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO335</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to Option A and my reasons are as follows:</p> <p>Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -As the fields in Option A are in a valley, building roads and houses here make the area more polluted as the fumes cover and stay in the area.</li> <li>• -The increased pollution from car fumes etc... Will cause higher rates of asthma.</li> <li>• -With no crops being grown in the fields food will be grown further away which will increase car fumes.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-There are a number of species of animals whose habitat can be found on this land. E.g. - badgers, bats and birds are just a few. Having looked at the RSPB website Corn Bunting is in danger of extinction. I have seen these birds when walking my dog.</li> <li>-Loss of the fields would be bad for dogs as they would have to walk in the streets. This would mean they have to stay on leads. Dogs would also have to walk by car exhausts, which are located close to their mouth and nose.</li> <li>-Building the houses on the fields will increase global warming and impact other animals not just in the fields.</li> </ul> <p>Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The fields are used by a variety of people of all ages to interact and exercise. The fields are a free resource and you do not have to drive there.</li> <li>-Cyclists have a higher chance of getting knocked off bikes with the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-As the town centre is not used by many residents, I propose that houses are built on Brownfield sites near the town centre as it will encourage the residents to spend money in local shops. This could encourage more shops to come to Kidderminster.</li> </ul> <p>I hope you consider the points carefully. We need to protect the Green Belt for future life.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO336</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to Option A, i.e. Large scale development of fields adjacent to Spennells with associated infrastructure changes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a beautiful area of Green Belt used by walkers and dog walkers. Giving a place to exercise.</li> <li>2. The school is too small and would create extra traffic problems around the area.</li> </ol>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>3. We already have congestion. The area cannot cope with extra vehicles on the roads.</p> <p>This area was originally supposed to have a church and a pub. Where are they?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO341</a>	Object	<p>We strongly object to the proposal to expand Spennells by robbing the very distinctive Green Belt to build new dwellings on. The very special character of the estate blends well into the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and would be totally destroyed by a further 1700 dwellings, which would result in an urban sprawl. Kidderminster is a lovely Market town. By building further, we would have our own 'Castle Vale' estate on the edge of town, with most of the residents commuting to Birmingham or the Black Country.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO665</a>	Object	<p>Proposed development between Spennells Estate and Stanklyn Lane raises number of concerns:</p> <p>1 proposed relief road - visual and noise impact - significant screening needed</p> <p>2 junction with A449 likely to cause further traffic flow issues</p> <p>3 Land between proposed road and Stanklyn Lane unlikely to remain viable for farming - concerned re future uses</p> <p>4 should consider reusing empty buildings in town centre before releasing Green Belt land. Persuade more elderly to downsize and free up family homes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO754</a>	Object	<p>Shocked to see how many houses are proposed on fields at Spennells.</p> <p>Area is used by lots of people, area cannot cope with another 2 to 3,000 people, cars and children, roads cannot cope now. Fields needs to be kept for conservation and recreation, not enough open spaces for people to walk.</p> <p>Look at Brownfield sites and the town centre, lots of empty spaces and CROWN HOUSE which has been empty for years.</p> <p>Save Our Spennells.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO758</a>	Object	<p>Development of GREEN BELT LAND south of Spennells would have an adverse affect on the amenities of this agricultural land.</p> <p>Residents use this land for walking, exercising their dogs appreciating wildlife, hedgerows and the ambience of the area.</p> <p>If housing were built on this Greenfield site it would have an adverse impact on local amenities. Traffic density which is already substantial and the road system would need significant expansion and widening.</p> <p>Proposed expansion of Spennells towards Stanklyn Lane would increase traffic density on Stanklyn Lane itself. This would entail extensive road and railway bridge widening.</p> <p>Residents on Spennells chose this location as adjacent to beautiful open countryside and opportunities for enjoyment, exercise and peaceful relaxation.</p> <p>Doctors, Dentist and the community healthcare services, including the hospital and emergency services are already overstretched.</p> <p>Logical to build houses on Brownfield Sites between Kidderminster, Bewdley and Stourport on an infill basis. This could contribute to the regeneration of these towns.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO760</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development on Green Belt fields at Spennells.</p> <p>Concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of prime fields with associated footpaths &amp; bridleways</li> <li>• Loss of already endangered songbirds, namely Skylarks</li> <li>• Loss of other wildlife that use the fields, trees or hedgerows.</li> <li>• Massive impact on already very busy access roads.</li> <li>• Local school, doctors etc will be put under even more pressure to deal with the enlarged community.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A massive negative impact on Spennells.</li> <li>• We need the green space around the existing estate.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO762</a>	Object	<p>We object to change Spennells fields from Green Belt to enable houses etc to be built.</p> <p>So much wildlife to be disturbed. Many people enjoy these fields, families feel safe using it with their children. Dog walkers and lots of people who walk alone. There is not enough open spaces now for an estate of this kind.</p> <p>No facilities for young or older people to get together now, so more people will make it worse. People benefit from our green spaces, both physically and mentally, they are so important. Housing is just as important but it's too easy to take green spaces rather than develop derelict spaces.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1686</a>	Object	Loss of valuable agricultural land for recreation would affect users physical/mental wellbeing and wildlife.
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPPO1717</a>	Object	<p>The fields are productive, agricultural land which also serves as popular recreational and social facilities for walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers, photographers and horse rider.</p> <p>The area offers a number of different habitats for wildlife, including important nesting sites for <b>corn buntings</b>, <b>larks</b> and <b>linnets</b> (all of which are included on the red list as endangered birds), badger setts and bats.</p> <p><b><u>Landscape and Visual Amenity Appraisal</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report' published in 2013 emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan removes.</li> <li>• The Local Plan's suggested Option A, building houses to the north of Stanklyn Lane would be to the detriment of the visual landscape. To build houses in these fields would spoil the current visual amenity and represent clear evidence of Urban Sprawl. This would be evident from the A449 trunk road approach to</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster and from the railway line as it approaches Kidderminster in a northerly direction.</p> <p><b><u>Drainage</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are also historical drainage ditches in this area of archaeological importance that should be protected and enhanced.</li> <li>• During the last 20 years, there have been severe flooding issues on Spennells estate around the Linnet Rise area.</li> <li>• Development of these sites will reduce the natural drainage maintained by the fields, crops, trees and hedgerows, and not only pose real issues to flooding for the new development, but exacerbate and pose further flooding issues for the existing properties and road structures already in place</li> <li>• This is well-farmed prime grade 2 arable land which needs to be protected</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Health and Wellbeing of residents</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The open space, public footpaths and Rights of Way across the fields are intensively used by local residents which have positive effects upon their physical and mental wellbeing. A cycling route through a housing estate could not claim to meet the needs of all the current users of the PROWs and Bridle paths. Footpaths that allow walking in the open countryside cannot be equated with 'Green Corridors' between housing developments.</li> <li>• Kidderminster has higher obesity levels than the national average and this would be exacerbated by reducing local access to these fields for local health and recreational.</li> <li>• Other threats to the health and wellbeing include:</li> <li>• The proposed new road (Eastern Relief road) causing increased traffic noise, air pollution, light pollution and additional traffic vibration to Spennells' residents.</li> <li>• Increased demand on infrastructure including medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Social problems; evidence exists that large housing estates suffer more crime and anti-social behaviour (as acknowledged in the WFIDP May 2017).</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b><u>Strain on local infrastructure</u></b></p> <p>A new large residential development requires proper infrastructure to support its current and future residents. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hospital services</li> <li>• GP &amp; Dental surgeries</li> <li>• Schools – Existing local schools are nearly full. We are not confident that extra school places will be made available in time for the projected new arrivals to this part of town.</li> <li>• Local shops, pharmacy and post office – We are not confident that adequate additional local shops will be constructed to serve any enlarged Spennells</li> <li>• Local leisure such as a village hall, pub, and fitness centre/gym – We are not confident that adequate local leisure facilities will be built to serve an enlarged estate, leading to a soulless estate with heightened youth alienation, graffiti and crime.</li> <li>• Local roads and transport – The absence of adequate schools, shops and leisure facilities will increase car journeys which will contribute to local air pollution and traffic congestion. The building of an estate on the fringe of Kidderminster will see more car journeys rather than walking and cycling, compared to development closer to the centre on brownfield sites.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Loss of Green Belt</u></b></p> <p>The purpose of Green Belt is to:</p> <p>a. Check unrestricted urban sprawl. The proposed Option A development would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, whereas development under Option B would have a more dispersed effect upon a range of town boundaries. The Wyre Forest Review states that "The parcel is largely open in character, part of the strong division between the built edge and open countryside." The claim in the LPR that "extending the built edge of Kidderminster south-eastwards would not constitute urban sprawl" is contradicted later in the Report by the need to "reduce the impression of urban sprawl" in the Green Belt evaluation (LPR Appendix C).</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>b. Stop neighbouring towns from merging. The development on this land would mean that Spennells would merge with Summerfield and Stone, thus losing their separate identities.</p> <p>c. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The development in Option A would encroach significantly into open Green Belt land.</p> <p>In the Green Belt Review Report on both Sprawl and Encroachment, weightings were scored as 'Considerable' for this parcel of land (SE1). This parcel of land also scored 2 'considerables' but was weighted alongside other areas (not selected for development) that scored only 1 'considerable' impact assessment.</p> <p>The proposed Option 'A' plan removes 22% (48 Hectares) more Green Belt from Wyre Forest than Option 'B' and we strongly support the minimum removal of Green Belt land.</p> <p><b><u>Wildlife and Bio Diversity</u></b></p> <p>The Spennells fields have a diverse and flourishing wildlife population. There are protected trees and ancient hedgerows that are home to, and provide a vital food source for, a wide range of birds, mammals, insects and bats. There is evidence of Red and Amber Listed Bird species such as Corn Buntings, Skylarks and Linnets in this area and sightings of European otters, 3 species of Bats and badgers setts with breeding pairs. We suggest that you fully consider the ecological impact of continuing with your proposed development on these fields.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01798</a>	Object	<p>The housing proposed in Option A is enormous to say the least.</p> <p>The mere thought of constructing a bypass road so close to the existing Spennells estate is a preposterous proposal; the diabolical row from fast moving traffic would be unbearable.</p> <p>A shame to lose the protected bats that dwell on the fields.</p> <p>The skylarks are a wonderful asset that will also be lost.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The fields contain excellent barley growing soil.</p> <p>Dog walking and recreational space is so vital to the existing Spennells population.</p> <p>Taking all of this into consideration the choice of option A is totally out of the question.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1828</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to option A of the local plan review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option is totally unjust for the people of Spennells and surrounding areas due to the disproportionate size of the proposed build.</li> <li>• Spennells does not have the infrastructure to cope with 1065 extra houses.</li> <li>• Herenswood School is already overcrowded and there is no room for expansion without the loss of playground.</li> <li>• The District suffers with a huge child obesity problem, taking the fields on which we exercise and reducing the school playground will worsen this.</li> <li>• The fields at the rear of Spennells are valuable grade 2. With Brexit looming we ought to be saving our agricultural fields until we are sure of our future in the importation market.</li> <li>• Believes that Option A has been pushed by WFDC and the whole report is heavily weighted towards it. Questions that it's already a 'done deal.'</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1844</a>	Object	<p>Object to using Green Belt land adjacent to Spennells to build 1700 new homes. The fields are used for exercise, and provide access to the countryside close to the already large housing estate. It provides an escape for humans and is also a home to wildlife/threatened species. Spennells is already large/too large and is the largest estate in Wyre Forest. Why make it larger?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1845</a>	Object	<p>A bypass road so close to the existing Spennells estate is a preposterous proposal; the diabolical row from fast moving traffic would be unbearable.</p> <p>A shame to lose the protected bats that dwell on the fields.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The skylarks are a wonderful asset that will also be lost</p> <p>The fields contain excellent barley growing soil</p> <p>Dog walking and recreational space is so vital to the existing Spennells, population.</p> <p>Taking all this into consideration the choice of Option A is totally out of the question</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1855</a>	Object	<p>Objection to proposed development to the rear of Spennells.</p> <p>Fields are used for exercise and observing nature locally including bats, building would be detrimental to the local wildlife.</p> <p>Services and schools oversubscribed and doctors' surgery is always busy.</p> <p>The traffic is already awful and the local infrastructure cannot support hundreds more cars. Only solution is an Eastern relief road, ripping up more Green Belt land, this is also an awful idea that should not be entertained for any reason.</p> <p>Developers want to maximise profit by building on Green Belt land to command higher selling prices for the houses they will build.</p> <p>There are several other sites that could be developed that aren't Green Belt. Say NO!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1859</a>	Object	<p>Object to the proposed 'Option A' involving the building of 1735 new homes on land adjoining Spennells.</p> <p>We do not believe that there is a need for so many new homes in Wyre Forest, and feel that it would be sensible to wait until the Silverwoods site is completed an every property sold, and to utilise other brownfield sites such as Lea Castle.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The proposed development would create significant additional traffic on our already congested roads, causing pollution and frustration. This valued Green Belt land should be protected, and only lose its status if all other options are exhausted and it is really needed.</p> <p>There are few employment opportunities locally, so unless new industry is brought into the area, where would the occupants work? If they do not have employment then they will not be able to afford to buy these homes, but by then it will be too late.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1865</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposal to build on Green Belt land to the rear of Spennells.</p> <p>Main reason for objecting is due to the health benefits that access to the land gives to local people.</p> <p>The fields are used for exercise for young and older people, as a place to learn about wildlife and nature for children, a safe place where they can build confidence and be away from roads.</p> <p>Older people use the space for exercise and socialising to combat isolation.</p> <p>The area provides so many benefits to both physical and mental wellbeing and is easily accessible for local residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1879</a>	Object	<p>Spennells estate is large enough. Unacceptable to extend it further and destroy open field lands. The environmental impact would be devastating. The area supports a vast variety of wildlife that would be lost for all time. These include insects, butterflies, plants, grasses, birds, mammals and amphibians. Larks losing another site to breed. The ecology would be destroyed.</p> <p>Many people walk this area to enjoy the wildlife and fresh green open space. Protect what we have now.</p> <p>All the extra traffic etc would impact on health, heavier air pollution. Asthma sufferers but it much more than just that.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1919</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spennells Estate is already a very large estate and does not need further expansion on to the Green Belt.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1930</a>	Object	We object to the proposal of the development which will cause huge problems to the environment and infrastructure of the Spennells Estate, in particular schools, medical facilities, shops, roads traffic congestion.
	<a href="#">LPPO1938</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spennells is set in lovely surroundings.</li> <li>• Facilities of the estate would not be enough if the development went ahead.</li> <li>• School is full to capacity.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Very little work in Kidderminster currently - where will the influx of people work?</li> <li>• There are a number of empty shops and factories which could be put to use for living accommodation instead.</li> <li>• Object plans A&amp;B as there is no sense in the developments.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1945</a>	Object	<p>I strongly oppose new houses on the fields at Spennells. Therefore I oppose option A.</p> <p>Do not believe that Wyre forest is expanding by such an amount and question the need for so many houses, other than for the council to receive a government payout for each dwelling built.</p> <p>It would put huge pressure on existing roads, schools, shops, doctors and dentists, the police and hospitals. I do not think that the infrastructure is there to support such a huge growth in population.</p> <p>The fields, which are part of the Green Belt for a reason, are enjoyed by huge numbers of people each day of the year. It inhabits a wealth of wildlife which would be disrupted.</p> <p>I believe that affordable housing could be built in other areas of Kidderminster and that enough land lies derelict on brownfield sites to cater for the population growth</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1947</a>	Object	<p>Object to development around Spennells. I walk there daily; it is both physically &amp; mentally uplifting. Our estate will lose its identity if the fields were built on.</p> <p>Our town centre is practically dead. There is so much space there that could be built on without destroying our much</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			loved fields & all the wildlife that inhabits it. Why else are all our roads named after birds?
	<a href="#">LPPO1950</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to development at the rear of Spennells Estate.</li> <li>• Development would see wildlife lost.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1954</a>	Object	<p>We are writing to raise objections to the proposed further expansion along the southern edge of Spennells estate from the railway line to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</p> <p>We enjoy walking in the Green Belt land and have done so for the past 39 years. Many people from the community benefit from easy access to the public footpaths and rights of way alongside beautiful countryside. We enjoy meeting other residents walking dogs and pushing prams. Access to the countryside enhances wellbeing, physical and mental, and helps to promote community.</p> <p>The proposed area for development is very attractive countryside. There are woodlands, pools, streams, agricultural fields, hamlets, wildlife habitats, lanes with blackberries for foraging, and many varieties of birds. This is one of the most attractive parts of the Green Belt around Kidderminster.</p> <p>There are plenty of areas of Kidderminster which need to be improved and this is not one of those areas. Our preference would be more development on brownfield sites in the urban area.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre has been badly affected by poor historic planning decisions and now needs substantial investment. If additional housing is needed in the area, we would prefer for this to be concentrated on the town centre in order to provide investment and much needed improvements. A greater sense of community would be developed when compared with a satellite commuter suburb. Housing in the town centre would also encourage use of public transport, such as the train and walking, rather than more cars.</p> <p>The proposed development would also cause additional traffic congestion on already busy roads and would put additional pressure on already stretched public services, such as hospitals and schools.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1969</a>	Object	<p>I object to “Option A”</p> <p>I use these fields everyday,</p> <p>What happens to the wildlife that currently lives there?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1970</a>	Object	<p>I object to both options A and B and core housing sites for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My property backs onto the A448 which is already a very loud and busy road. I am worried about the level of extra road noise in my garden. I have 2 small children who love to play outside and I believe this would have a detrimental effect on the wellbeing of my family</li> <li>• Increase in traffic volume. The island at Stone Manor and Spinals Valley Road are both already heavily congested at peak times.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that this has been thoroughly planned and where this road would go to support the traffic from extra houses.</li> <li>• There are only plans to provide 1 extra primary school but no plans for any extra services such as doctors or another secondary school.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt. There are many brown site areas around Kidderminster sitting derelict and dangerous where houses could be built. Churchfields, old carpet factories in the town centre and the old Sion Hill School site to name a few.</li> <li>• The fields are a beautiful part of town they provide so much happiness to residents in and around Spennells as well as support wildlife and birds</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1973</a>	Object	<p>Please registrar my objection to the planned use of Green Belt on Spennells Fields. The Hospital is already unable to cope, Doctors Schools are struggling, Railway and Station needs further development</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1985</a>	Object	<p>Our objections regarding Option A the building of 1735 dwellings between the Birmingham to Worcester railway line and the A448 Bromsgrove Road to the south of the Spennells Estate are as follows:-</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Objection 1</p> <p>Very few job opportunities in the area. The majority of the new residents will travel further afield for work i.e. the West Midlands area. Extra commuters will impact on the local environment because the only viable method of commuting is by car.</p> <p>The only industrial addition is an extension to the Easter Park site. This will only provide few warehousing and retail jobs. This is not an addition of facilities that will provide a large number of well paid jobs for the new residents.</p> <p>A local Kidderminster estate agent stated that there are large numbers of families that would like to move from the West Midlands to the Kidderminster area. Houses are being built to accommodate West Midlands overspill NOT extra housing needed for Wyre Forest residents. Extra housing should be located nearer to industrial areas where jobs are available, better for the environment with a reduction in the pollution from commuting cars.</p> <p>Objection 2</p> <p>If an extra 1735 houses are built the current road network in the Spennells area will not be able to cope with congestion and increased pollution at peak times.</p> <p>No current plans to improve the road network, the best option for residents is to drive towards Kidderminster town centre via Heronswood and Spennells Valley Roads and being that there are only currently two exits from Spennells this would lead to high traffic congestion.</p> <p>Because of this the development is not viable.</p> <p>Objection 3</p> <p>Another objection is effect on schools and recreation facilities in the area. No concrete plans to build extra school buildings or to improve recreational facilities. Without extra provision for schooling the additional homes are not</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			feasible.  What is needed is a plan not just showing extra homes but also the infrastructure to support this plan (roads, schools and recreation facilities). The plan including this should be presented to county council and central government and then a plan presented to the current residents that shows new roads, schools etc. with time frames.
	<a href="#">LPPO1998</a>	Object	I object to further building on the area between Spennells estate and Stanklyn Lane. This Green Belt area is so precious to people on the estate, it's a free social area where like minded folk meet daily for a breath of fresh air, relaxation and mental welfare. The wildlife there is beautiful, sky larks nest there, and the Corn Bunting bird which is extinct in Wales and Herefordshire is nesting and breeding there. The Green Belt should be protected for future generations.
	<a href="#">LPPO2016</a>	Object	Objects to proposed development at Spennells and Stanklyn Lane for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of fields that are an important source of well-being for local residents. Fields are used extensively by local people for; relaxation, exercising, walking, jogging, dog walking, mindfulness and contemplation.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic. The noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes will result in a greater health risk, particularly to those living in the immediate area.</li> <li>• Strain on existing education providers.</li> <li>• Increase pressure on doctors, hospitals, dentists, police, fire and other services.</li> <li>• Result in the loss of the Green Belt area which protects the countryside and existing Public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Result in the loss of wildlife including: Skylarks, swallows, linnets and other red-listed birds as well as squirrels, foxes and badgers.</li> <li>• Result in the loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Result in the loss of hedgerows, which are conservation areas, along Stanklyn Lane.</li> <li>• Result in the reduction of property prices in the surrounding area.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2049</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green Belt in these areas is thriving. The birds and hedgehogs and their habitats rely on all the hedgerows you intend to build over.</li> <li>• Residents use these fields daily to walk round with their children and dogs.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Spennells estate is already over populated.</li> <li>• The park for children is already too busy.</li> <li>• The facilities on the Spennells estate are too small to cope with more houses.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2053</a>	Object	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to the invasive expansion in Spennells area.</p> <p>Expansion on the Green Belt land is lazy, and done simply because it is cheaper and quicker, but it is utterly irresponsible. Green Belt expansion should only be developed as a last resort; these houses will not be affordable.</p> <p>Brown Field sites that are in need of renovation could serve far better as locations for new houses, for example the area of the old Leisure Centre at Stourport.</p> <p>Strain on local resources such as schools and doctor's surgeries.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2058</a>	Object	<p>We object strongly to the above development. The area is unspoilt countryside (Green Belt) and benefits: views, walks, bike rides, dog walking, picnics and observing and appreciating the countryside. Greenfields are accessible to all. We are encouraged to do more exercise for our physical and mental wellbeing. Walking is a cheap and therapeutic form of exercise. Skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds are to be found in the fields</p> <p>The Green Belt is part of our heritage and our children's, once it has disappeared will not be restored.</p> <p>Relevant searches on the immediate area did not reveal plans for the abovementioned development, so why were we not told about the development by the council?</p> <p>How will people on average salary (£26,000) in Kidderminster be able to afford the executive homes which will be built on Green Belt land? People will buy them from further afield,</p> <p>Plenty of brownfield sites in Kidderminster and Wyre Forest areas, among them, former carpet</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>factories/warehouses, e.g. Tomkinsons Carpets at Churchfields, Bouchers Textiles Ltd on Green Street, Lionfields on Worcester Street and Sion Hill Middle School on Sion Hill. Possibly using the facades of the aforementioned buildings (if they have historical significance) and turning them into stylish yet affordable homes... If used for dwellings it would reduce car journeys and pollution. If brownfield sites used it will improve the local environment.</p> <p>Infrastructure has to be further developed. This will increase pressure on health services, schools, bus services and emergency services. This is a substantial argument for greater employment, but will local people get these jobs?</p> <p>Finally, if Green Belt is developed on, good quality agricultural land will be used up and "buying local" means buying from Herefordshire, Gloucestershire and further afield?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2061</a>	Object	<p>I object to option A because it relies on the use of Green Belt land which should be kept for food production.</p> <p>The evidence on size of future population growth/new employment opportunities are unconvincing.</p> <p>Housing on the eastern side of Kidderminster in option A would end up as commuter suburbs and create overwhelming demand on public services.</p> <p>The eastern relief road, which forms part of option A, would funnel increased traffic from new housing onto the already busy A456, A448 and A449 roads esp. at rush hour.</p> <p>Option A offers very little 'affordable housing'.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre should be regenerated and more housing built there.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2088</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While there is a desirable need for town centre redevelopment, particularly in the retail area of Worcester Street, there is no logical sense to build new housing on the Spennells fields.</li> <li>These fields, while serving the local agricultural economy have for many years provided the local community a place of recreation where people of all ages can relax and unwind from their ever increasing pace of life.</li> <li>There is a rich abundance of wildlife thriving all year round. Birds, small insects, butterflies and wild flowers</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and plants all play a part in these fields. It is their habitat and must be allowed thrive without human interference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provisions for schools, hospitals, GP surgeries and other public services will be under further strain.</li> <li>• The road network even with a nearby relief road built will still suffer further congestion with Hagley and Halesowen taking the full brunt of commuter traffic between Kidderminster and Birmingham. The same will apply to commuter traffic from Stourport, Bewdley, Bromsgrove, Worcester and Wolverhampton etc.</li> <li>• The only bus service serving the Spennells is not a reliable service and it wouldn't be able to serve an expanded Spennells estate.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2110</a>	Object	<p>I am particularly objecting to Plan A and the Spennells' fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These fields are used daily for walking, cycling, horse riding, dog walking etc by people for a number of reasons such as recovering from illness/surgery, mental health problems, trying to keep healthy and lose weight, some just to socialise. It is a "feel good" aspect of living which is free.</li> <li>• The fields behind Spennells are used for agriculture. Less locally grown vegetables will mean having to import goods at a higher price, thus making us all poorer; this doesn't make sense to me in this unknown time of Brexit.</li> <li>• Then there is the wildlife on Spennells fields.</li> <li>• The impact of development on infrastructure such as the hospitals, local surgeries, schools.</li> <li>• Traffic - it can take up to twenty minutes to get off the Spennells estate when traffic is heavy. The proposed "relief road" will do nothing to help this, in fact it would probably become a rat run and become dangerous within this built up area.</li> <li>• Brexit will mean less immigration so we will need fewer houses.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2158</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to object to 'Option A' - the proposed development of houses on the Spennells fields.</p> <p>I use these fields every day to travel to and from work. I do this as a healthier option for me, and also a healthier option for the environment. Me and my family also regularly go for walks over the fields on the weekend to take in</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the beauty, fresh and wildlife this area has.</p> <p>By removing this area to use for housing it would mean we wouldn't have somewhere to go that is just on our doorstep. It would mean I may have to drive to work, rather than walk meaning an already congested road system around the area would be a lot more pressured.</p> <p>In addition removing Green Belt land which is already so precious in the area rather than using the Option B area, would mean a lot less Green Belt land lost. Surely this is a much better option for the environment and families around the Spennells area.</p> <p>My preferred option is Option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2167</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is to facilitate the building of the Kidderminster ring road. The resulting bypass would increase traffic, raise noise and emission levels from exhaust fumes, a risk to the health of the local population.</li> <li>• Land is good agricultural land, also used for recreation or leisure purposes, Walking In the countryside offer huge benefit to health saving huge amounts of money and pressure on local healthcare services as a result.</li> <li>• Schools hospitals are already struggling. This plan would put added pressure on the existing education system in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Brownfield sites alone should be a good alternative to expansion of Spennells. Save our countryside ONCE ITS GONE IT GONE</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2169</a>	Object	<p>Development is unnecessary and irrevocably damaging to the local environment. Why build on Green Belt land when there are brownfield sites such as The Lion Works” on Worcester Street, Boucher Textile Engineering Ltd on Green Street which could be made Into apartments, keeping their façades in order to preserve their architectural historicity. Such buildings could actually be purchased by Kidderminster residents. Kidderminster residents could never afford proposed houses.</p> <p>Keeping the countryside is good for local tourism and economy; such as pubs and restaurants which are frequented</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>for their rural charm.</p> <p>Damaging as loss of the habitats of skylarks and linnets, and damaging to residents of Spennells, Stone and surrounding areas. Many use the fields for jogging, walks, picnics and dog walking. Walking is available to young, old, regardless of budget or socio-economic background. We're also being told to buy local British produce, but how can we do this if fields where crops are grown are being developed?</p> <p>Once this rural and unspoilt "green and pleasant land" is gone, it's gone. We must not and will not lose our beautiful English countryside for which our county and Indeed country is renowned.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2181</a>	Object	<p>Object to development There are many Brownfield sites that could be developed. One example of these is a factory on Green street formally called Bouchers Textiles LTD.</p> <p>I use the fields at Spennells for walks with family, dog and friends.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2182</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed expansion of Spennells in the Local Plan review. This objection is for to Options A, B and also the Core housing sites.</p> <p>My reasons for the objection are as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effects on health and wellbeing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Noise pollution from Increase the amount of traffic travelling along the A448.</li> <li>○ Air pollution that will be caused by the construction of development between now and 2034.</li> <li>○ Light and noise pollution that will be caused due to the number of houses in such a small area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The eastern relief road should not still be under negotiation. Residents are not being provided with all the necessary information in order to make an informed decision.</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure to support development – schools, hospitals, doctors, roads.</li> <li>• Increase in vehicle traffic. The roundabout at Stone Manor is already deeply congested at peak rush hour times development will cause further traffic congestion to this area.</li> <li>• Green Belt should be protected for future generations.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are more brownfield sites across Wyre Forest that should be considered prior to building on Spennells Green Belt land. Such as Churchfields, Sion Hill School and areas of Kidderminster town centre which have become abandoned and desolate.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2197</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building on Spennells Green Belt is unnecessary when there are plenty of brown field sites available.</li> <li>Using brown field sites would help regenerate the town.</li> <li>Regenerating existing sites will reduce the need for commuting and extra traffic on stretched infrastructure.</li> <li>Spennells roads/Stanklyn Lane are already gridlocked.</li> <li>Local schools are full.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2233</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Loss of Green Belt and Urban Sprawl:</u></b> Option A would take 2% of the area's Green Belt and would almost double the size of the Spennells estate. Green Belt should only be used in exceptional circumstances; it is to prevent urban sprawl. Inclusion of the Green Belt adjacent to the Spennells estate would join Spennells to Summerfield, Stone, Comberton and Offmore, a huge area of urban sprawl. I suggest that building west of Kidderminster should be take place instead. The expanded Lea Castle site should be fully developed for housing, with associated provision of a primary school, shops etc. The plan has not considered Blakedown. Parking at Kidderminster station cannot be expanded but there is scope at Blakedown. Consideration should also be given to building at Chaddesley Corbett and Wolverley, rather than focusing upon the area joining the east of Kidderminster. The plan should be revised to include this option.</p> <p><b><u>Loss of Agricultural Land:</u></b> The area adjacent to Spennells is very good quality, agricultural land, currently being well farmed and yielding well. This year a fine crop of barley has been harvested from the central field (WFR/ST2) and the fields running from Captains Pool to Stanklyn Lane (OC/13) are currently growing acres of carrots. In past years potatoes, spring onions, peas and sugar beet have been grown, as would not be the case if the land were of lower quality.</p> <p>This very good quality and productive agricultural land, graded as high as any in Worcestershire should not be used for housing, it would be a crime. Where is food to come from if productive land is used for housing? Option B would</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>avoid building upon so much highly productive farmland.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> Large scale development to the SE of Kidderminster would put increased pressure upon the existing roads. The A449, A448 and A456 are already full to capacity at peak times. The proposed Eastern link road would not solve this problem. Moving heavy traffic from one road to another would cause unacceptable noise and pollution from exhaust emissions in a residential area.</p> <p>The B450 already provides a link from the Worcester road to the Birmingham road. If the low railway bridge at Tortan was modified and the roundabout at Mustow Green improved then this route could be used for heavy traffic seeking to avoid Kidderminster.</p> <p>Full use of the extended Lea Castle site, as suggested in Option B, would not put additional pressure upon roads to the east of Kidderminster. Development at Blakedown would have good access to the A456 and the wider motorway system for those heading for work in and around Birmingham.</p> <p>Access to new development through Spennells would lead to existing traffic problems. At peak times there are already long tail backs at both entrances to the estate.</p> <p><b>Rail Transport:</b> Housing adjoining the SE of Kidderminster would be too far from the railway station (1 hours walk or a greatly improved bus service). Is there to be additional parking at the new station? Why does the new station need to be so grand and expensive?</p> <p>Option B with development around the town centre would have much easier access to the station. Inclusion of Blakedown in the plan would give easy rail access.</p> <p><b>Physical and Mental Health Issues:</b> The report raises concerns over the level of obesity within the local population. The footpaths and bridleways within the rural area adjoining the Spennells estate are regularly used by walkers, runners and cyclists seeking to remain fit and healthy. (Wear on footpaths bears witness to this.)</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Access to open countryside and the opportunity to engage with nature is a proven factor in maintaining and improving mental health.</p> <p>I and many like me have chosen to live on Spennells because of the semi rural environment that it offers. Option A would remove this facility by surrounding the estate with a built up area, increasing its size by 85% and making it a more stressful place to live.</p> <p>The report implies that walking and cycling to the town centre will improve the fitness of the population. This is not a realistic expectation for walkers because of the distance involved. Provision for cyclists is not good.</p> <p>I propose that the area adjoining Spennells should remain open countryside (Option B) and continue to be used by all to remain healthy. Provision for cyclists wishing to access Kidderminster town centre should be improved.</p> <p><b><u>Loss of Wildlife Habitat:</u></b> Option A will have a detrimental impact upon wildlife. While the Spennells fields are not areas of great biodiversity, they with their associated hedgerows and the woods and lakes that they enclose, do provide extensive habitat for wildlife that lives and feeds within the area.</p> <p>I regularly see groups of fast flying Bats feeding over my garden and the fields at dusk. <i>In Britain all Bat species and their roosts are protected by British and international legislation.</i> I suspect that there may also be slower flying night feeding bats in the area. I am informed by an expert carrying out research into bat behaviour, that Bats use hedgerows to navigate, building would disrupt feeding patterns. Bats will be using the local pools to drink; lighting associated with housing would disturb them. Before any building takes place research into Bats in the area must take place.</p> <p>There are Badgers in the area. Badgers are fully protected by UK law.</p> <p>I have often heard Foxes in the fields.</p> <p>Skylarks constantly fly above their nests in the fields in Spring and Summer. <i>The skylark is a Red Listed endangered</i></p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><i>species, fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult skylark, or to take, damage or destroy an active nest. The only exception is farming practices that cannot be delayed, although farming methods can often be modified to reduce impact on the skylarks.</i> Late harvesting of corn this year, beyond the end of July, has meant that second batches of young skylarks have had time to fledge.</p> <p>There are also Linnets, another Red listed bird, nesting in the area and wild geese feed upon the stubble fields in the autumn and winter.</p> <p>I have recently seen a Kestrel, another protected species, flying over Spennells fields and a neighbour has photographed it sitting upon her fence.</p> <p>I object to Option A as it would be unlawful in not protecting wildlife and does not encourage biodiversity, one of the council's objectives. Spennells fields should remain as agricultural land which supports wildlife.</p> <p><b><u>Schools and Medical Care and Crime Prevention:</u></b> Expansion to the SE of Kidderminster of the proportions proposed in Option A would put extra strain upon existing infrastructure. It is claimed in the report that a new school will be built to serve the area. Wyre Forest no longer provides new schools. Would an existing academy want to build a new Primary School? 1000 new homes need to be built before a school has to be provided. If just 700 new homes are built where do the children go to school? Where will children of High School age go, King Charles High School does not have room for expansion? The Council are committed to raising educational standards. Higher population would put additional pressure upon existing schools. Larger class sizes do not lead to rising standards. If local schools become full, children would need to travel further afield leading to more pollution from additional traffic.</p> <p>GP surgeries are already struggling to cope with case load. How would the health care of an expanded population be catered for? Worcester hospital is already unable to cope at times of high demand and Kidderminster hospital has been downgraded. Will more money be made available to increase hospital provision or is a poorer standard of care throughout the community to be expected?</p> <p>Expansion to the SE of Kidderminster will almost double the urban area. Greater density of urban areas leads to</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more antisocial behaviour and higher crime figures. Will extra funds be available to increase the police force?</p> <p>Option B, with a more widely dispersed population and major expansion centred on the expanded Lea Castle site would result in less pressure upon the existing infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Conclusion: I strongly object to the proposals laid out in Option A of the Draft Local Plan for Wyre Forest and support the proposals in Option B, as I feel that these best meet the needs of the local area and its people.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2237</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the Option A redevelopment as described in table 6.0.6.</p> <p>I believe the council's fixation on an eastern relief road does not address the congestion issues experienced within Kidderminster town centre. Table 6.0.6 suggests that this road will reduce congestion on the Kidderminster ring road and Horsefair area which. Surely people living in all these new homes around Kidderminster will want to travel into the town centre via the current roads including the ring road to shop etc. An eastern relief road would do nothing in reducing this congestion.</p> <p>This table covers the expansion of new schools. If the council were to choose Option A then the table describes a requirement for 4x 1 form entry expansions to current secondary schools in Kidderminster. Has the Council fully considered this; our secondary schools are already full and there is not the funding/pace for this sort of expansion so pupils in Kidderminster will suffer from increased class sizes and less teaching support leading to lower exam results in the area.</p> <p>It would be most beneficial to concentrate funds on the regeneration of Kidderminster town centre and improve current infrastructure, before the strain of an increased population appears. By improving current infrastructure, like schools, the hospital and bus service then Kidderminster will become a more desirable area to live in and possibly result in increased demand for housing which would then warrant such a development as described in the preferred options document.</p> <p>Table 2.0.1: I wish to comment on this table in relation to the proposed redevelopment, known as option A.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The fields surrounding the Spennells Housing estate are used extensively by residents for activities such as (dog) walking, jogging and riding. I have found the fields to be perfect for jogging, improving both my physical and mental health. Table 2.0.1 in the council's 'Preferred options document' states that the district has problems with high obesity levels; How does the council expect to reduce these levels when the only outdoor safe space for physical activity is taken away? Walking the dog in these beautiful fields also allows residents the time to reflect and get away from their stressful everyday lives. I believe this is very important in maintaining a positive mental outlook and makes Spennells a desirable place to live. By taking this away from the residents I believe Kidderminster will only continue to decline, and with Kidderminster hospital in the state it is in, only encourages an unhealthy population. Furthermore, point 8 of the plan objectives includes maximising 'the benefits of walking and cycling'. Where are residents expected to enjoy these benefits with the redevelopment of this land?</p> <p>It is also imperative to consider the knock-on effect this change would have on the local wildlife in such a green and biodiverse area. Within the Spennells nature reserve we are fortunate enough to hold a population of Black Poplar trees. These are one of Britain's rarest native species which are rapidly reducing in number, hence their protected status under Section 13 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981. If the surrounding fields are no longer Green Belt then this species will not have the space it needs to reproduce and spread further.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2252</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my concerns about the draft Local Plan in particular Option A.</p> <p>Green Belt is a very valuable asset and although I accept that in some cases there may be marginal degraded areas within the Green Belt that could be removed from Green Belt status and usefully redeveloped this does in no way apply to the area between the Spennells and Stanklyn Lane. According to the National Planning Framework Local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts, take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term,</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.</p> <p>There is no good case for removing this area from Green Belt status. Certainly there are no exceptional circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is high quality agricultural land. A light sandy soil with a south facing aspect the soil is quick to warm up in the spring giving crops a good head start and high yields. This is the sort of land we can ill afford to lose to production, especially with the prospect of leaving the EU in the near future we need to aim to be more self-sufficient in agriculture.</li> <li>This is an area with high amenity value, the footpaths and bridleway are well used by walkers, with or without dogs, cyclists and horse riders. Not just from the immediate area.</li> <li>Wildlife, the field margins provide a good habitat to a wide range of wildlife, recently the area has been teeming with butterflies.</li> <li>Birds: This area supports a wide range of birds. In particular very large numbers of larks. Nationally this species is in decline so we can ill afford to lose habitats which support it. I would remind you that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined. Due to its importance such an assessment should definitely take place.</li> </ul> <p>In my Opinion Option B is preferable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2253</a>	Object	<p>I have looked at the local plan review and I object to Option A, as it will use a greater amount of Green Belt land. This will have a dramatic effect on the wildlife in these areas, which once lost can never be enjoyed by future generations. Core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework are that 'planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Local plans should include strategic policies for the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment' There is only one mention made about wildlife, this is the proposed Stourminster site and the badgers that live in the woods, though we have skylarks and other RSPB red-listed birds nesting in this Green Belt area. We also have bats and badgers, protected species, living in the core sites mentioned as well as on the other areas shown in Option A.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The Local plan states ‘As previously stated, there is insufficient sustainably located readily available brownfield or non-Green-Belt land to accommodate the necessary housing and employment growth required in the plan period’ I believe that there are sufficient readily available brownfield sites that can be used before we use the Green Belt land in either Option A or Option B. Of course, builders will prefer to use Green Belt land but we urgently need to regenerate parts of Kidderminster including the rest of Silverwoods, now it is not going to be used for the Emergency Services Hub, Worcester St, Bromsgrove St, Sladen School, Sion Hill School and Park Lane. All of these sites should be used for housing, before we use our Green Belt land. There are also brownfield sites available in Stourport e.g. Bewdley Rd.</p> <p>I object to Option A as it will mean creating a huge amount of housing on the eastern side of Kidderminster this will put pressure on the doctor’s and dentist’s surgeries and other facilities on this side of town. Planning officers stated that if Option A is taken then a primary school could be provided, this assumes that all children moving into these houses are below the age of 11. King Charles the only secondary school on the eastern side of town is already working on a split site causing problems for teachers and students in wasted time during the school day moving from upper site on Comberton Rd to lower site on Borrington Rd and vice versa. It will also lead to more traffic, air pollution and noise in this area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2256</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why are you not building on brownfield sites before using Green Belt sites?</li> <li>• Why not develop the derelict area in the town centre, for example Sion Hill, Sladen School, Worcester Street and knock down the old Post Office building and develop. Consider building in Blakedown instead.</li> <li>• Increase in noise, traffic and pollution from cars, it will become unsafe for me to play outside and will harm my mental health.</li> <li>• More pressure on local schools, class sizes will be more than the government recommended size, less resources and parents will be using cars to bring children to school so more pollution.</li> <li>• Wildlife will be lost which uses the fields as a source of food and grazing I'd linnets, dormouse and skylarks. The vast majority of the trees on this estate have Tree Preservation Orders on them, they need to be protected.</li> <li>• There will be a loss of agricultural land which is of a good quality.</li> <li>• Public right of way across the fields will be lost. This will affect my mental health and may lead to illness.</li> <li>• Further increase and pressure on doctors surgeries, hospitals, dentists and opticians including schools and</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the nursery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a loss of internet speed and quality.</li> <li>• Drainage issues as the fields are a soak away; the showers would lose water pressure.</li> <li>• Extra buses and traffic will be on the estate and will be a safety issue.</li> <li>• A lot of people use these fields to walk, run, meet friends, recuperate from illnesses, just to get a bit of fresh air, exercise.</li> <li>• Traffic congestion is already an issue as there is only one road on and off the estate, more pollution and more accidents.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2257</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to option A on the following grounds:</p> <p>Kidderminster is historically a town with a carpet industry; which has declined in recent years leaving an unattractive town centre that has many vacant properties, with few shops that will encourage people to this area.</p> <p>If any building takes place on Green Belt this contravenes Government policy of keeping any urban sprawl to a minimum. If any building is carried out on the Green Belt land behind Spennells this will merge Kidderminster into Summerfield, Stanklyn and Stone thus creating a mass of houses. This is a semi- rural area and this boundary should be maintained at all costs.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells are farm land is Grade 2, the best Worcestershire has, as we prepare to leave the EEC we will have to provide more home grown crops for our UK population, we should be ring fencing this type of farmland for the future crop now so we can protect British jobs and reduce our imports and follow what has been suggested by central government becoming more self-reliant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trees on the edge of Spennells are covered by the blanket Tree Preservation Order. These trees now over 50 years old should not be felled.</li> <li>• Bats, Skylarks and Badger sets are all present around the perimeter of Spennells and fields which are protected by British and European Legislation.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By not encouraging Bio diversity you are actually contravening the Councils Planning Policy statement 9.</li> </ul> <p>Many people, not only the residents use these fields for a variety of leisure pursuits, walking, birdwatching, keeping fit and dog walking, running. Government / Local government are trying to encourage this in order to reduce NHS costs by encouraging a healthy lifestyle. Using the local countryside cuts down on vehicle emissions and helps with people's health and well – being both physically and mentally. People would not tend to walk around the streets so this would be a detrimental step to health and well- being.</p> <p>If these houses were built it would put an extra 2000 / 3000 cars onto the road system in rush hour – our road system simply cannot cope with this extra traffic.</p> <p>Rush hour traffic at the viaduct island is already queuing up the Worcester road and this often starts before the children leave school in the afternoon, so what's it going to be like with a further 2000 houses being built.</p> <p>Access to these properties would have to come from behind Spennells due to volume of the extra cars &amp; commercial vehicles and safety. Spennells cannot be used as a "rat run" for any new builds. This must not be allowed to happen.</p> <p>Drainage work has been carried out recently on parts of Spennells to help with insufficient drainage of the area. In the last 20 years Avocet Drive residents have been flooded several times as well as the area around Linnet Rise. If further building work is carried out then this will prevent any natural ground drainage thus creating the potential for further flooding in this area.</p> <p>Heronswood School cannot take any more pupils due to the lack of land.</p> <p>The town centre &amp; surrounding area does not have enough to offer an increasing population, Doctors Surgeries, Dentists, Hospital, Police and shops need to be increased if the population is to expand. Further to this the hospital will need to have more services bought back to Kidderminster.</p> <p>My belief is that any new housing would only attract further people from the Birmingham area thus putting even</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more congestion on the over crowded roads for example Hagley, Halesowen Bypass, Bromsgrove &amp; Worcester. As these roads would not cope, the extra traffic would find alt ways cutting through side streets etc. causing more pollution and safety issues for those local residents.</p> <p>If Option A goes ahead then all brownfield sites, abandoned buildings and all empty properties should be developed before any green field sites are touched. If building takes place on the Spennells fields it has to be sympathetic to the existing area with pollution kept to a minimum, speed/weight restrictions on any new roads and low intensity housing possibly using it for bungalows to allow the aging generation to downsize, freeing up the larger family homes that are already available.</p> <p>I strongly reject Option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2258</a>	Object	<p>I wish to voice my objection to the proposed further expansion of Spennells and the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>I walk my dogs here regularly, without access to this it would make life very hard for me &amp; the dogs.</p> <p>I also use the road twice daily to commuted to work and the traffic is bad enough as it is queuing up to the roundabout at Stone....another 1735 new homes would cause major chaos on the road.</p> <p>This is not a good idea; the knock on effect will have far reaching consequences.</p> <p>As pointed out by Spennells Against Further Expansion, there are plenty of brownfields site within Kidderminster which would be a far more sensible option for regeneration.</p> <p>Please stop this madness and save our Green Belt!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2260</a>	Object	<p>I object to option A of the Local development plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Kidderminster is historically a market town with a carpet industry. This industry has almost completely disappeared with an unattractive town centre that is full of empty properties, minimum shops that will encourage people to the</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>area.</p> <p>If building takes place on Green Belt this contravenes Government policy of keeping the urban sprawl to a minimum. Historically urban sprawl policy has been to keep areas of Green Belt to minimise this. By building on the Green Belt behind the Spennells estate you will merge Kidderminster into Summerfield and Stanklyn stretching also to Stone. We are a semi-rural area and this boundary should be maintained.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells are Grade 2 farm land which is the best Worcestershire has. As we leave the EEC we will need to provide more home grown crops for the population, therefore we should keep valuable farm land for this purpose.</p> <p>When I visited the roadshow at Heronswood School no representative was available from Highways to discuss the proposed road. The local planning officers appeared or unwilling to answer any questions with a blanket response, “well it’s a draft plan we don’t know.”</p> <p>No information was forthcoming on how you propose to cross the railway or the type of road surface, lighting etc. that would be needed, other than it would serve the houses only no other traffic would use it.</p> <p>In my opinion this is not thought through at all as large lorries would use this to get to the Worcester Road to avoid the Black Bridge or vice versa with its height restriction.</p> <p>The implications of this road to Spennells residents are the following:</p> <p>Light pollution – lighting would be required, and as the road would be used by 44 ton trucks high, bright lighting would be needed especially as a bridge flyover would be needed to clear the railway line.</p> <p>Noise pollution – the increase in traffic would increase the noise in the area, the road surface would need to be of a type that keeps noise to a minimum.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Air pollution – this would be increased and is detrimental to health and well being.</p> <p>Environmental &amp; Countryside grounds – this area at the present time has a number of trees that are on the edge of Spennells and are covered by the blanket Tree Preservation Order. These trees are over 70 years old and should not be felled. There are also Badger setts, Skylarks and Bats all of which are protected by British and European Legislation.</p> <p>By not encouraging biodiversity you are contravening the Councils Planning Policy statement 9.</p> <p>Health grounds – many people, not only residents, use the fields for a variety of leisure pursuits; walking, birdwatching, keeping fit and dog walking. The government and local government are trying to encourage this to reduce costs to the NHS. Using the countryside locally not only cuts down on vehicle emissions but helps with people's health and well- being both physically and mentally. People would not walk around streets so this would be a detrimental step to health and well-being.</p> <p>At the moment congestion on Spennells at particular times can build up, if more traffic was accessing the newly built properties it would cause excessive problems. Therefore I do not think that if houses are built on the fields behind Spennells access should be from the existing Spennells area.</p> <p>Drainage work is currently underway on part of Spennells to help with insufficient drainage of the area. In the last 20 years Avocet Drive residents have been flooded several times as well as the area around Linnet Rise.</p> <p>Heronswood School would not be able to accommodate any more pupils due to the lack of land. This may have been hampered by the Council's lack of insight, had the Council built a middle school as well as a first school originally as they had planned this would have helped accommodate a greater number of pupils.</p> <p>The town centre and surrounding area does not have enough to offer an even greater population, Doctors Surgeries, Dentists and shops need to be increased if the population is to expand along with more services being bought back to the local hospital which in hindsight should never have been down-graded, but again local people were side-lined and ignored on local issues. I do however wonder where this population increase will come from as the growth of</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the Wyre Forest has not been overly large and I question whether the figures being given are a true reflection of the population growth we can expect as the figures quoted by Wyre Forest appear to be much higher than those proposed by other Government departments.</p> <p>I am also concerned that we are being used as an overflow of the Greater Birmingham area, this incoming population would not be working locally but Kidderminster would become a commuter town to Birmingham and surrounding areas. The road infrastructure to areas beyond Wyre Forest is already congested so I would question what measures are being put in place to upgrade roads to Hagley, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Worcester, and Bromsgrove to access the motorway systems.</p> <p>In summary I would say that until Kidderminster has a thriving shopping area, employment through local industry we should be very careful about building housing to accommodate another areas overflow, particularly as reports are now showing that as we withdraw from Europe many people are returning to their own homelands, so we could end up with empty properties built on the Green Belt thus losing valuable farm land forever.</p> <p>Should option A go ahead I feel we should insist that all brownfield and empty properties should be developed before any green field sites and if building takes place on the Spennells fields it should be sympathetic to the existing area with pollution kept to a minimum, speed/weight restrictions on any new roads and low intensity housing possibly with this land used for bungalows which would allow the aging generation to move from larger homes to allow younger families to have the larger family homes already available.</p> <p>For the above reasons and my belief that building should be kept within the footprint already here I prefer option B and object to option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2263</a>	Object	<p>I write in relation to the Local Plan Review Consultation for Spennells estate in Kidderminster. I would like it known I strongly object to Option A and Option B.</p> <p>I shall outline my reasons below:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be an increase in traffic, noise and pollution from cars. This will have a detrimental effect on our</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>mental health and wellbeing. Unsafe for our children to play out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be an increased pressure on local schools. The class size will become too large and there would be fewer resources available to the students. Parents will have to bring their children to school in their car; again which will have an increase in pollution.</li> <li>• There is a good variety of wildlife in the area which will be lost, that nest on the fields i.e. Linnets, Skylark, dormouse etc. Wildlife should be protected. Also a lot of the trees on Spennells have preservation orders on them. Impact on the wildlife which feeds and grazes the land is to be protected.</li> <li>• It will have a loss of agriculture land which is of a good quality.</li> <li>• There is a public right of way on these fields which would be lost, which would contribute towards our mental health.</li> <li>• There would be a large increase in pressure on already stretched services for Doctors surgeries, hospitals, dentists and opticians, school and nursery on Spennells.</li> <li>• These fields are an important/integral part of the Spennells estate as a lot of people use the fields in a variety of ways. For instance, just going out for a stroll, walking their dog, riding/training their horses, children playing, running/jogging training, to recuperate from illness, exercise and interaction with friends for a walk and chat.</li> <li>• There is already an issue with traffic trying to get off Spennells during the day, this new development will only make matters a lot worse, more accidents can occur. There will be an increase in noise and car pollution which again has an effect on mental health. Extra pressure on our roads, more potholes to fill in after winter, heavy congestion.</li> <li>• Loss of internet speed and quality.</li> <li>• Extra busses and traffic which will be a safety issue for adults and children alike.</li> <li>• There will be drainage issues as the fields would be a good resource for soak away, showers will lose pressure.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2265</a>	Object	<p>Please find below my views and consequential objections to Option A for large scale development of fields adjacent to Spennells.</p> <p>As a layman in these situations it is my understanding however that planning policy should not conflict with adjacent</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>land use and there must be no adverse effect on existing properties typically in terms of overlooking, loss of light, noise or other disturbance such as existing enjoyment of property and the loss of well used recreational spaces for all ages.</p> <p>This proposed high density development will in no doubt adversely affect the intrinsic environmental value and rural character of the local landscape and as such will cause serious harm to the local wildlife with specific reference to birds of 'conservation concern' of which there are species of 'Red Listed' status nesting in these fields. It may also be the case that the Governments own National Planning Policy Framework could be compromised in terms of the loss of recreational areas, checks on unrestricted sprawl, wildlife and regulations that keep our air clean.</p> <p>The proposed scope of this development is on such a vast scale it will clearly dominate the local area and in turn significantly impact on the existing Spennells estate especially as the proposed feeder road is allegedly planned to run between the A449 and the A458 behind existing housing. Whilst there appears to be no current detailed information regarding the feeder road I am assuming that at some point the existing Spennells roads ending adjacent to the fields could well be opened up giving the new development access to the Spennells estate.</p> <p>As stated above, this development will result in the loss of the natural environment and the eradication of available and accessible open space and its consequential effects and also the loss of good quality productive food producing agricultural land. This is not poor Green Belt land; it has enormous value in many ways and should be preserved at all cost.</p> <p>If the proposed Option A development were to be approved, it would create a poor precedent and as such make it difficult for the Planning Appeals Commission for instance to refuse similar developments on green field sites. It is not just a case of trying to incorporate local concerns into the designs for such a vast project but perhaps more the case that the development concerns cannot be 'designed out'.</p> <p>It should be recognised that the cumulative impact associated with any such vast singular development severely affects the character of the area and the resultant overload of local services including but not limited to, local schools, hospitals, doctors, fire services, public transport etc. Tourism and commercial development could also be</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>adversely affected if visitors and business find the Kidderminster area impossible to negotiate.</p> <p>Road safety has been at the forefront of local concern for quite some time now and speeding especially in the Spennells area seems to get worse year on year. With a potential for many hundreds of additional vehicles trying to negotiate Kidderminster's already crowded roads, the grid lock conditions currently the norm at rush hour, will only increase current problems not least of all the exhaust fume emissions. It seems ludicrous therefore to propose nearly 2000 new homes and associated vehicles into an already congested co2 and noise polluting urban traffic system.</p> <p>With the general trend of devolution of Central Government responsibility, many important decisions on open spaces are now being made at a local level whilst still hopefully maintaining government policies on preserving open spaces. Whilst local authorities may gain from financial contributions intended to be spent on offsetting the effects of such new developments it should not be the driving force behind this vast development. Councillors must push back against all proposals for Option A regardless of any potential accusations from senior officials of being 'anti growth'.</p> <p>It seems to me that Option B is by far the most viable proposal as it clearly allows the dispersal of new build homes across the district and allows much needed improvements to existing roads and infrastructure, area regeneration and in some cases neighbourhood revival of local families with ties and supportive social networks in the area.</p> <p>I would suggest that the Option A proposal must not succeed for the many good and valid reasons given.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2266</a>	Object	<p><b>Social issues:</b> The proposed Option A has a disproportionate negative impact on the residents of Spennells and increase the size of Spennells by 87%. Option A will encourage localized sprawl, and the merging of Spennells to Offmore &amp; Comberton. The linear approach of the option will result in amalgamating two estates with very different characteristics. Spennells has very little green space per resident for recreational use such as physical exercise, cycling and off lead dog walking. It would be inappropriate for dogs to be off lead close to the children's play area, which is also close to the main Spennells Valley Road. Street walking ensures all are at the emissions level of any passing vehicle, therefore consideration for increase in respiratory diseases such as asthma must be given. Otherwise it is a car journey to Hartlebury, Habberley, Hurcott or further afield to take a dog for a walk – with increased congestion on the roads and additional emissions.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Green space is necessary to promote physical and mental wellbeing for all generations. The fields to the south of Spennells provide a huge recreational resource for the residents of Spennells, Stone, Stanklyn, Summerfield, Hoo Road, Aggborough, Hill Grove, Oldnall Road. The fields are used by ramblers, ornithologists, photographers, star gazers, cyclists, joggers, horse riders, dog walkers, children, families, and the elderly. The fields encourage a community spirit, which was very publicly highlighted by the protest march to the Town Hall.</p> <p>The LPR identifies the benefits of Green Belt space and the problems faced with modern society - mental wellbeing, obesity, general ill health - then appears to begrudge the residents of its very existence. I know many people who use the fields for exercise to help with medical conditions. This is a free resource, one that is costing the NHS nothing.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter town on the southern flank of Kidderminster will be divisive for the town, as Kidderminster town centre is in desperate need of rejuvenation. If funding to improve housing and small retail units within the town centre is continually overlooked, it will become the future slums – only encouraging existing crime to escalate. A lack of policing within Kidderminster is already a problem, with needles to be found in all parks and drinking on the streets prevalent. The residents of the proposed commuter estate will be encouraged to shop in Birmingham / Worcester and their money spent outside Kidderminster's local economy. Such residents will be disengaged from Kidderminster. I believe Option A sets a precedent to place affluence above need within Kidderminster. Such a blinkered approach will lead to a rise in tension within the community, which is already evident on social media.</p> <p><b><u>Environmental Impact:</u></b> The environmental impact of releasing the Green Belt for development is huge. Two thirds of Green Belt land, is of high value, agricultural land. The London School of Economics supported by the NEA (National Ecosystem Assessment) agree that Green Belt land is high value agricultural land, both in terms of food production and 'cultural services'. The ramifications of Brexit are yet to be felt and the future population growth of the UK very uncertain. Now more than ever the UK needs to hold on to productive agricultural land to ensure consistent food supplies. The land to south of Spennells/Kidderminster is identified as some of the best (most productive), agricultural land within Wyre Forest. We must also look at food miles and carbon footprint.</p> <p>Green Belt space provides the lungs of the planet – climate change makes the value of Green Belt even higher. It is an important factor in the storing of carbon; prevention of flooding and soil protection.</p> <p>The fields to the rear of Spennells play host to a plethora of wild life Bats, Badgers – there are active sets within two of the fields. Corn Buntings, Skylarks both of which are red listed birds. Waxwings that winter visit have been</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>photographed. My list could be endless and is supported by Worcestershire Biological Records Centre.</p> <p><b>Economic impact:</b> PFI's (Private Finance Initiatives), and their scandalously high interest rates have ensured hospitals across the UK have debts that are beyond their control, none more so than 'CRISIS-HIT' Worcestershire Acute Hospital Trust, which has just been named one of the worst trusts in the country for A&amp;E waiting times. This alongside the down grading of Kidderminster Hospital has now put existing resident's lives at risk. Worcestershire Hospital Trust will not be able to support the Pro-Growth Agenda actively pursued within the LPR and supported by WFDC.</p> <p>Doctors are under pressure to take up any existing slack from the hospital service – appointments requiring a weeks notice in some cases. There is a shortage of trained Doctors. So where will funding come from to extend existing practices or Doctors to open new practices? This argument extends to NHS Dentists.</p> <p>Educational standards within WFDC are lower than national average. 1000 homes required before a feeder school built. The LPR implies the 6000 'required homes' will be phased in over the time span covered by the LPR, averaging 360 homes per year. This potentially takes us up to a three year period of (continual) development on one site before additional school requirement is deemed necessary – then put out to tender. Shoehorning children into existing schools will only mean fewer resources per capita and poorer learning outcomes. Children from Silverwoods development are currently attending Heronswood Primary School. A distance that requires a car journey – not only adding to congestion on the estate during peak traffic times, but poorer health outcomes for children not being able to walk to school – perhaps we need to revisit obesity here! We currently have a population bulge within primary schools. These children will all need to receive higher education and at present that provision will again be met by existing secondary schools operating at full capacity. Where will additional children be educated? Portacabins?</p> <p>GCSE results in Wyre Forest are lower than national average, standards in schools need raising not diluting by increased pressure.</p> <p>In-migration will add to the pressure of Wyre Forest's frontline services. If finances can't provide a safe level of cover now it is blinkered to believe more housing equals more tax for better services, because more tax equals more people and more people equals more demand - status quo.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter estate with a road that provides a direct corridor to Birmingham, Worcester and associated Motorways will ensure money from the south of Kidderminster will not be spent within the local</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>economy. There is very little to draw people into the town centre and it is not true to say online shopping is the cause. Lincoln and Leicester are good examples of how to manage a vibrant community - independent, small, eclectic shops working alongside flagship stores despite the availability of online shopping. Stourport and Bewdley are more vibrant than Kidderminster. Even Hagley manages to support the village centre.</p> <p>The LPR highlights the need to market Kidderminster as an attractive tourist destination to encourage money into the local economy – an over developed visual approach on the south-eastern flank to Kidderminster will not achieve this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2279</a>	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending.</li> <li>• <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990's and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the congestion that already exists.</li> <li>• <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity.</li> <li>• <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>rural areas. Worcestershire's Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school.</li> <li>• <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion</u> and sprawl at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land.</li> <li>• <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals.</li> <li>• <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall.</li> <li>• <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely.</li> <li>• <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited.</li> <li>• <u>Good place to live</u> – this proposed development does not enhance my surroundings or improve my place to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2280</a>	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending.</li> <li>• <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990's and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>congestion that already exists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity.</li> <li>• <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more rural areas. Worcestershire's Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk.</li> <li>• <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school. I have to drive a lot for my job and this will not help my journey time or experience.</li> <li>• <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion and sprawl</u> at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land.</li> <li>• <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall.</li> <li>• <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees.</li> <li>• <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely. Already happens on the Estate in certain places.</li> <li>• <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited.</li> <li>• <u>Good place to live</u> – I have lived here since 2001 and have regularly used this field for exercise/running. This development will not improve the place where I live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2281</a>	Object	I am particularly concerned to make representations concerning the Council's Option A, requiring the massive re-designation of valuable Green Belt land to the south-east of Kidderminster and to make reference to the Council's

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>stated objectives.</p> <p><b><u>Objective: To determine where houses are to be sited.</u></b></p> <p>This objection, to the Council's apparent preference of Option A as its selected area for major development, clearly shows why this option is the lesser appropriate of the 2 choices offered for public review. It also suggests that there are various other potential alternative sites, available to relieve pressure on the Council to re-designate Green Belt for housing and infrastructure.</p> <p>Incidentally, it's common practice for planners to avoid urban development across ridges into valleys, in order to take account of visual intrusion into surrounding countryside. The existing Kidderminster boundary is so screened from Summerfield. Selection of Option A would extend the boundary into the valley occupied by Stanklyn Lane, with the next ridge being a further half mile, or so, away at Shenstone. That visual intrusion could be seen as unacceptable to Summerfield residents, who will quite reasonably wish to perpetuate separation of their village from the town, both physically and visually.</p> <p>The mere nature of a mega-estate with little or no open space makes it environmentally unattractive and, as such, that prospect should be avoided.</p> <p><b><u>Objective: To provide necessary Infrastructure (transport, schools, health etc.)</u></b></p> <p>Consideration has to be given to the significant needs and the problems emanating from planned urban expansion including (a) the need for new surgeries and the lack of qualified doctors/nurses, (b) similar considerations for dental and other health services, (c) Hospital provision (Worcestershire Royal is already at breaking point), (d) a really substantial increase in the need for school places (new developments always attract young families), (e) the current lack of local bus services and the apparent inability to improve the situation, etc. Importantly, it has to be established if it's practical to provide these services and if Government money will be made available, as the cost, which will undoubtedly increase substantially over the period of the Plan, should not be borne by the local purse.</p> <p>The practicality and affordability of providing (a) road access, (b) gas supplies at required pressure - already low at peak times, (c) electricity, (d) water and sewerage, remain questionable – there's been little change since the existing Spennells Estate was developed and previous investigations considered by Tribunal identified that such works can be potentially problematical and costly.</p> <p>If Option A were to be selected:</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road access will present a particular problem, (<b>see also *** below</b>).</li> <li>• There's every possibility that 'Severn Trent Water' would still have "supply difficulties .... which would cause financial problems"</li> <li>• The cost and practicality of contract works, and the adequacy of the water table to supply water to a massively extended Spennells Estate, will presumably need to be determined.</li> <li>• The difficulty of dealing with surface water is another issue, requiring investigation. It's believed there's no natural drainage from the valley surrounding Stanklyn Lane and that the 'run off' from the proposed development would simply exacerbate the problem.</li> <li>• Existing foul sewers are unlikely to have the capacity to handle sewerage from a vastly expanded estate. It's understood there's a small 'pumping station' in Summerfield (Wychavon) but, it's probable that entirely new contract works, with related costs and difficulties, will be necessary.</li> <li>• Broadband has now become a further consideration.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Objective: To avoid traffic congestion and resulting health and nuisance issues.</u></b></p> <p>There should be no need for new motorways and trunk roads, but simply to improve communications to resolve local issues.</p> <p>In this context, any proposal for development of Green Belt between Spennells, Stone and Summerfield is premature. It is questionable as to how the proposed site can be served by roads. There are two road exits from the existing Spennells Estate on to Spennells Valley Road which, at times, are already heavily congested. These exits could not possibly cope with a massive expansion of the estate, which would simply exacerbate existing traffic problems and certainly not provide safe pedestrian and vehicular access. Any decision to select Option A, therefore, should not be concluded until it can be established that additional access is both practical and affordable.</p> <p>It's reasonable to submit that further development of Spennells would require a completely separate road network. The only obvious alternative being access from Stanklyn Lane, which is not practical, as the existing junction with Worcester Road is already dangerous and inadequate for present needs. Access to the Bromsgrove Road is understood to have similar difficulties.</p> <p>It can only be assumed that the Council's plans are reliant upon the future potential for the construction of the long-postponed Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, which would require massive expenditure, including for the bridging of the railway from Worcester Road. The financing of any such project would be the responsibility of Worcestershire</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>County Council and, presumably require Government financing. Recognising that available finance is extremely difficult to secure and that the Government has many other major priorities, it has to remain in doubt as to whether such a major project would receive the necessary backing.</p> <p>It goes without saying that increased volumes of traffic = more emissions = more illness and early deaths, noise pollution, vehicular and pedestrian hazards, nuisance etc. The Council's planning does not appear to have addressed this problem, which has no obvious solution.</p> <p><b><u>Green Belt is valued</u></b></p> <p>The countryside (particularly Green Belt), is a valuable asset in its own right. It should be safeguarded, and indeed restored where possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The economy of Wyre Forest is to a large extent dependent on tourism and the District's natural environment is part of its attraction.</li> <li>• The Worcestershire Wildlife Trust is aware that the land designated for Option A has, for many years been habitat for nesting skylarks and more recently to substantial flocks of corn buntings, varying numbers of wintering fieldfares, redwings and waxwings. Song thrushes have returned, as have linnets, house sparrows and starlings, all of which appeared amongst the 67 species identified on a recent 'Red List' of endangered species. Even the herring gulls we see in our fields are on that list. We are also privileged to share our local area with swallows, goldfinches, greenfinches, chaffinches, siskins, jays, carrion crows, rooks, nuthatches, dunnocks, great spotted and green woodpeckers, kestrels, buzzards, tawny owls, and other bird species. The area is also home to various moth and butterfly species, most of which are in serious decline, foxes, badgers, rabbits and, importantly, bats ... a really fantastic biodiversity to protect!</li> <li>• The Green Belt provides a buffer zone between the large urban areas and the pleasant surrounding country residential areas of Stone and Summerfield.</li> <li>• Retention of Green Belt avoids the possibility of the whole area becoming a built up urban sprawl.</li> <li>• It's an invaluable asset for public recreational use – Healthy exercise and relaxation, use of the bridle path and public rights of way for walking, jogging/running, , horse riding, dog walking, nature /bird watching etc. and simply the peaceful enjoyment of open 'green space'.</li> <li>• Agriculture – It was confirmed in writing, some years ago, but nevertheless still relevant, that most of the land in question (Option A), had been surveyed by the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food and had</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>been classified as “Grade 2, with a small proportion falling within Grade 3a”. It was then made clear by the Ministry that this land is “of a high quality and should be retained in agricultural production”.</p> <p><b><u>Objective: The protection of, and support for the role of the Green Belt - limited strategic release.</u></b></p> <p>The Green Belt is an important aspect of regional planning.</p> <p>The Council has had a Green Belt Review carried out by Planning Consultants, as part of the Wyre Forest Local Plan. It’s apparent however that, until recently, there’s been no public consultation on this issue.</p> <p>Every effort should be made to retain this important asset for the District. The Green Belt gives legal protection to the English countryside, whilst avoiding urban sprawl, notwithstanding the significant pressures being put on Councils to provide for unrealistic housing and infrastructure.</p> <p>The Council’s planning, so far as it relates to Option A, makes no attempt to achieve its stated objective of a “limited strategic release”. It is indeed planning for the wholesale destruction of a most valuable, local asset.</p> <p>N.B. If this plan were to go ahead, there would be little, if any, remaining Green Belt where Kidderminster (Wyre Forest) adjoins the District of Wychavon.</p> <p><b><u>Access to Option A and other potential alternatives</u></b></p> <p>If, and only if, all other avenues have been investigated and it is established beyond doubt that there is no other alternative than to remove some selected areas from Green Belt protection, it will be entirely preferable for the burden to be shared, so far as possible. All interested parties will have some empathy with the efforts of other groups to protect their local environment and most will have persuasive representations. However, the foremost considerations in such circumstances must essentially be the comparative practicality and cost of constructing access to the selected land and the provision of related infrastructure. In selecting Option A, the Council is gambling on the most unlikely prospect of a massive injection of Government money to finance the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road.</p> <p><b><u>Objective: To give due consideration to Nature protection issues.</u></b></p> <p>Clearly the proposed development of massive areas of countryside, including Green Belt to the south and east of Kidderminster, takes very little consideration for the protection of nature in this area. It simply suggests that other areas may have been given more favourable consideration. The value to nature of the land designated as Option A, particularly to endangered species of birds and bats, is the subject of earlier comment. To develop this land will,</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>therefore, be counter-productive in achieving the Council's objective.</p> <p><b><u>Objective: To help resolve traffic issues in Kidderminster by providing an alternative route for through traffic and enhancing rail services.</u></b></p> <p>Comments concerning the reliance on Government funding and the lack of any certainty regarding the construction of the long-planned Kidderminster Eastern Relief road are given above. The Council should re-address this objective. The rebuilding of the Rail station at Kidderminster will result in a much better image for the town, as will a new bus station on Comberton Hill. It will, however, be much more difficult to persuade rail operators to enhance the quality and regularity of services and the cost of public transport generally is offputting. Neither rail nor bus services are relevant to the objections included in this communication.</p> <p>The local traffic issues on Spennells have been created by the excessive use of land for housing and past failure to plan adequate vehicular access for such a large residential area. To proceed with plans to develop Option A without planning an entirely new road access, irrespective of proposals for through traffic, will simply exacerbate the problem and, for that reason, any consideration of this option is premature.</p> <p><b><u>Summary</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents may be forgiven for believing that local planning is bureaucratic and unproductive and, that their participation is unlikely to make a difference. Since the widespread loss of valuable agricultural land was identified after World War II and the Town &amp; Country Planning Act of 1947 established rules for the long term protection of farmland and the monitoring of planning decisions, land loss to urban sprawl has continued at an increasingly alarming rate. That will, if allowed to continue, decimate most of the Country's green spaces. This 'creeping' phenomenon is now seriously threatening quality of life in Wyre Forest and must be addressed. It cannot be reasonable for planning 'blight' to continue enforcing one new housing development after another, each leapfrogging over the last incursion into Green Belt, ad infinitum.</li> <li>Spennells was originally planned in the late 1970's/ early 1980's, as a 'village type' development. In subsequent years, however, this ambition has got completely out of hand. Further expansion and consequent deterioration of residents' quality of life is, in itself unacceptable but, where does this stop? Continuing development is self-perpetuating. It goes without saying that more roads/industry/housing = more population = more development = more need for development land, ad infinitum. It's important therefore, for planners to keep expansion under control and take account of the damage being done to a</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>desirable residential district by an over-indulgence in the use of tarmac, concrete, bricks and mortar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The National Planning Policy Framework, as the main statement of Government policy, explains that Green Belt is fundamentally designed “to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open”; the essential characteristics being “openness” and “permanence”. Any decision to remove that “permanent” protection should only be considered therefore, in the most exceptional circumstances. It has to be recognised that, once Green Belt protection is lost and land developed, it can never be returned to the countryside. Indeed, the loss of that protection simply puts under threat the next area of our countryside environment. Green Belt protection should therefore be the first consideration of any Local Authority’s Structure Plan.</li> <li>No Green Belt land should be lost unless it can be shown beyond doubt that there’s an imperative need which cannot be resolved in any other way. The land designated as Option A has been previously proposed by the County Council for re-designation but after due consideration by Planning Tribunal has retained its protected status.</li> <li>The existing Green Belt in Wyre Forest and, specifically that between Spennells Estate, Summerfield and Stone has functioned well for the last 35/40 years or so and, has continued to achieve its objectives. ,</li> <li>Should it be established beyond doubt that there is no alternative than to plan for selective development of Green Belt, there are more suitable alternatives to Option A, including those designated as ‘core’ sites. The main considerations are (a) ease of access (b) uncertainty of the availability of Government finance, (c) fewer problems in providing infrastructure/services and, (d) relative development costs.</li> <li>Wyre Forest District Council was successful in supporting the Spennells Valley Residents’ Association, in 1983, when objecting to the County Council’s Structure Plan proposal to remove from the Green Belt the land now designated as Option A. There has been much changed in the meantime but, if the District Council is to press on with its apparent preference for development of Option A, residents should have sight of the Council’s objections to the Hereford &amp; Worcester County Structure Plan, for which an Examination in Public was held in October 1983. There will undoubtedly be continuing issues even after the passage of time.</li> </ul> <p>And finally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Protection of Green Belt is of much greater value than that of open countryside.</b></li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2282</a>	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending.</li> <li>• <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990's and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the congestion that already exists.</li> <li>• <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity.</li> <li>• <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more rural areas. Worcestershire's Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk.</li> <li>• <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school. I have to drive a lot for my job and this will not help my journey time or experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion</u> and sprawl at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land.</li> <li>• <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals.</li> <li>• <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall.</li> <li>• <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees.</li> <li>• <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Already happens on the Estate in certain places.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited.</li> <li>• <u>Good place to live</u> – I have lived here since 2001 and have regularly used this field for exercise/running. This development will not improve the place where I live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2283</a>	Object	<p>Having attended one of the consultation events, I wish to object to both option A and B that relate to expansion of the fields behind Spennells Estate on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Insufficient information and evidence</u> at the consultation with regard to reasons why the expansion of Spennells Estate is necessary and the potential impact that either option will have on the population, residents, infrastructure and environmental issues. Residents unable to fully engage with minimal information from the council staff attending.</li> <li>• <u>Population in our area</u> has been static since early 1990's and therefore, I see no substantive evidence to suggest that the population is likely to grow to anything like the projections stated in the Local Plan. Furthermore, the restrictions being placed on migrants now and post-Brexit suggest that population will not increase significantly. The projections being stated are purely speculative. There is no reason for people to move to Kidderminster in large numbers and they would not move here for work. Those who will move here will continue to commute to Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham and will continue to add to the congestion that already exists.</li> <li>• <u>All brownfield sites</u> in the region should be exhausted as should empty housing and buildings before any Green Belt should be considered. Recent communications from the council have suggested that there are sufficient brownfield sites to accommodate the housing needs. There is no substantive evidence to conclude that expansion into Green Belt land is a necessity.</li> <li>• <u>Climate change/CO2 emissions</u> – Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy already acknowledges that Worcestershire has a higher than West Midlands average of CO2 emissions due to domestic and transport</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>emissions. Higher emissions are found along major concentration of roads with lower emissions in more rural areas. Worcestershire's Planning Policy to reduce CO2 emissions by reducing the need to travel is contrary to what is being proposed with this development and does not provide any evidence to show how such proposals contribute to the national objective of reduction in CO2 by 2050. Removal of the Green Belt would mean residents would have to travel by car to a green space whereas now they can walk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Traffic congestion</u> leading from Spennells to Worcester Road, Comberton, Kidderminster railway station and Mustow Green is already heavy, particularly morning and evenings and start and end of the school day. Increasing the number of houses and subsequent traffic both for the estate and through traffic will do nothing but add to the existing problem. Each household will have at least two cars. We have seen significant increases in cars on Spennells over the last 15 years as families have grown up and children have purchased cars. There is also difficulty in finding sufficient car parking now where you have more than two cars and so people are parking in other roads to compensate. This also has issues relating to pedestrian safety especially with children walking to school.</li> <li>• <u>The overbearing nature of the expansion and sprawl</u> at Spennells affecting the population/over-population, character, beauty of the landscape whilst impacting on noise levels, disturbance, reduction in privacy, potential overlooking and proximity to green space. Also encroachment and sprawl towards Stanklyn Lane. This is not poor quality land.</li> <li>• <u>Healthy individuals and community</u> – Residents use the fields for walking and exercise whether that be cycling, dog walking, running to name a few, each day and the loss of this space will affect health and personal wellbeing. Proximity of the green open space increases levels of physical activity. This informal recreational space makes it a good place to live. It also created a space for other interaction with residents. Worcestershire Council Green Infrastructure Strategy makes particular reference to the importance of spaces such as this for activity and mental health. This is a key health matter, which will not be helped by these proposals.</li> <li>• <u>Flood Risk/Climate Change</u> - Loss of Green Belt land has the potential to increase the flood risk as there will be an obvious reduction in ground to absorb water. House building and residents need for parking will mean that even small green lawns will disappear to accommodate that aspect. This already happens. Worcestershire Planning Policy states that we should minimize hard land surfacing and hard landscaping in recognition that climate change is seeing and will see surface water increase due to short intense periods of rainfall.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Natural Environment</u> – the NPPF states that we should create, protect, enhance and manage green infrastructure and bio-diversity. We should minimize pollution and other adverse effects on our local and natural environment. We should conserve landscape and scenic beauty, tranquillity and the riches of wildlife. These proposals present potential unacceptable risks from pollution on health, natural environment and general amenity/recreation. The policy also states that any plans should allocate land that is of least environmental value. The fields house a host of wildlife including bats, sparrow hawks, skylarks, waxwings and badgers. The land is sometimes left as a natural habitat attracting the very insects that is encouraged e.g. butterflies and bees.</li> <li>• <u>Increased anti-social behaviour and crime</u> – with the doubling of the size of Spennells, this is highly likely.</li> <li>• <u>Infrastructure</u> – no indication as to the needs of local schools, places available and where and the resultant increase in traffic. Traffic already heavy to Heronswood, Comberton and King Charles 1. Increased demands on public health, refuse, road maintenance. Medical services – what impact on obtaining doctor and dental services and hospital facilities? Worcester hospital is already in special measures and unable to cope with demand. Kidderminster services limited.</li> <li>• <u>Good place to live</u> – this proposed development does not enhance my surroundings or improve my place to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2291</a>	Object	<p>Why use green fields when there are Brownfield sites which will help regenerate Kidderminster.</p> <p>Houses are required but with this comes more schools, health facilities and roads. Green Belt must be protected for the future.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2292</a>	Object	<p>Concern regarding Spennells, we use the proposed areas for jogging. Dog walking; relieve stress, bridle paths for to ride horses.</p> <p>More houses would affect the local primary school by increasing class sizes and reducing resources per student, they are already stretched now.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt, loss of wildlife habitat, skylarks, linnets, badges, hedgehogs and field mice.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Increased pollution both noise and emissions from heavier traffic which will increase the risks to our health and well being.</p> <p>It is good quality agricultural land which should be used to grow food reducing our carbon footprint.</p> <p>Alternative land should be found as there are plenty of unused, derelict properties and grounds that could be used instead for homes instead of destroying countryside.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2293</a>	Object	Object to the proposal to develop Green Belt land at Spennells. Will exacerbate already bad traffic congestion; ruin the countryside which is extremely important for physical and mental wellbeing. Please consider the wider impact on people than meeting government targets.
	<a href="#">LPPO2294</a>	Object	Object to the proposals at Spennells fields being built upon. It would cause terrible congestion, stop walkers enjoying the countryside; and destroy wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO2299</a>	Object	I do not think the benefits of easier school provision and eastern bypass option outweigh large scale expansion east of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2300</a>	Object	<p>I object to proposed development at Spennells (Option A).</p> <p>We use these fields.</p> <p>Green Belt land - original purpose of Green Belt, was to contain sprawl of urban development and provide green space between towns.</p> <p>Health and wellbeing of residents. Childhood obesity is on the rise, we should encourage children to stay active and healthy by taking regular exercise.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2304</a>	Object	We have regularly used the footpaths from Spennells to Stanklyn Lane, Stone and Captains Pool to relax, walk, jog, cycle and see the wildlife, hedgerows and the agricultural crops. The loss of the Green Belt fields would severely affect our wellbeing and quality of life. Whilst respecting the need for housing developments I believe that this part of the Green Belt, with its strong links to the local community, must be protected.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b>I do not believe, for the following reasons, that the south east of Kidderminster, in particular the fields between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells, are a suitable or sustainable location for urban expansion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WFDC housing strategy in the Preferred Options Document is driven by a desire to build a Kidderminster eastern relief road. It is of concern that the road proposal is not contained in the WFDC 'Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2012)' and that there has not been any visible planning and public consultation for it. The desire for a new road has placed a bias on the proposal for housing developments to the south and eastern side of Kidderminster (core and option A) whilst disregarding other potential areas to the north and outer regions of the town. WFDC are using the government housing demands with potential funding from the housing contractors to remake their case to government for a relief road, regardless of the impact of such a development and road near to existing communities. This appears to be a backdoor approach to planning and shows a total disregard for the communities affected.</li> <li>• The land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane is of the highest agricultural quality in the Kidderminster area and is well managed. The Preferred Options Document is in error as it states that the land is of poor agricultural quality and poorly managed.</li> <li>• The fields between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane are in the Green Belt and combine good agricultural land with a multitude of footpaths, bridle paths and hedgerows. The elevated position also provides views of Stone Church, the Abberley Hills, Habberley, the Clee Hill, the Brown Clee and across Kidderminster. The footpaths and bridle ways are well worn and used extensively by Spennells, Stanklyn, Stone and Summerfield communities for walking, jogging, cycling, dog walking and horse riding. They are also accessible for people of all ages. Loss of this Green Belt would deprive the community of a much used and valued open space, essential for their health and wellbeing in this age of stress and obesity.</li> <li>• If the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane are built on then accessible open spaces for residents will be lost as the Green Belt to the south of Stanklyn lane does not have public access.</li> <li>• Building on this elevated area of Green Belt would have a significant visual impact on Spennells Summerfield and Kidderminster alike, particularly for those residents who are adjacent to the Green Belt.</li> <li>• The elevated position of the fields has caused flash flooding to Spennells residents on two occasions to my knowledge. Building on the fields could increase the risk.</li> <li>• The Spennells community is large and further expansion could not be accommodated by the school. The school acquired the community hall to accommodate current levels of intake.</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion during Spennells School opening and closing times is already high, further housing development would render this intolerable.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2306</a>	Object	<p>Object to proposed development on Green Belt land between Spennells Estate, Stanklyn Lane, A448 and the A449.</p> <p>Spennells is one of the largest estates in the Wyre Forest area, but because of the fields and footpaths everybody can walk into countryside. There are no public footpaths south of Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>New relief road will add to pollution and traffic around Kidderminster making the A449 even busier. Often long queues starting before the Black Bridge. Encourage lorries to stay on the motorway and not head for Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2312</a>	Object	<p>Option A. Building on fields at Spennells. Locals and others enjoy walking, walk dogs, countryside, enjoy nature.</p> <p>Relief road - poorly thought out as 5 junctions between new Hoobrook/Stourport Rd relief road and Droitwich Road turnoff which causes long tailbacks for all especially at peak times.</p> <p>Currently getting out of our lane is a nightmare as very busy and been the scene of numerous accidents. This will only get worse if more traffic is added.</p> <p>More pollution to the local area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2315</a>	Object	<p>Object to the Spennells proposal.</p> <p>We need more houses, but only if the residents have local jobs, therefore encourage investment in industry for the town.</p> <p>We need a better transport infrastructure, upgrade the A456, and A449 to a dual carriage way.</p> <p>We need improved rail infrastructure, we need more trains, and bigger trains. A large number of homes would need</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>more energy whereas a smaller number of homes could benefit from a solar/wind farm.</p> <p>The bypass from Stourport road to Worcester Road has eased traffic going towards Kidderminster but prior to it, at peak times is backed. Roads need sorting before more housing or better public transport.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2319</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Option A - Spennells development.</li> <li>• Recently moved to the area and the main attractions were the countryside and views.</li> <li>• Have opportunity for exercise and do leisurely activities such as bike rides, walking etc. regardless of financial status.</li> <li>• Countryside is good for our wellbeing.</li> <li>• Our children enthuse about the local wildlife.</li> <li>• Children from nearby schools visit these fields to appreciate the wildlife.</li> <li>• Once Green Belt is gone it will not be restored.</li> <li>• Concrete playground is no substitute for green fields.</li> <li>• Our solicitor did relevant searches on the immediate area - they were not told about this development by the council.</li> <li>• Local people will not be able to afford new homes built on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• There are plenty of brownfield sites which could be used instead to create affordable homes - therefore reducing car journeys and pollution.</li> <li>• Using brownfield sites would improve the local environment.</li> <li>• Good quality agricultural land will be lost if Green Belt land is developed - how are we expected to buy local produce and reduce carbon footprint if it is not produced locally.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2328</a>	Object	<p>Looking at the proposals it appears that there are plenty of brownfield sites already available for redevelopment which should be used before any new areas are considered for development.</p> <p>The case for such a large increase in house building in the area appears to be based mainly on optimistic guess work which will need a large expansion of the employment prospects within the area. This at the present time appears most unlikely. If the employment prospects are not available a large increase in housing will bring in people who</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>become commuters and the current infrastructure, roads and rail, will not cope with this, meaning large investment in the area. Is this funding available in the current economic climate, which with Brexit about to happen could well cause economic cutbacks to extend well into if not beyond the local plan period.</p> <p>The area to the rear of Spennells estate in option A should remain in the Green Belt. The footpath/bridleway and the edges of the fields are currently used for people exercising and walking their dogs, not all of these people are Spennells residents. I object to this facility being lost as we are all urged by the Government and medical professions to take more exercise to keep healthy.</p> <p>The fields are currently productive from an agricultural viewpoint, if this land is reclassified this will be a loss not only to the farmer but to the country as a whole. I therefore object to the reclassification on these grounds as with Brexit approaching we are told we need to be more self-sufficient in our food/drink needs. The Barley regularly grown on these fields must help with this need.</p> <p>There is a small coppice adjacent to the southern boundary of Spennells, this includes several Scots Pine and Oak trees all of which have preservation orders on them. Also this area is visited by many species of birds which are not common in our gardens as well as bats and badgers. Both of which are subject to legal protection, therefore I object to this area being removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>I strongly object to the fields to the south and south east of Spennells being reclassified and developed, if this should be done it should be subject to very strict planning rules, because it will cause urban sprawl linking Kidderminster to Summerfield, Torton and Stone.</p> <p>There should be no direct vehicular access to the new housing development from the existing estate. Currently at peak periods there is frequently a 20 minute waiting time to access Spennells Valley Road and then further congestion to the Worcester Road. I therefore object to any further vehicular access being provided from the existing estate roads. Not only will it cause increased traffic congestion but it will affect the quality of life for existing residents by increasing pollution, which the council are supposedly trying to improve.</p> <p>To sum up this is a very vague plan with no decisions being made until it is adopted. There is nothing included to</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>improve the quality of the town centre. This would attract business and employment to the area, which would increase the requirement for housing within the whole of the Wyre forest district and not just Kidderminster which the plan proposes.</p> <p>I therefore prefer Option B and object to Option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2330</a>	Object	<p>Preferred Options Document Consultation flawed; Option A offers little benefit.</p> <p>The proposed housing projection overstated.</p> <p>Is this another attempt at getting a relief road (para. 31.5), existing road system is insufficient more houses would exacerbate</p> <p>The Council's track record for building new roads poor.</p> <p>How will already over-stretched Health/Social Care Services cope with aging population</p> <p>Building on Green Belt = less outdoor exercise opportunities</p> <p>Evidence suggests enlarging Spennells could lead to an increase in crime</p> <p>The town centre has already and continues to decline</p> <p>Multi-plex cinema a non-starter</p> <p>With increase in online shopping, use town land for housing</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2338</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to Option A.</p> <p><b>There Is No Significant Natural Interest in Spennells Fields.</b> Rather than meet the required objective of enhancing</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>biodiversity and geological conservation, Option A will destroy an area which the report incorrectly states has no natural interest. As an owner and breeders of award winning show dogs, in recent years we have walked in Spennells Fields more than 200 times each year. The fields are teeming with wildlife with over 90 species of birds being identified on Captains Pool and a further 20 species in and around Spennells Fields. Many of the birds listed in these records are Red and Amber listed (Birds Of Conservation Concern 4) including on the Red List Lapwing, Merlin, Skylark, Starling, Ring ouzel, Fieldfare, Song thrush, Redwing, Mistle thrush, House sparrow, Yellow wagtail, Grey wagtail, Linnet, Yellowhammer and the Corn bunting.</p> <p>In addition to the bird life there are badgers and foxes present (the boundary to the south of Captains WFR/ST/1) comes within 2m of a very large fox earth. Foxes are protected under a series of wildlife protection laws against poisoning, gassing, asphyxiating, maiming, stabbing, impaling, drowning, clubbing and most forms of snaring, with anyone convicted of carrying out such acts liable to 6 months imprisonment and/or a £5,000 fine per animal. The fields and hedgerows of this area are where the animals forage.</p> <p>Grass snakes are widely distributed in the area of Spennells fields and in 2016 there was signage warning walkers that adders were in the area.</p> <p>Four species of bats are identified in and around Stone Hill South (OC13). These include Long Eared Bats, Pippistrelles, Soprano Bat and Daubentons Bat.</p> <p>A large number of moths and butterflies have also been noted in the area widely now known as Spennells Fields.</p> <p><b>The Infrastructure Demands Are Inadequately Addressed.</b> If all the development takes place as in Option A, there would not be the pupil numbers required to build a new primary school for a number of years. Heronswood Primary does not have the capacity to expand exponentially during this time.</p> <p>Secondary schools in Wyre Forest are underperforming BUT if option A is adopted the secondary school in the Wyre Forest with the least opportunity to expand is King Charles, where the upper school site is landlocked. Other schools have greater possibilities for quality expansion of resources and so it would be sensible to distribute the new units</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>around the area as in Option B.</p> <p>Hospitals throughout Worcestershire are in Special Measures. This issue should be addressed before either Option is adopted. It is also becoming increasingly difficult to obtain a doctor's appointment. This matter also requires rectification if and when Wyre Forest expands further.</p> <p>Open Space and PRoW's do not as such feature in our community facilities plans in the detail we would expect, and yet this is the reason that the area of Spennells Fields is so admired. It is a natural community asset which must not be lost as would be the case in Option A</p> <p>If Spennells doubles in size how could traffic enter and exit the estate? The results of the complete adoption of Option A will be unbearable for current residents of the area.</p> <p>Policing costs also appear greater in Option A and it is also probable that doubling the size of Spennells Estate would promote anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>With a modified Option B development (making greater use of Blakedown and Wolverley) across the Wyre Forest will maximise the use of current resources and as a consequence reduce demands on the infrastructure of one area.</p> <p><b>Option A will not address the need for affordable homes.</b> WF Council require 30% of new homes to be affordable. Yet the Local Plan Review suggests that WF is an area with a household income that is below average. The percentage of affordable homes therefore needs to be greater in order to attract a greater proportion of younger families to Wyre Forest and to allow these families to purchase a property and to make Wyre Forest a desirable place to live.</p> <p>The Campaign for Rural England has produced a report stating that dwellings built on green land often do not meet such criteria. Based upon planning consultant Glenigan data shows demonstrates that just 16% of houses built on Green Belt land since 2009 outside local plans were classed as 'affordable'.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>A point which applies to all development is the capacity of large companies to avoid even a 30% target as they have greater resources to call upon than local planning officers who are working with small teams on limited budgets.</p> <p><b>There will be a major and significant loss of amenity</b> to the residents of Spennells should Option A be adopted, and no details are given relating to the compensatory amenity that residents will enjoy.</p> <p>Proposals within, or conspicuous from the Green Belt, must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt, by virtue of their siting, materials or design. The openness of the Green Belt is its most important attribute. By placing a very large proportion in this one area as detailed in Option A this openness will be lost. It would be further compounded if the bypass were also to go ahead as this would require a large buffer on both sides of such a route in addition to the area required for four carriageways and a central reservation.</p> <p>The removal of these open spaces in largely one area will have a detrimental effect upon active lifestyles of Spennells residents and damage the biodiversity of an area it seeks to enhance.</p> <p>The visual amenity and unique landscapes of Spennells Fields will be lost forever' and the southern and eastern routes into Kidderminster damaged.</p> <p><b>Watercourses.</b> Whilst the major watercourses of the Severn, Stour and Canal are detailed in the report, the series of pools leading to Stanklyn Pool and onto Captains Pool receive little attention. This area in the early 1990's was classified as a site of ecological interest forming part of the linear landscape leading to Spennells nature reserve.</p> <p>We have addressed this issue further in our consideration of developing site OC/12</p> <p><b>Loss of Green Belt and Arable Land and Hedgerows.</b> Although both Options appear to use roughly the same amount of Green Belt land, the amount used of around 2% is double that which the Government recommends. With Option A this is compounded should the southern/eastern bypass go ahead as this will consume considerably more of the Green Belt to the south of Wyre Forest. The rural nature of Stone Parish will be destroyed.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Spennells Fields also provide a green space enjoyed by many of the residents of the current Spennells estate. This space is essential for the well-being, air quality and health of the population. There are also numerous PRoW in the Fields the character of which would be destroyed should Option A proceed. These assets have for decades been used and enjoyed by residents.</p> <p>Furthermore it is not only the development of the fields themselves to consider but also the accompanying destruction of the hedgerows which are an environment for many forms of natural life.</p> <p>Spennells Fields are also used intensively for the production of both cereal and vegetable crops. A stated objective in the plan is to prohibit the development of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Development will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it cannot be located on previously developed land, within the boundaries of existing settlements or on poorer quality agricultural land. The case to develop this land has not been made.</p> <p><b>Summary.</b> The use of all the fields suggested in Option A is not a stand-alone decision as the development of a southern/eastern bypass would have a compounding effect in this one area.</p> <p>The doubling in size of Spennells estate will place an unacceptable proportion of the new housing in the Wyre Forest, an area which does not have the infrastructure which can be developed, whereas an amended Option B including both Blakedown, and Wolverley and a development of Lea Castle are better served by the existing infrastructure in terms of transport and schools than is the case in Option A.</p> <p>The doubling in size of Spennells may well increase anti-social behaviour in the area.</p> <p>Unless planning conditions are enforced with vigour the plan would not develop the required number of affordable homes. It is widely accepted that many large building companies often do not deliver the infrastructure promised in their original plans. Therefore whatever plan goes forward it must contain watertight conditions that ensure development companies do not renege on any undertakings made.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2341</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to Option A</li> <li>• Fields used extensively for recreation would be lost and users would have to travel to similar increasing</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic congestion/pressure on public areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of farmland/wildlife</li> <li>• Use Brownfield first and plan better so units are not built and left unused where houses could have been built.</li> <li>• Option B provides preferred.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2344</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic already congested at peak times = impact on air quality/noise</li> <li>• There is no objective assessment of future trends</li> <li>• Loss of recreation space used for health and wellbeing/impact on landscape</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife, should sustain biodiversity.</li> <li>• Impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage in</li> <li>• Detrimental visual impact forever.</li> <li>• The proposal to build next to one of the already largest housing estates in the area is poorly considered.</li> </ul> <p>Regenerate brownfield areas to attract new businesses. Implement plan B - more dispersed strategy across the district</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2345</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At event Council staff appeared before end of consultation period to favour Spennells in hope of getting bypass which I don't think is needed</li> <li>• Use brown field sites first e.g. Lea Castle/former Sion Hill school/land next to Wolverhampton road - already good transport links.</li> <li>• Regenerate town centre with affordable housing for residents not large detached properties for commuters.</li> <li>• Loss of recreation space/healthcare provision issue/increase in air and noise pollution</li> <li>• Are housing needs figures correct?</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No more industrial units needed, Easter Park still has some empty units</li> </ul> <p>This is not a done deal take people's views into account</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2346</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans to build east of Kidderminster:</p> <p>It's Green Belt land, wildlife be lost/increase in traffic on already congested roads/School capacity issue</p> <p>Everything is in favour of LEA CASTLE</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2347</a>	Object	<p>I wish to raise my strong objection to the above with regard to plan A - the proposal to use Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster with associated infrastructure (land adjacent to Spennells and Offmore).</p> <p>My grounds for objection are as follows -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal will result in a huge increase in traffic volumes on minor local roads which are already heavily congested particularly during school term times and bad weather.</li> <li>2. This increase in traffic will lead to a significant increase in impacts on air quality and a significant increase in noise causing nuisance issues for local residents.</li> <li>3. The fields are used by many local residents for walking; the loss of this community facility will have an impact on both the physical and mental well being of residents. The plan will result in the loss of this open space.</li> <li>4. The loss of the fields will have an impact on the diversity of wildlife living in and around the habitats in the area of the fields; we have a responsibility not only to retain suitable areas for wildlife but to improve upon them. The plans to use this Green Belt destroy this valuable space.</li> <li>5. The building of houses on this area will have a significant detrimental visual impact on the natural beauty of the</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>area forever.</p> <p>6. The proposal to build so many properties in a concentrated area in addition to what is already surely one of the largest housing estates in the area is poorly thought through.</p> <p>7. There are many brownfield areas in Kidderminster and the surrounding area which would benefit greatly from redevelopment and regeneration. This could ultimately encourage new businesses to those areas.</p> <p>8. The current infrastructure will not be able to accommodate the increased pressures from so many new homes, families and traffic in an already large housing estate.</p> <p>9. The loss of the Green Belt land to development will have a significant impact on the water environment in the area; affecting local drainage leading to an increase in surface run off.</p> <p>I strongly request the above concerns are taken into consideration and ask that plan b is implemented - the proposal to have a more dispersed strategy across the district to accommodate the required development</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2349</a>	Object	Object to Option A: Loss of Green Belt/impact on residents/wildlife/local infrastructure which will not cope
	<a href="#">LPPO2354</a>	Object	<p>Object to plans for area adjacent to the Spennells. Serious concerns about the negative impact that the proposed building works would have on both the estate itself, and on the area as a whole.</p> <p>Primary concern is with the already problematic traffic in and around the Spennells estate. Insufficient road infrastructure to support additional traffic as it is already heavily congested at busy times. The provision of the suggested eastern relief road would not solve the problem of the additional traffic volume entering towards the town.</p> <p>Spennells offers a safe, semi-rural area with easy pedestrian access to nearby countryside. To take away a large section of the surrounding Green Belt land would be damaging enough to the environment, not to mention the detrimental effect it would have on the wellbeing of the local residents. It also seems highly unreasonable that the</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster vicinity alone should bear the majority of the development, when there are so many areas across other nearby towns far more suited for this purpose. This would distribute the housing requirements more fairly and provide opportunities for people on a wider, but still local, scale.</p> <p>Another great concern is the pressure the proposed plans would have on the provision of all the necessary services. The local schools are already stretched to their limits. Sufficient educational facilities would be required to accommodate around 2500 children over the coming years in this area alone. More imperatively, healthcare and emergency services would require huge supplementation both practically and financially in order to suffice the inevitable increase in demand.</p> <p>To summarise, we believe strongly that the proposals to use all of the land adjacent to the Spennells estate for the purpose of housing would be hugely detrimental to the local vicinity. We feel that the best option would be to disperse the housing requirements more evenly across a wider area, using previously developed land first, and Green Belt land only as a last resource once all other available areas have been exhausted.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2361</a>	Object	<p>Loss of recreational asset</p> <p>Capacity issues for schools, doctors, hospitals</p> <p>Use Brownfield sites before Green Belt</p> <p>Traffic already bad would be much worse</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2369</a>	Object	<p>Object Spennells:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roads already regularly gridlocked/new link road has added to it</li> <li>2. Local schools are already full and hospitals are unable to cope</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2377</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of open countryside for recreation</li> <li>• Impact on local farms/wildlife</li> <li>• Increase in traffic</li> <li>• Schools - capacity issue</li> <li>• Large housing developments can encourage poor/anti social behaviour</li> <li>• This is significant in size, use other key Kidderminster sites first</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2380</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of fields for recreation/education</li> <li>• Extra pollution/congestion, more dangerous for children</li> <li>• Strain on local schools, doctors, shop</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2382</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use Brownfield sites first, e.g. Kidderminster town centre</li> <li>• Loss of recreational land/wildlife</li> <li>• Traffic already heavy would be worse</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2383</a>	Object	<p>Object Spennells/Stanklyn Lane Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of recreational land</li> <li>• Increase in traffic/noise/fumes</li> <li>• Strain on existing education providers/medical services/emergency services</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/rights of way/wildlife/agricultural land/ conservation areas (hedgerows), along Stanklyn</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fall in property prices</li> <li>• Use Brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2384</a>	Object	<p>Object Spennells/Stanklyn Lane Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of recreational land</li> <li>• Increase in traffic/noise/fumes</li> <li>• Strain on existing education providers/medical services/emergency services</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/rights of way/wildlife/agricultural land/ conservation areas (hedgerows), along Stanklyn Lane.</li> <li>• Fall in property prices</li> <li>• Use Brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2387</a>	Object	<p>The document contradicts itself, P14 'Virtually static growth' and P33 'needs of the growing population' Wyre Forest population has not grown on the last 10 to 20 years, so assumptions and rounding up of figures have been done to justify building on Green Belt land. Use actual numbers and don't round up housing can be supported by brownfield development. The document should be rejected.</p> <p>The plan appears unbalanced with major expansion to the east of Kidderminster with little to the west. Development of the town centre is not balanced, with plans for a cinema multiplex around the old Glades leisure centre, this could be improved by moving the multiplex into Worcester Street (number of large stores vacant or little used), and use the Glades area for housing, keeping the multiplex closer to the current shops.</p> <p>On expansion to the east of Kidderminster, there would be a loss of Green Belt land and subsequent quality of life, with loss of fields used by Skylarks and other field birds. Option A should be dropped for Option B (lower loss of Green Belt Land).</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Using the fields to the east of Spennells would effectively merge the communities of Spennells, Stanklyn Lane &amp; Stone which is contradictory to Green Belt rules which is there to prevent communities being merged.</p> <p>Section 31.6 talks about keeping Stanklyn Lane community separate from the proposed development however Option A shows it going right up to the edge of that community, even if only 50% is developed this is still contradiction so Option A should be rejected.</p> <p>Section 31.6 also talks about keeping the view up to Stone church clear yet Appendix A map shows development right along the A448 another contradiction.</p> <p>Option A land adjacent to the railway line (Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park (AS/10)) is this within a 600 metre blast zone of the Roxel Summerfield site?</p> <p>The plan talks about a relief road from the A449 to the A456 though this proposed development, this should be dropped along with Option A and develop relief road starting around the around the A449 / A450 Black Bridges area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2400</a>	Object	<p>Object Spennells area:</p> <p>Impact on wildlife/Increased traffic congestion/School capacity issue</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2406</a>	Object	Object to the Spennells planning proposals
	<a href="#">LPPO2407</a>	Object	<p>As AS/10, WFR/ST/2, OC/13and WFR/ST1 all of which lie at the rear of Spennells estate.</p> <p>My reasons are that the land is greenfield and should remain so. Also the extra traffic on the already congested A449 from Hoo Brook would become intolerable. Added to the extra number of new inhabitants the already struggling schools in the catchment area would not cope, Heronswood Primary school has no scope for expansion and is already having to use portacabins. The local infrastructure is sufficient but would not be able to handle an influx of the number expected.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2417</a>	Object	We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed extended development of Spennells estate on the grounds of Green Belt destruction instead of use of brownfield land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2418</a>	Object	<p>Object to building on Green Belt land within Kidderminster especially the fields between Spennells and Stanklyn lane.</p> <p>Housing requirements within Kidderminster, based on previous growth, do not warrant anywhere near the proposed amount of houses to be built. There are enough brownfield sites within Kidderminster to meet the current demand.</p> <p>I would like to see evidence of a compiled list of brownfield sites within Kidderminster, including an estimate of the number of dwellings possible on these sites as a total, before considering eating into our precious Green Belt. Suggestions include the old Sladen school site on Hurcott Road, the Old Magistrate's Court and Glades Leisure Centre. There are many more brownfield sites with dwelling potential as you will be aware.</p> <p>We are regular visitors to the fields backing Turnstone Road and have been for many years. On our walks we have seen some wonderful wildlife, including Skylarks, Starlings and Corn buntings (All of which are on the Red List), an array of amazing insects as well as evidence of Badgers (I have photos of their Sett).</p> <p>Once Green Belt is built on it can never be regained. We obviously need the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl but it also provides a corridor for wildlife.</p> <p>I think that the council should concentrate on regeneration of the ghost town centre and its many empty derelict buildings which could be converted to dwellings.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2424</a>	Object	<p>I should like to register my opposition to the proposed plans you have outlined to use Green Belt land at the rear of Spennells and Stanklyn to build further residential homes.</p> <p>My reasons for my opposition are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spennells is already a sprawling residential development, and at peak times the surrounding area suffers from traffic congestion, almost doubling the size of the estate will only serve to increase this congestion. I</li> </ol>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>understand that the current road layout within Spennells and the surrounding areas will not be changed. You have indicated a through road but this will not reduce the amount of traffic needing to access an expanded housing development. Increasing traffic will not only create further congestion but also increase air pollution which has been highlighted in recent studies as a factor contributing to thousands of deaths in the UK each year.</p> <p>2. Published data indicate that the population in Wyre Forest has increased only slightly over the last 15 years, whilst surrounding areas have increased at a much faster rate. Predictions used to justify this development somehow predict a much faster rate of future population increase than indicated by the ONS. I am concerned that this Green Belt land is earmarked for development not to cope with future population increase in the Wyre Forest area but to solve the housing problems of surrounding areas who presumably are reluctant to build on their own Green Belt land. This should be investigated thoroughly.</p> <p>3. Green Belt land is surely in place to protect our green open spaces and to stop further urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with? All possible alternatives should be thoroughly explored before the use of any Green Belt land is approved. To me there seems to be a number of sites in Kidderminster that could be used and redeveloped first. These include disused and derelict buildings like those in park lane (by Matalan), the old indoor market, the old Woolworths and the ugly crown house. I understand that the old leisure centre site will be redeveloped into a cinema complex! If the need for housing is so great then surely it would be better to develop this land into town centre affordable apartments. Many areas within the town are ripe for regeneration into low cost housing and should be regenerated before any consideration is given to destroying Green Belt land. Owners should be obliged by law to regenerate disused buildings or land themselves or sell to those who are prepared to develop these sites. Better use of these urban areas would negate the need to expand into our surrounding countryside.</p> <p>4. It is an area enjoyed by many children, walkers, exercisers, birdwatchers &amp; nature photographers from Spennells and beyond. It is a great place to relax, de-stress and enjoy the natural environment. These recreational activities are important to the mental health and physical wellbeing of those who live in Kidderminster. The area also attracts a wide variety of species and wildlife, I understand that bats and some rare birds nest within the fields. Destroying this Green Belt space will have a devastating impact on the existing community and the natural wildlife that exists within it. We will never get this wildlife back once it is destroyed.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>5. I cannot see the justification in placing such a large proportion of the proposed new homes in this Green Belt area. You have an option B, which almost provides the same housing yet is more evenly distributed throughout Kidderminster. This should not just be about efficiency, cost and profit. Impact on the environment, existing communities, natural habitats, local services and infrastructures all need to be considered.</p> <p>6. Adding a large number of houses in one area will put huge pressures on already oversubscribed services like local schools, doctors, dentists and hospitals. How will this be addressed if we are adding a large number of new homes and therefore increasing the population in this one area alone? I have seen very little information about how this increase in population will be catered for. The closest hospitals in Worcester and Redditch are already struggling to cope with the demand placed upon them and are currently in special measures due to poor performance.</p> <p>In conclusion do not let Kidderminster become an overflow for commuters from other areas. Look at realistic predictions of future population increase. How many residential properties are actually needed compared to how many the developers want to build in order to maximise their profits? Look at all the unoccupied, empty derelict buildings around Kidderminster first. Surely it is better to regenerate buildings that stand empty or vandalised and breathe life back into the town centre before considering any development that will destroy surrounding Green Belt land.</p> <p>I object to both proposals put forward but if I have to choose an option then I choose Option B which more evenly distributes the developments around the town of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2428</a>	Object	We object to the use of Green Belt land for housing development to the rear of Baldwin Road and Spennells fields etc. This would irrevocably destroy the appeal and beauty of the area and bring with it added health, pollution and social problems.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Alternative brown field sites are available along with pockets of derelict land ripe for redevelopment.</p> <p>The amount of development required has also been vastly overestimated and the actual amount needed could be sustained on alternative brown sites (Lea Castle, disused pubs, disused factories such as those in Park Lane, Sladen/Sion Hill schools).</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> Any development of these areas would substantially increase the already heavy traffic pollution.</p> <p>We have monitored the traffic in the Hurcott area. Much is from non residents travelling to the West Midlands. Also the speed of this traffic is seriously dangerous, especially to children, the vulnerable and animals. This development would further impact on air quality and is contrary to NPPF para. 109-124. Add to this an increase in the already incessant traffic noise levels.</p> <p>I would not wish to see a further increase in traffic using Hurcott Road.</p> <p>The proposed development to the rear of Baldwin Road infers that Hurcott Lane will require the road to be blocked for vehicle access at either the Birmingham Road or Stourbridge Road ends but this will not prevent traffic flow just divert more traffic into Hurcott Road increasing pollution and volumes of traffic on roads only designed for local residential traffic which have inadequate flow characteristics.</p> <p>In conclusion, this is not a healthy and community spirited decision to develop the area. Baldwin Road is similarly treated like a rat run and as for the Horsefair how much more can this bottle neck sustain? We are trying to improve the look of this run down area not destroy it and end all hope of engendering a happy community spirit. Extra housing would require a by-pass to be built as the aforementioned roads just cannot sustain more traffic and the pollution it brings.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> The area is known and loved for its beauty and wildlife. This Green Belt plays an aesthetic role in separating the town from the West Midlands conurbation and these green fields are the first glorious introduction to Kidderminster on the A451 and A456. Do not bulldoze this asset as safeguarding the district's Green Belt preserves its attractiveness to both locals and visitors. Consider the importance of recreational activities in terms of health,</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>wellbeing and tourism. People need space to thrive. It's unlikely developers would provide sufficient open spaces or parks. Compared with neighbouring towns like Stourbridge we are lucky to have such big green spaces. Don't destroy it for future generations when alternative brown or derelict sites are available. Endangered species, indeed wildlife in general would be threatened. Development would seriously impact and cause irrecoverable change to wildlife habitats especially on buffer zones for Hurcott and Podmore SSSIs.</p> <p>Some proposed development sites have steep gradients which could raise the risk of potential flooding. The proposed development behind Baldwin Road has the potential to flood, on one side with run off towards the Birmingham Road with a natural hollow in the main road and on the other side run off towards the lower end of Hurcott Road where it is a narrow lane which in turn would run off into the outfall from Hurcott Pool and transfer to Broadwaters with the potential for flooding the adjacent main road.</p> <p>Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is generally much higher than the rest of the area so any development would be very visible and not blend in spoiling the beauty of the area. The field height to the rear of Baldwin Road means that the proposed properties would adversely overlook the existing properties &amp; their gardens at the lower end of Baldwin Road.</p> <p>The Government's own policy regarding planning decisions is to prevent harm to biodiversity and geological interests. In brief all planning decisions must consider location on alternative sites to green fields.</p> <p><b>Amenities and Community Spirit:</b> We already suffer from a lack of amenities in this area. One shop in which our post office was taken off us. A smattering of shops in Spennells and Offmore. Can local schools accommodate extra housing on this level? Offmore is already full and can't be developed. We no longer have an acute hospital so all this extra population would place more pressure on Worcester Royal already facing special measures. This also raises questions with regards the existing level of doctors, dentists and opticians in the area. Public transport is poor and infrequent.</p> <p>Big developments generally have no community spirit. Building on smaller pockets of land fosters integration. Large sprawling estates increase social isolation, antisocial behaviour and crime rates as acknowledged by the WFIDP.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Doubling the size of Spennells would not be a wise move.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> We need smaller numbers of houses proposed which can be sustained by brown sites like Lea Castle. Smaller pockets of once used land should be considered like factories on Park Lane, closed pubs (The Broadwaters?) closed schools like Sladen and Sion Hill.</p> <p>We need to reinvigorate existing eyesores such as disused schools &amp; factories which are frequently vandalised and this will improve some of the more rundown areas rather than permanently erode Green Belt sites, which once gone they are gone forever.</p> <p>Don't bulldoze green field sites prior to using up every brown field or derelict site in the locality.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2437</a>	Object	<p>Please note my objections to the proposed expansion option A, on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The already large Spennells estate has not got the infrastructure to support the amount of housing proposed, the school is small and to expand this would cut necessary recreation facilities in the school going against government objectives for healthier lifestyles and more exercise for children. If, as what is suggested in the report, the population of elderly is to rise significantly, local doctor and hospital services, already heavily burdened would collapse. Even with the proposed link road onto the A449 from the expanded estate, traffic is ALREADY struggling at other points along the A449, at the Droitwich turn, at Black Bridge, at Sytchampton school to name a few. As Kidderminster has very little work one would suppose new residents would also need to commute using this road towards Worcester or the more industrialised areas of the West Midlands. The A449 certainly cannot cope on most weekdays with the amount of traffic it already has, let alone looking to increase this.</li> <li>2. Taking away the last vestiges of Green Belt land under Wyre Forest control to the east of the district leaves the District Council with no future control to the east of urban sprawl. It will be for Wychavon to protect against further expansion. This cannot be right, please look at this again.</li> <li>3. The fields to be lost are not poor agriculturally as is required for Green Belt land to be considered for change of use, otherwise peas, carrots and spring onions that have been grown in rotation in previous years, not to mention other high value crops such as potatoes, beet and oats would not have been produced in</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>abundance.</p> <p>4. The wildlife to be lost by these proposals is frankly unacceptable. The fields behind Spennells are rich in rare bird, mammal and insect life. Skylarks frequent the fields, as do a large number of bats easily seen at dawn and dusk around the edges of the fields, along with several badger colonies (3 active setts of which were purposely razed to the ground earlier this year by a tractor then ploughed through).</p> <p>I strongly think both proposals are not acceptable. Please go back and rethink. The figures and assumptions made on the scale of expansion required by the town are very debatable and as such need to be looked at in more depth before a huge and irreversible decision such as this is made. You as our representatives have one chance to get this right and an absolute duty to be sure of your facts and make completely informed assumptions. More work is needed, reconsider!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2438</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the council plan to possibly build up to 2000 new houses in the Spennells area, this includes Captains Lodge and opposite side of A448 Bromsgrove Road. Objection is based on:</p> <p>1) Spennells estate is already big enough you will have to provide more schools as Spennells, Comberton and King Charles Schools would not be able to cope with possibly 2000 extra families, not forgetting shops etc also.</p> <p>2) The roads on this side of town are choked at peak times of the day already, you can't say that you will build an eastern bypass because this has already been turned down by Ministry of Transport. On this side of town at 8.00am there are queues at Comberton Hill, Low Hill, Goldness Corner (Black Bridge) and Mustow Green.</p> <p>How do you relieve this situation?</p> <p>3) Kidderminster is not a growing town, a lot of businesses are closing, especially carpet related companies or moving to other areas in the country. I would suggest you wouldn't require anything like 2000 new houses over the next 15 years i.e. 2019-2034.</p> <p>Please don't pile more misery on the residents of Spennells. I hope common sense will prevail. The council should use common sense and don't do anything at the moment.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2443</a>	Object	<p>I write in objection to any proposed development of the “Spennells Green Belt Fields” located at the end of Turnstone Road/Imber Place.</p> <p><b>My Objections are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any Development would increase the traffic access/exit on Turnstone, Captains Pool and Heronswood Roads. (In support of this point I would draw attention to the Severn Trent Water works in Linnet Rise during the recent months of 2017 which caused a considerable increase in traffic delays exiting the estate at school/work time.)</li> <li>The additional traffic would also put children at <i>extra risk</i> during the walking commute to the local school.</li> <li>I don’t believe there are sufficient local services to support further development.</li> <li>Encroaching onto Green Belt areas when there are other brownfield areas more suitable to use.</li> </ul> <p><b>My Reasons are:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The space is currently a superb natural nature habitation.</li> <li>This Green Belt is so important to the locality and balances the light industrial/commercial investment with the current levels of housing of the Wyre Forest Area.</li> <li>I support the practice of ‘infill house builds’ vs. ‘creeping into Green Belt space’ as this brings a balance to areas and uses space that is/or could be wasted.</li> <li>By spreading the development over ‘smaller brownfield sites’ the required local services will also be spread making it a more viable plan.</li> <li>It is of prime importance that as an island we retain Green Belt areas.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2450</a>	Object	<p>I feel strongly about the fields of Spennells being saved as these fields mean so much to myself and the local community.</p> <p>There are lots of brownfield sites that could be used to build on instead rather than our beautiful countryside.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>If that is not an option, please just save two fields so that we have somewhere to walk our dogs and play with our children.</p> <p>Spennells doesn't have the facilities such as schooling and shops to cope with the large growth you are proposing.</p> <p>I have just bought my first house on Spennells and that heavily was based on the surrounding areas and the village like feel the area has to it.</p> <p>Please do not ruin all of our beautiful fields, at least meet us in the middle.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2453</a>	Object	<p>I herewith put forward my objection to the building of homes on the Spennells fields.</p> <p>Family walks are taken along the fields throughout the year enjoying the ever changing fields of poppies, wheat etc.</p> <p>To lose this whole area to housing is an utter disgrace. Along with the extra traffic, noise and the loss of wildlife it would be completely wrong go ahead with such plans.</p> <p>I hope that my objection along with the other objectors will be enough to change the decision.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2454</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development of the whole area of Option A as shown on the plan for Spennells for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These fields are used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle, walk dogs and ride horses which aids physical and mental health.</li> <li>• Traffic and noise pollution causing harm to health. Alternatively building higher density homes in the town centre will reduce car journeys and pollution.</li> <li>• Local schools having larger classes and fewer resources per student</li> <li>• Increased pressures on our hospitals, doctors, dentists and opticians</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt and threat to the existing public Rights of Way</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds.</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land</li> <li>• Traffic entering and exiting the new development from Spennells would cause further traffic disruption to an already busy road at peak times.</li> </ul> <p>Build on Brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2460</a>	Object	<p>I believe the quality of life on Spennells estate will reduce not increase if the new development on the southern edge of Spennells goes ahead. The reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal of fields that are used extensively by local people on the estate for recreational purposes</li> <li>• The impact on the wildlife within those fields and hedgerows and surrounding Green Belt area. There are a number of red listed birds within these fields and area such as Skylarks and linnets</li> <li>• Increased traffic and noise – the estate can get congested now and the roads that service Spennells will not cope with the extra through Hoobrook onto Worcester.</li> <li>• The internet quality is very poor already and this will add extra pressure to another service that probably isn't scheduled to be upgraded</li> <li>• There will be an impact on drainage as the fields offer a soak away</li> <li>• The quality of housing and space allocated for frontages, drives and gardens need to be consistent with the current estate and planners ensure that there are drives on the front of houses not used group parking areas. The housing companies need to make a few less homes and money to ensure that the area is decent</li> <li>• There seems to be no additional plans for road infrastructure changes or additional public transport services and impact assessments on the increase in population to additional services for GPs, schools, hospital, benefit offices, council services, etc.</li> <li>• Loss of the Green Belt status means an impact on protecting further urban spread, it sets a precedence and is an “easy option” as its cheaper for the builders than insisting the spend extra money preparing derelict or brownfield sites.</li> </ul> <p>The plan mentions 10% of the population in the district currently attend swimming or gym and the new leisure centre has not been built to sustain the increase in usage for the next 10 years so already this is a short-sighted approach by a council who knew they would need to expand within the next 15 years. The current site cannot be</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>expanded to take this increase.</p> <p>It would be useful to ensure that the contracts with the building companies who want to buy the land actually put something back into the community by way of renovating something else - be it a building or park space or similar as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility and therefore the council get something extra than just easy money for easy land.</p> <p>The town centre needs to be regenerated otherwise all the money that additional residents will bring will be spent outside of the town because it looks deserted and run down.</p> <p>The land is currently Green Belt and there are plenty of areas in Kidderminster that are rundown or derelict and these areas/buildings could be renewed to make the place more pleasant to live in as a while not just expand the edges with nice new homes and keep the old all rundown. The whole Kidderminster town has become dis-jointed from many years of different decision making on development in the centre. Sadly it is more expensive for the builders to renovate and regenerate sites then build on land that doesn't need work and this influences the decisions.</p> <p>I don't believe that the surrounding infrastructure, roads, schools, shopping areas, supermarkets will be changed enough to managing the increase in population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2462</a>	Object	<p>The parcels adjacent to Spennells estate – designated “Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park AS/10”, “Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2”, “Stone Hill South OC/13” and “Captains and the Lodge WFR/ST/1” – should remain as Green Belt and not be subject to housing development.</p> <p><b>Green Belt:</b> the purpose of Green Belt is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Check unrestricted urban sprawl.</b> The “Option A” proposal would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, while development under “Option B” would still have a more dispersed effect upon a range of town boundaries.</li> <li>• <b>Prevent neighbouring towns from merging.</b> The development adjacent to Spennells would mean that</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Spennells would merge with Summerfield and Stone, thus losing their separate identities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</b> The development in “Option A”, in particular, would encroach significantly into open Green Belt land.</li> <li>• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</li> <li>• <b>To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</b> – Thereby providing the planning imperative to use brownfield sites first.</li> </ul> <p>Once an area of land has been defined as Green Belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include and are clearly seen in Wyre Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population.</li> <li>• Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas.</li> <li>• The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live.</li> <li>• Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns.</li> <li>• The securing of nature conservation interests.</li> <li>• The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.</li> </ul> <p>Building on Green Belt is fraught with issues of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of the natural environment and habitat of rare and threatened species;</li> <li>• Infrastructure provision;</li> <li>• Loss of countryside’s positive effects on health and wellbeing;</li> <li>• Increased risk of flooding;</li> <li>• Loss of productive farming land;</li> <li>• Increasing car dependency;</li> <li>• Large new developments placing strain on local infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>I assert that no Green Belt is necessary to meet a realistic population growth projection, with all housing demand being met on brownfield sites, including at Lea Castle, up to 2034.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Protection for the Natural Environment:</b> There are supportive words in the Draft Local Plan about “protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation”. However, any development on the natural environment in countryside areas will have serious negative impacts.</p> <p>Spennells Fields is said to have no nature conservation interests pertaining to them, however the area offers a number of different habitats for wildlife, including important nesting sites for corn buntings, larks and linnets (all of which are included on the red list as endangered birds), badger setts and bat roosts. Also sighted in Wyre Forest in areas earmarked for development are European Otters. The rare and protected Tower Mustard plant thrives along the lanes adjoining Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>Endangered species like the Corn Bunting, Linnets and Skylarks would not nest in an area of “Green Corridor” adjacent to a large housing development as they need wide, open spaces to thrive. Tree Preservation Orders on old and venerable trees and woodlands must also be respected.</p> <p>I am concerned that issues of drainage and flooding have not been given serious enough consideration in the Draft Local Plan. Countryside typically has trees and hedgerows upon it which assist in water absorption and mitigates run-off, so replacing fields and hedgerows with urban development will literally have downstream effects.</p> <p>There is no indication/mention in the Local Plan of a Design Exceedence Flow Pathway, indicating what would need to be built into any new development in the event of a ‘Flash Flood’, to prevent ‘runoff’ from any new development causing flood damage to existing properties.</p> <p>Much of the Green Belt land, notably Spennells Fields, are used for productive farming activity which should be maintained and enhanced on ecologically sustainable principles rather than destroyed. Section 5.6 mentions “...promotion of local food production.....” whilst the planned intrusion into the Green Belt will reduce local food production. The proposed extension of Spennells, for example, will mean the loss of good quality agricultural land which in summer 2017 was growing barley. Past years have seen crops of wheat, peas, potatoes and beets.</p> <p><b>Recreation Landscape and Visual Amenity:</b> Many fields threatened by this Draft Local Plan serve as popular recreational and social facilities for walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers, and horse riders, amateur astronomers and wildlife and landscape photographers. There are a number of well-used Public Rights of Way and bridle ways across the fields which allow fast and easy access to open countryside.</p> <p>The landscape around many areas, such as Spennells, is an important part of people’s lives, contributing to individual, community and national identity and offering a wide variety of benefits in terms of quality of life, well-</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>being and economic opportunity. The 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report' published in 2013 recognised that Landscape provides a shared resource which is important in its own right as a 'public good' - something which is very obvious by the current use of Spennells' residents as a local amenity on the Public Rights of Way. This Report also emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan removes.</p> <p><b>Implications for Health and Wellbeing:</b> There are already well-used and designated Public Footpaths and Rights of Way across the Spennells Fields that the Local Plan recognises as being intensively used by local residents (people of all ages) – with the positive effects this produces upon their Health and Wellbeing.</p> <p>Many reports (e.g. World Health Organisation April 2017) have identified the positive effect that natural open spaces have on people's physical and mental wellbeing. Access to the countryside has been proved to promote physical activity, positive mental wellbeing and healthy childhood development. Regular physical activity contributes to the prevention and management of over 20 conditions including coronary heart disease, diabetes, certain types of cancer and obesity. Access to the countryside has also been shown to have a positive impact upon mental health. Responses to nature include feelings of pleasure and a reduction in anxiety. Moderate outdoor activity is claimed to be as successful at treating depression as medication. Children with access to safe green spaces are more likely to be physically active and less likely to be overweight. Outdoor play also encourages healthy brain development and promotion of healthy wellbeing through to adulthood. Indeed, the Wyre Forest Public Health Profile 2016 lists improving mental health and wellbeing, along with increasing physical activity in the area, as its main priorities. The Sustainability Appraisal (May 2017) states that it recognises the "positive effect of links via pathways and cycleways" and intends to provide wide cycle paths in any new development. However, a cycling route through a housing estate could not claim to meet the needs of all the current users of the PROWs and Bridle paths. Footpaths that allow walking in the open countryside cannot be equated with 'Green Corridors' between housing developments. I feel that the LPR does not sufficiently acknowledge the role of the threatened fields in the provision of access to safe countryside for existing residents of Wyre Forest and certainly has not made any suggestions for protecting or safeguarding this access.</p> <p>It has already been recorded that Kidderminster has higher obesity levels than the national average (Wyre Forest Public Health Profile 2016) and this is a position which would be exacerbated by reducing local access to local fields for health and recreational use. The fact that the new Wyre Forest Leisure Centre has now been moved out of the town centre has already reduced access to some residents, especially children without their own transport, which</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>again is likely to cause reduced exercise and increased obesity.</p> <p>Other threats to the health and wellbeing of residents arising from development of   Green Belt adjacent to existing homes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed new road (Eastern Relief road) causing increased traffic noise, air pollution, light pollution and additional traffic vibration to Spennells' residents.</li> <li>• Increased demand on infrastructure including medical facilities and schools.</li> <li>• Social problems arising from increasing the size of the estate; evidence exists that large housing estates suffer more crime and anti-social behaviour (as acknowledged in the WFIDP May 2017).</li> </ul> <p>Many of the six key areas which affect health will be dependent on agreement with developers to provide these facilities. The provision of public open spaces, a network of good quality cycling and walking routes, and easily accessed health facilities are important both for public health and the development of a community.</p> <p><b>Strain on Local Infrastructure:</b> The claimed 6,000 homes by 2034 mean approximately 20,000 new people in Wyre Forest District. How will the Hospital and emergency services cope with this growth? Even halving this number to the number which I believe is realistic requires significant investment.</p> <p>An expanded residential development requires proper infrastructure to support its current and future residents. I have found no evidence of future funding to support this at Spennells. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hospital services</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kidderminster Hospital (which is on the opposite side of the town centre, so there are issues with travel time) continues to see services downgraded or taken away.</li> <li>2. Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust, which runs Kidderminster, Worcester Royal and Redditch Hospitals, is struggling and is one of the worst performing trusts in the country.</li> <li>3. Mental health services have been reduced at Kidderminster, with service users and their relatives needing to travel to Redditch</li> </ol> </li> <li>• <b>GP &amp; Dental surgeries</b> – I am not confident that there will be adequate provision of GP and dental services in</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>a greatly enlarged Spennells.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Schools</b> – Existing local schools are nearly full. I am not confident that extra school places will be made available in time for the projected new arrivals to this part of town. Temporary portacabin classrooms and long travel times for pupils to get to a school with capacity will lead to poorer educational outcomes. The funding that is supposed to be made available for a new school if the housing development surpasses 1000 homes is no guarantee that the school will actually be built. Car parking outside many schools is already extremely hazardous at the beginning and end of the school day.</li> <li>• <b>Local shops, pharmacy and post office</b> – I am not confident that adequate additional local shops will be constructed to serve any enlarged Spennells community and there is no capacity to enlarge the existing shops and car park at Warbler Place.</li> <li>• <b>Local leisure such as a village hall, pub, and fitness centre/gym</b> – I am not confident that adequate local leisure facilities will be built to serve an enlarged estate, leading to a soulless estate with heightened youth alienation, graffiti and crime.</li> <li>• <b>Local roads and transport</b> – The absence of adequate schools, shops and leisure facilities will increase car journeys which will contribute to local air pollution and traffic congestion. The building of an estate on the fringe of Kidderminster will see more car journeys rather than walking and cycling, compared to development closer to the centre on brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2464</a>	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposed development of the Green Belt fields designated 'Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park AS/10', 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2', 'Stone Hill South OC/13', and 'Captains and the Lodge WFR/ST/1' (marked Option A and a Core area on the Draft Local Plan).</p> <p>In support of my objection I wish to make the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The population of Wyre Forest district has hardly grown in the past 25 years, so the quantity of houses that has been projected as being necessary has been over-estimated or even exaggerated. Brownfield sites and regeneration of Kidderminster town centre could provide sufficient land for new housing without resorting to taking Green Belt. Green Belt should only be taken as a last resort and we have not reached that point yet.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The infrastructure is not in place to support a huge increase in the number of households in the area. Our medical establishments are already at breaking point, our schools almost full. Our road network cannot support more vehicles.</li> <li>An immense area of wildlife habitat would be lost which currently supports a number of rare species of animals and plants. Currently the fields are in use – they are not left barren.</li> <li>The Spennells fields area is a valuable natural open space which has a positive effect on people's physical and mental wellbeing. The public footpaths and bridleways across these fields are used by walkers, dog-walkers, joggers, horse-riders, photographers and birdwatchers and people of all ages and levels of fitness. This is a convenient location for taking exercise without first having to jump in a car.</li> <li>If these fields were to be given over to housing, tarmac roads and driveways, what would happen during periods of heavy rain? How would drainage be managed to avoid causing flooding in the lower-lying area of Stanklyn/Summerfield?</li> </ul> <p>Once our Green Belt has gone we cannot get it back. Once a habitat has been lost we cannot get our flora and fauna back. I urge you to make the right decision – a decision which leaves Spennells fields Green Belt land intact.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2468</a>	Object	<p>Object to the proposed building of houses on the Green Belt land behind Spennells for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorrect figures submitted on housing requirements.</li> <li>There are plenty of brown field sites to use before Green Belt land should be considered.</li> <li>The protection of the environment should be important (as agreed by the Prime Minister Theresa May at the G20 summit).</li> <li>The devastation of the wildlife, birds, bees, butterflies, bats, badgers, field mice etc.</li> <li>The loss of good productive agricultural land.</li> <li>Insufficient infrastructure in the local area - Hospital, roads,</li> <li>Loss of recreational land used by the local community (dog walkers, walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders etc)</li> </ul> <p>The town centre needs the regeneration and affordable housing – not Spennells.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2471</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed building of houses on the Green Belt land behind Spennells housing estate/land adjacent to Stanklyn Lane for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wyre Forest District has a virtually static population growth. How have the figures have been calculated for the suggested number of new houses?</li> <li>• Development will take away open spaces that are used recreationally on a daily basis by joggers, dog walkers, cyclists, horse riders. Benefitting physical and mental health. Also helps to address the high obesity levels in the district.</li> <li>• Loss of local good productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There are plenty of brown field sites to use before Green Belt land should even be considered.</li> <li>• Development should not impact on our wildlife. This land is home to many birds, bees, butterflies, bats, badgers, foxes, rabbits, field mice etc.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure is already extremely poor in this area.</li> <li>• What provision will be made to ensure our local hospital and schools will be able to cope with the extra residents that will potentially move to the district?</li> </ul> <p>The regeneration of the town centre should be a priority. Affordable housing could be built closer to the centre of town allowing easy access to its facilities and amenities.</p> <p>Why has no development been proposed in Wolverley?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2477</a>	Object	<p>There are many areas of Kidderminster which would be better suited to be developed before you have to destroy fields. Town centre living, Park street by Matalan, Stourport road Golf course to name but a few.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kidderminster needs investment in the town and building more houses will not help this.</li> <li>• These houses are to ease Kidderminster's existing housing problems but the houses are not solely for the purchase by Kidderminster residents so if they all sell to outside people this will not ease anything.</li> <li>• The types of houses that will be built and the prices they will cost are not the types of houses that are needed to ease any problems.</li> <li>• The houses would be better spread out around the area. That way more shops and local businesses from</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>around the area will benefit from an increase in footfall and trade and not just the Spennells side of town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The local infrastructure is not sufficient for any major influx of people. Estates are already poorly maintained, so this tells me the council is already stretched. The hospital, Police, Ambulance and Fire don't have enough staff at the moment, let alone with more people to look after.</li> <li>• The existing road network on and off Spennells estate is already beyond capacity, based on the traffic jams at peak times that already exist. Opening up the Spennells estate as an access route to the new development will only add to these problems.</li> <li>• The increased traffic from opening up Spennells will increase the risk to the existing residents of road accidents. Noise and air pollution will also increase and this is not acceptable.</li> <li>• The school on Spennells is already at capacity and cannot take further children.</li> <li>• The fields are a good educational tool for young children. Encouraging exercise to combat the growing obesity crisis.</li> </ul> <p>There are many more reasons why this is a bad idea and why I object in the strongest possible way.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2480</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A and B:</p> <p>Loss of recreational land/effect on health/loss of wildlife</p> <p>impact this development would have on the towns local infrastructure, medical care/schools/traffic/pollution</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2481</a>	Object	<p>I would like to register my opposition to the proposed plans to use Green Belt land for residential homes near the Spennells estate and Stanklyn Lane. My reasons for this rejection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I feel that there are sites that could be used without using this land such as Lea castle, Sion hill middle school and other areas in the town such as the leisure centre which could be developed.</li> <li>2. Mental well being-research shows that the colours, sounds and smells we can encounter outdoors stimulate our senses in a way that the gym or urban environments may not. These fields are used by many for leisure activities</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>such as walking or cycling giving them the chance to switch off from the pressures of life therefore relieving stress.</p> <p>3. Wildlife-it is a natural habitat for many species and attracts a variety of creatures such as birds, bats, hedgehogs and insects.</p> <p>4. Increased air pollution- due to an increase in population and trees/green space being destroyed there will be more air pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2484</a>	Object	<p>Object to Plan A where all the supposed houses required immediately will be build on Green Belt land and impact solely on Spennells and the area around Stanklyn Lane. The amount of homes talked about cannot be quantified as figures have shown that population of Kidderminster has only grown 2% in last 10 years. Why are we building homes for Birmingham and its suburbs when there is plenty of land green and otherwise between them and us?</p> <p>Plan should encompass all parts but especially brown sites and vacant properties and the town centre (which is never going to be developed into the cultural centre of Worcestershire). With internet shopping increasing all the time who is going to want to try to run a business in the run down street. The empty shops show that. Build fair price houses and apartments.</p> <p>Spennells: this is Green Belt. Surely there must be a conscience about the facilities and lifestyle that Plan A would inflict on all local residents. Lack of schools, hospitals, doctors, jobs with businesses closing with regularity, social amenities, buses the list is endless. The new leisure centre is already too small and has far too few parking spaces. Traffic disruption, which is already high in the area. Talk of a road across the Green Belt fields and around the perimeter of the housing is horrifying.</p> <p>The Green Belt fields on which are now farmed must be part of a water table which would change dramatically should hundreds of houses be built on it.</p> <p>We are told that a great many in this country are obese but take away our fields and our areas to walk, run, cycle, play in is not a way to encourage exercise. There are not too many places to do these things around here. It is much simpler to walk, run round a field, ride a bike than travel to gyms, pay exorbitant prices to exercise. It's not only</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Spennells residents who use the lovely fields. Wildlife is abundant. We are always being told we need bees birds and nature of all sorts to make our world liveable. Why destroy it.</p> <p>I hope that someone somewhere would think again about these awful plans and try to come up with a plan that suits all the affected residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2487</a>	Object	<p>The only people who use Turnstone Avenue are the home owners, prospective buyers, dog walkers and driving instructors. The cul-de-sac is safe and secure for children and homes. Now this is all put under threat because, we are told, there is a requirement for more housing for future generations.</p> <p>Firstly, I would argue that the future generations will not be able to afford to live on the Green Belt land as it will surely offer a much higher price than they can afford. Similarly to make the houses affordable that will bring down the quality of the houses at this end of the estate.</p> <p>Secondly, the brownfield areas of Kidderminster will be more enticing to the youth of today, in the same way that Merry Hill has been developed for the 'younger' generation I personally would never think of living there. Young people would much rather live where there is a nightlife close at hand without the additional expense of taxis home.</p> <p>The Green Belt around our town needs to be protected otherwise this country will just become a brick filled land. I work in education and already know that there are students who attend our school that do not benefit was fortunate backgrounds, so a simple trip to the countryside is amazing for them. If we take away these opportunities close-by then they, the future generation, are losing out. It is important that the wildlife themselves are protected too from developments that are unnecessary.</p> <p>With regard to education in the area, this is another issue that needs consideration. I know the school I work at is almost at full capacity per year group, I believe this may be the case for most schools in the Wyre Forest area. If houses were built on the Spennells Fields where exactly would these children be educated?</p> <p>These are some of my objections, I know that many of my neighbours have listed theirs at great length too, I could also mention increased traffic to the area. On Turnstone Road already there are an increased number of cars parked</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>along this narrow road due to families with grown-up driving children. This is not only a safety hazard as it is, however if this were to become a public right of way onto the fields themselves I can see a higher risk in accidents.</p> <p>I feel that we all need to be heard and consideration given to NOT allowing the option to build along the Green Belt of the Spennells Fields and Stanklyn Lane, especially when there are great areas of Kidderminster Town Centre that lie empty or derelict, which can be regenerated and make Kidderminster the town it once was.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2489</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A &amp; B especially A:</p> <p>No regeneration of the town included despite potential larger population.</p> <p>Is this another attempt at getting a Bypass approved?</p> <p>More building would make Kidderminster a commuter town</p> <p>Infrastructure, schools medical services already stretched</p> <p>Wyre Forest has agreed to reduce its carbon footprint but pollution would be increased with extra traffic</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land/Green Belt/recreational space which benefits health/wildlife</p> <p>Use brownfield sites for regeneration first</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2491</a>	Object	<p>We would like to voice our concern and ill thought plans to cover our countryside in houses.</p> <p>I, like many, love the open countryside that the surrounding areas of Kidderminster provide and although my initial thoughts were that the land has “build on me “written all over I do believe that the plans are being thought through.</p> <p>All points already raised are also my concerns,</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Life styles and well being of current local residents. The land is used daily by numerous people for all activities.</p> <p>Increased traffic on roads that are already fast driven and often dangerous.</p> <p>Impact on local schools, hospitals , and surgeries etc</p> <p>Green Belt status setting a precedent for future land to be used.</p> <p>Wildlife and habitat.</p> <p>Are all these concerns being heard? If so what is the thought and reply from within the council?</p> <p>The development that is planned would not have any serious impact of any positive consequence.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2494</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the possible removal of Green Belt status to land at the back of Spennells Estate.</p> <p>The fields are a well used community asset with walkers, dog walkers and cyclists. In these days of obesity warnings, to have such an amenity can only be a benefit for physical and mental health of all who use it. That includes families, people of all generations and people of varying physical ability.</p> <p>These fields also provide an easily accessible opportunity to get an appreciative sense of nature and wild life. A fantastic amenity particularly for children. From being able to watch the crops grow from seed, to seeing a vast variety of wild flowers, birds, butterflies and insects.</p> <p>In addition, the access to Spennells is already at certain times very congested. There is no other viable access to those fields so the congestion and therefore pollution would increase.</p> <p>As I understand it there are options to develop ONLY next to Spennells, or to spread the developments across Kidderminster. I urge you NOT to completely remove such a valuable amenity that is close to so many people, and at</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the very least to have a sense of fairness and spread the new housing across the town.</p> <p>Further to my objection previously entered, I now have further understanding of the proposal and therefore additional objections.</p> <p>In the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, section 8.7 says that the '..... 300 dwellings per annum is at the upper end of the requirements suggested by the various demographic scenarios....'. And then in the very next paragraph 8.8, the statement seems conclusive -</p> <p>'Housing market signals suggest that the housing market in Wyre Forest is relatively stable. There are currently no indicators suggesting a need for adjusting the housing dwelling requirement on the basis of market signals. '</p> <p>So therefore I have to ask why such a massive plan is being considered when there appears to not be the need for it.</p> <p>Why are more brownfield sites not being considered e.g. the town centre particularly Worcester Street? This is much closer to amenities and the railway station. Houses behind Spennells would need people to drive to the station.</p> <p>Option A seems to be preferred because of the possible provision of an Eastern relief road for Kidderminster. While this may relieve roads within the town, this would undoubtedly add significantly to the traffic travelling to both Birmingham and Worcester, as that is most likely be where people would be going for their work thus simply shifting the problem to else where on the network. As I understand it, all concerned are well aware that this road has to cross the railway - possibly twice - therefore is likely to cost millions of pounds which means that its development is unlikely to happen for several years. So why plan for houses for which there completely insufficient access?</p> <p>At the recent consultations, I spoke to someone about IF the new houses get built, will the town centre be improved. I was told that this was nothing to do with Wyre Forest and was up to the companies that own the properties. Surely any plan for increased housing on such a scale must include improvements and incentives to the town centre otherwise the increased population will bring very little benefit to the local economy with Merry Hill, Birmingham</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>and Worcester catering for the majority of shopping needs.</p> <p>The development around Spennells and Eastern Kidderminster seems to be the easy option. Surely with more creativity, and better clarity on the number of houses actually required rather than a number that appears to have no evidence to support it, solutions can be found that avoid spoiling a large part of what makes Kidderminster such a nice to play to live (current town centre excluding).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2495</a>	Object	<p>Probable detrimental effect to local wildlife and increased congestion, particularly going in to Kidderminster from the Bromsgrove Road and also the Viaduct island, both routes which can already be heavily congested.</p> <p>Spennells is already a hugely populated estate with considerable amounts of traffic at peak times.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2498</a>	Object	<p>Spennells is already a large estate but it has a lovely Green Belt within walking distance which is widely used and makes the estate so attractive. I fail to see how there is such a need for thousands of houses when the ones that are put up for sale are on the market for so long. Kidderminster town centre needs money ploughed into it and needs to be a place where people want to go and shop and socialise, it needs attractive, modern apartments that will ultimately bring in younger, vibrant professionals and families who want to be there. Find sites within the town to regenerate and add to Kidderminster, don't use the beautiful and precious Green Belt land which is home to much wildlife and is such a pleasure to live by and is used by so many.</p> <p>Traffic already congested most mornings getting off the estate and out of Kidderminster, this is only going to get worse with extra housing, not to mention the pollution that will inevitably get worse.</p> <p>I fear new housing will be occupied by people who do not have a connection to Kidderminster and probably work out of town, so they won't be spending money here or adding to the community in any way. The houses will not be affordable housing for current locals, and the families moving in will send their children to schools out of town, so many people already do from Spennells. Those same families will work in Worcester, Birmingham or surrounding areas adding to the pollution probably won't shop here either so will bring nothing in to the economy. Focus on getting the current education and housing right and the town centre right so that Kidderminster is a vibrant place to</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>live where people want to move to.</p> <p>The Green Belt is exactly that, it is there to stop urban sprawl, if we continue to build on it where does it end, there will be none left, there has to be a point where it stops before it's too late.</p> <p>The leisure centre development and the houses being built there is still ongoing, they are still building them so surely this is providing a need for future houses isn't it?</p> <p>The population isn't growing in the Wyre Forest so we don't need to jump on the band wagon and build additional housing, the country is already over populated we don't need to fan the flames by providing more housing, let's look after what we already have and get that right first.</p> <p>So in short we strongly object to any housing being built on Green Belt land and specifically option A around the Spennells area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2500</a>	Object	<p>My husband and I firmly object to Wyre Forest encroaching on the fields behind our house to build houses on the fields which are Green Belt as there are many sites in Kidderminster which are better for the purpose.</p> <p>We object to the gypsy proposed, traveller and travelling show people site in Heath lane as dangerous because of the narrow roads, and is totally impractical.</p> <p>The scale of development, on our Green Belt, is much better on brown sites.</p> <p>It would totally destroy the habitat of the Skylarks, linnets and other rare nesting birds.</p> <p>Loss of our countryside Green Belt status. Threatens our public right of way, and productive agricultural land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2502</a>	Object	<p>If Option A is selected then land at the rear of Spennells should be removed as it is not needed. If included it should</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>not start until “core Sites” (inc Lea Castle site in Option B) have been used.</p> <p>Object Option A On the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion, pollution, safety and health grounds.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality fields behind Spennells.</li> <li>• The NPFF should prevent neighbouring towns merging</li> <li>• Flood Risk</li> <li>• Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds</li> <li>• Impact on the wildlife inc Corn Bunting</li> <li>• Loss of recreational land/associated health benefits</li> <li>• Unnecessary urban sprawl</li> <li>• Extra traffic congestion</li> <li>• Re-designation of the fields is contrary to core strategy.</li> <li>• Despite house building the Council have already closed several schools which if needed should have been kept open</li> <li>• The current primary school is already full and more dwellings would need more places plus the extra buses/traffic will mean safety issues for the children</li> <li>• There has never been a Doctors surgery on Spennells.</li> <li>• Use of Green Belt because of wrong decisions in the past is not in the requirements of the National Planning Guidelines</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, from an environmental view point this must not go ahead. Concentrate instead on the regeneration strategy</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2506</a>	Object	<p>As somebody who has grown up on Spennells, the fields have played a big part in my life. It's a way of getting away from the town, and into the countryside. How can you destroy a place that brings so much happiness to so many? Think of others who won't be able to benefit from having somewhere like this as their playground.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2508</a>	Object	<p>I feel that the proposed expansion of Spennells to build new homes will only make the situation worse by causing</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic problems and more pollution. We need our agricultural land to farm and disposing of the fields will not only take away jobs for farmers but produce. Spennells is beautiful with large open spaces for walking and playing don't take these away. I hope the Wyre Forest District Council will look brownfield sites in town centre. I am officially and strongly objecting to building 1,735 new to expand Spennells. I hope this matter is taken with the upmost importance.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2511</a>	Object	<p>I wish to state my objection to plans to release land at the rear of Spennells ,Captains Pool and The Lodge, from the Green Belt for housing development (Option A)</p> <p>The Green Belt was set up explicitly to prevent urban sprawl and protect rural or agricultural land. If we allow land to be released from the Green Belt rather than look at alternative options, eventually Kidderminster will link with Summerfield, then Hartlebury, Ombersley and then eventually Worcester. Where do we draw the line?</p> <p>Housing developers are so certain land will be released from the Green Belt they are purchasing it for vast sums of money prior to consultations and decisions by Planning Departments. The message to developers must be clear – Green Belt is protected for a reason, and will stay that way. Developers must look to build on brownfield sites and previously developed sites, rather than build on Green Belt land because it is a cheaper option for them and generates more income for the Local Council.</p> <p>The massive environmental impact in the face of climate change needs to be considered. Rural areas provide a means of generating oxygen and reducing carbon dioxide, prevent flooding and provide food resources. Indeed, the fields at the rear of Spennells have been regularly planted with crops year after year in the twenty-one years I have lived here. Loss of this agricultural land means a loss of this food resource, resulting in a larger carbon footprint to bring in food from elsewhere. It also means a loss of employment to the workers whose jobs it is to maintain this arable land.</p> <p>Wildlife of many species live in the hedgerows around this land which will be forever destroyed if it is allowed to be developed. Public rights of way across the land provide safe leisure facilities for the people of Spennells and it rare not to see families of cyclists or walkers, enjoying outdoor family time on any given day of the week.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>In addition to this there is the added pollution that extra cars alongside the extra homes will undoubtedly bring, causing increased traffic congestion to an already poorly designed road network on the Estate. Any traffic incident which causes local delays on the A449 or A448, results in the residents of Spennells becoming trapped on the Estate, as traffic cannot flow onto Spennells Valley Road from the only two exits on the Estate. More homes will only increase this problem.</p> <p>Given the Government's commitment to protect the Green Belt, and reduce the impact of climate change I urge you not to allow Wyre Forest Green Belt to be depleted for short term gain. We must look for alternative more environmentally sustainable solutions.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2512</a>	Object	<p>It will cause chaos to the residents, with the invasion of more traffic along the roads and rat runs through the estate.</p> <p>The attraction of the estate is to be able to walk our dogs in a safe area.</p> <p>SO please reconsider changing the Spennells from a Green Belt area into an urban one!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2513</a>	Object	<p>I Object to development at Spennells/Stanklyn fields for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic – how will the roads cope? Stanklyn Lane junction is a nightmare to get out of and Worcester Road is already heavily congested.</li> <li>• There are several brownfield sites that should be used – Sugar Beet, Lea Castle, Town Centre.</li> <li>• The land is prime agricultural.</li> <li>• The fields are used for recreational walking and provide habitat for wildlife.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2514</a>	Object	<p><b>Education:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local schools will have larger classes and reduced resources per student in an education system already under pressure.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Health:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased pressure on health services already under strain – hospitals, doctors, dentists, opticians, district nurses, GP practices.</li> <li>Removal of the fields will diminish mental health and physical well-being of the people who use them. The fields are used extensively by local people for exercise of various sorts: to walk, jog, cycle, walk dogs and ride horses.</li> <li>Increased traffic, noise and higher exhaust emissions and subsequent risk to health</li> </ul> <p><b>Environment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The loss of Green Belt status to the land indicated on the Option A plan will threaten existing Public Rights of Way and removes protection of the countryside from further urban sprawl.</li> <li>There will be a loss of wildlife habitat – with skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds nesting in the fields.</li> <li>There will be a loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p><b>Town planning &amp; Economy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuing with the sprawl of development as proposed in Option A will radically change the character of the town and the area and not for the better.</li> <li>Building more homes around the town centres will reduce car journeys and pollution.</li> <li>It will regenerate the town centres to make them more attractive for inward investment by companies and</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>quality retail outlets. It is the centre of Kidderminster for example which requires the major investment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spreading the home building requirement around other smaller sites will reduce the radical changes in communities across the region.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2516</a>	Object	<p>I understand that the Council has conducted a review of Green Belt as part of their review of the Local Plan and that Spennells/Stanklyn fields might be built on. I would like to object to these plans and voice my concerns for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Green Belt is important as it prevents urban sprawl, the merging of towns and it safeguards the countryside.</li> <li>It also provides habitat, biodiversity, prime agricultural land, recreational space and it is essential to protect and promote the character of the countryside. For example there are Skylarks nesting on these fields. This is a bird in rapid decline in numbers.</li> <li>This is also a great social open space and currently provides somewhere for many people to meet, walk and socialise.</li> <li>Any removal or reduction of Green Belt will increase the urbanisation of the area with a consequent increase in traffic. Increased volumes of traffic will create congestion, exhaust and noise pollution and increase pedestrian and vehicular hazards.</li> <li>Where will a new road go? Any further junctions on the Worcester Road will create further back up of traffic towards Hartlebury. Surely brownfield sites must be prioritised for building on?</li> </ul> <p>In looking at the plans, the numbers for new houses in the plan are confusing, there are so many assumptions made and I feel the plan is written with a bias towards this option. We urge you to reconsider and not to make use of Green Belt land for the above reasons. Open spaces are in rapid decline and will continue to impact on the social wellbeing of many people.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2518</a>	Object	<p>I believe this will increase traffic, noise and disrupt the quiet lovely area we have.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>This is turn will impact on house prices for existing homes.</p> <p>My children are able to play out safely now but with an increase of traffic from all the homes this is likely to change.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2519</a>	Object	<p>I write to object to the proposals to build on land at the rear of Spennells estate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagree with the housing need of 6000.</li> <li>• Coalescence would occur between Stone, Summerfield, Stanklyn Lane and Spennells</li> <li>• Flood risk and drainage. The fields (at N522202 W0021337 and to the rear of south Spennells) are a valuable soak away. Flood defences have had to be installed by Severn Trent on the Spennells estate and the Victoria Carpet's old cricket field is designated flood plain.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic congestion, air pollution and effects on health.</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife, including protected species such as bats, badgers and skylarks. Option A does not encourage biodiversity.</li> <li>• Loss of public footpaths and the impact on health.</li> <li>• The current primary school is full and any more dwellings would have an adverse impact on the local schools and nursery plus the extra buses and traffic will cause increased safety issues for the children.</li> <li>• The fields are on the boundary with Wychhavon which would mean increased urban sprawl. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of unnecessary urban sprawl which has historically been against policy.</li> </ul> <p>The District should concentrate on the regeneration strategy. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of re-designating the fields is contrary to core strategy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2520</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to inform you of my objection to the planning proposal of further expansion to the Spennells area on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Green Belt land should be preserved for our future generations to benefit from, prime agricultural land if built on would be lost forever</p> <p>I believe not enough is being done to regenerate brown sites and inner town areas, having lived in Kidderminster for</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>45years I am amazed at the lack of imagination and endeavour by the council to develop empty sites left empty for years in and around the town ,prime example being the old PO building, for goodness sake get a grip and develop this blot on the landscape for retail and housing, I really do believe the council are trying to push through an easy option to build on Green Belt and not address and rebuild our inner town areas.</p> <p>Removal of fields from this area will have a devastating effect on our children's health and a lasting detrimental effect on the health and well being of all the people living in the area putting extra stress on health services.</p> <p>Traffic in the area will be horrendous, the traffic in the viaduct and Spennells Valley Road area is not acceptable now, I cannot comprehend the effect the extra traffic emissions will have on our children's health and safety, so building a link road form Easter Park area to the A456 Birmingham road would only increase traffic emissions really not a good idea.</p> <p>The pressure on the health centres, schools all public amenities will be totally overloaded.</p> <p>I firmly believe the council should concentrate more on developing brown sites and land in the inner town areas being sat on by speculative developers for housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2521</a>	Object	<p>Strongly against Option A. Spennells is already a very large estate, and it would be detrimental for existing residents to increase its size further. It nonsense to place such a large development in one place. I object most strongly to the loss of Green Belt land, particularly when the fields it is proposed to build on are good quality, productive agricultural land. Such land needs to be retained for food production, particularly at a time of Brexit when it is likely that importing food from abroad is going to be increasingly expensive. The fields are also valuable for local residents for walking the footpaths around the margins, for exercise, for dog walking, and for enhancing people's mental and physical health. They also provide valuable habitat for the wildlife found there, which would be destroyed if the development was allowed. It is no good the planners thinking that retaining some footpaths through the development would suffice. Who would enjoy walking through houses between high fences with no view? It is concerning the effect increased traffic congestion will have with noise and air pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2522</a>	Object	<p>I would like to place my objection to the proposed plans to build on the Green Belt designated land at Spennells. I</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			can't see that anywhere near the amount of proposed houses are needed and I believe that there are still brownfield alternatives available which surely must all be used before Green Belt areas. Once Green Belt areas begin to be used I think it will start a precedent that we can't afford. Building more and more houses is only a short term solution that must stop at some point there is only so much land. The land is a valuable resource in an already overcrowded area used by many people for jogging, dog walking and enjoying the wildlife. The road system around Hoobrook is already terribly congested almost completely gridlocked at times and I can't see the area coping with so many extra cars. The local hospitals and schools also can't be expected to cope with such a large increase in people. I hope careful consideration goes into your final decision.
	<a href="#">LPPO2524</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option A of the Draft Local Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People are being encouraged to get outside in to the fresh air for the good of their physical and mental well being. This is an area used and appreciated by the local community of all ages, dog walkers, walkers, cyclists, joggers, birdwatchers, parents and grandparents with toddlers in pushchairs, young families, people of all ages. The list goes on. Yet the local council wants to do away with it.</li> <li>2. At a time when we are being encouraged to help preserve butterflies and bees, increase their habitat for their and our own good, it's to be vastly reduced. We are lucky enough to have birds around here that are on the Red List. <b>Mistle Thrush, Sky Lark, Corn Crake and House Sparrow.</b> Does it not seem a little ironic to lose their habitat when the entire estate is named after birds?</li> <li>3. Increased pollution. A greater volume of traffic will result in slow moving and stationary traffic leading to more pollution ~ leading to more health issues.</li> <li>4. Increased light pollution. A huge increase in light pollution in an area where nature flourishes can only have a negative impact.</li> <li>5. Loss of agricultural land. The necessity for our country to be more self-sufficient is being brought to our attention. Retaining excellent agricultural land has to be far better than destroying it and having to find alternative but inferior quality land.</li> <li>6. No mention is made of associated services and amenities required. Doctors, emergency services, schools, sports &amp; recreation facilities. Existing services surely can't accommodate the increase in numbers quoted within the Draft Document.</li> <li>7. Travel will be needed for anything. Not everyone has access to a vehicle. Taxis are expensive and the bus</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>service seems to be forever being cut.</p> <p>8. Kidderminster Town Centre is a ghost town to what it was 30 years ago. Why not as part of a regeneration plan encompass new homes on brownfield sites? Use the brownfield sites first. I cannot believe they've all been utilised when there are so many derelict sites within the Kidderminster borders.</p> <p>9. Big play is made of the need for affordable housing yet often these new builds are 4 and 5 bedrooms.</p> <p>10. People will move in from elsewhere, commuting outside the area and probably unlikely to support and integrate with the town by spending their money here rather than where they work etc. Kidderminster will become a satellite town.</p> <p>Once the Green Belt is gone that's it. It can't be replaced. Not everything in life is measured purely in monetary terms. We have a responsibility to preserve our beautiful land for future generations.</p> <p>I therefore herewith register my strong objection to Option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2526</a>	Object	<p>As a resident of Spennells estate I would like to submit my views on the proposed plans.</p> <p>I am aware that not only myself but also other near-by residents are concerned of the impact that this will have in regards to the volume of traffic coming and going from the estate. This is already an ongoing issue on weekday morning as traffic jams and stand still traffic often forms if leaving the estate after 8am. Therefore, I can only see this problem getting worse should more homes be built and do not feel that additional road access being created would necessarily relieve the issue.</p> <p>After speaking to many neighbours, they have also expressed their interest in moving off the estate should the proposed plans go ahead, which is something that I would consider too.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2531</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the development of the whole area of OPTION A nearly doubling the size of Spennells. Option A is too large a development for one area, whereas Option B would be a better solution as less Green Belt would be used, not concentrated in one area but dispersed across the district so less impact on local infrastructure .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This new development would lead to a larger loss of Green Belt which in the face of climate change has an</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>increasingly significant role in storing carbon and preventing flooding and is a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fields, apart from being farmed for crops, provide annual nesting grounds for declining bird species such as Skylarks and other wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• The fields are used extensively by local people to walk, jog, walk dogs and ride horses. With mental health on the increase the loss of these fields would have a detrimental effect on all who live in this area not to mention physical well being especially as the district has one of the highest levels of obesity.</li> <li>• Existing rights of way threatened i.e. Bridal paths</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise and pollution resulting in increased risk to health putting pressure on local medical services.</li> </ul> <p>We appreciate difficult decisions have to be made especially in the light of the government guidelines, although we feel that the population of the area will decrease not increase due to the reduction in available employment (carpet factories/Sealine) and future housing is likely to be purchased by commuters to Birmingham/Worcester etc. it also seems an excessive amount (4.3 million £) that is to be spent upgrading Kidderminster Railway Station primarily for commuters. Surely it makes more sense to use less Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2534</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the development of the whole area of option A, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Mental health and wellbeing would be affected. This field is used by walkers and cyclists. The social aspect of meeting and talking to people would be greatly reduced. Sometimes this is the <b>only</b> time some have any social interaction.</p> <p>Wild life would be habitat would be lost.</p> <p>The volume of traffic would increase and add to traffic congestion in the area.</p> <p>Pollution levels would increase, causing greater health issues in the area.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Agricultural land would be lost.</p> <p>It would increase pressure on all local amenities, already stretched to capacity.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2546</a>	Object	<p>It would be a huge loss to the community and area to build on this Green Belt plot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fields are used by people to walk, jog, cycle etc which is good for mental and physical wellbeing. To deny people the chance to so easily walk to and enjoy these fields would be such a shame, especially when young people are now out doors so much less than in the past.</li> <li>• The schools are over subscribed and getting a doctors appointment is tricky at best.</li> <li>• Spennells is a lovely estate. The residents enjoy space, greenery... quiet.</li> <li>• A busy relief road will increase noise pollution which will affect the health of local residents.</li> <li>• The area is home to a range of wildlife including, hedgehogs, bats and a huge variety of birds.</li> </ul> <p>I hope that this option will be rejected in favour of building on the brownfield land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2549</a>	Object	<p>I hereby tender my objection to Option A of the Draft Local Plan for Wyre Forest:</p> <p>The houses abutting the fields behind Spennells have enjoyed the privacy, quiet and amenity of those fields.</p> <p>The fields to the rear of Spennells provide a place to stroll and enjoy a vast array of natural features.</p> <p>This space is a valuable resource to many residents and visitors: walkers (with or without dogs), joggers, horse riders and twitchers to name but a few.</p> <p>Option A would replace a diverse natural habitat with concrete, brick and tarmac, traffic and its inevitable noise and pollution, people with families and dogs all demanding a share of what resources remain after the houses have been</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>built - all at the cost of the current residents.</p> <p>Why is such a massive destruction of greenfield even being considered - indeed, even preferred to an option that uses brownfield sites?</p> <p>The Captains was refused planning permission for caravans - now it can have houses?</p> <p>The destruction of the fields of Spennells would have serious environmental costs. Apart from the reduction of clean, natural land for the benefit of people, an abundant array of flora and fauna would suffer.</p> <p>With numerous species of grass, campions, clover, knapweed, plantain, hawkbit, dandelion etc., it is no wonder that a remarkable number of skylarks use the fields. Red underwings, fieldfares and housemartins visit. Chaffinches and great tits inhabit the smatterings of hedge around the fields.</p> <p>My own garden has been visited by sparrowhawks, nuthatches, bullfinches, goldfinches, great tits, coal tits, blue tits, long-tailed tits, greater spotted woodpeckers, green woodpeckers and goldcrests - many visit annually. Robins, blackbirds, hedge sparrows and wrens regularly nest with us. Hedgehogs and toads appear every year - probably having hibernated in the garden or nearby. Grass snakes nested in our compost bin a few years ago. Foxes, owls, badgers, sparrow hawks, kestrels and buzzards all value the land.</p> <p>In late February and March we experience the migration of toads. A massacre occurs on the Spennells Valley Road. Toads also migrate across Stanklyn Lane. They will be seriously impacted by a housing development.</p> <p>I have not even begun to mention the insect life that visits my own garden and the Spennells fields: bees, butterflies: commas, red admirals, whites, blues and the meadow species; moths: yellow underwings, eyed hawkmoths, scarlet tiger moths; maybugs and hover flies.</p> <p>All this to be replaced by strain on local resources, massively increased noise, dog mess and litter. And what compensation? It seems that there will be no gains for Spennells residents.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2551</a>	Object	<p>Development here will automatically mean more traffic on the Bromsgrove Road. People who choose to live here are more likely to use the A448 as their local road and to commute to work via Bromsgrove and out to the Motorways. This poor quality, narrow and speed restricted A448 is already over loaded and congested, the Mustow Green roundabout in the evening is a nightmare regularly adding between 10 and 15 minutes to the evening commute.</p> <p>One of the attractions in living on the Spennells estate is that it borders on open country and affords easy access to country footpath through green fields, especially for joggers and those who own dogs and need to walk them. These footpaths encourage healthy outdoor exercise in all age groups. If they are lost then the option of pounding the pavement outside yet more houses is not nearly as appealing.</p> <p>There are plenty of sites in and around the town centre which could be restored into high quality housing. Also there are brownfield sites which should be considered first before taking the easy option of building on the Green Belt and taking yet more valuable agricultural land out of production.</p> <p>Do we really want to encourage more people to live in Kidderminster with the town centre the way it is at the moment? The town centre is a disgrace, it is depressed and an embarrassing place to take friends and family around when they visit. There are no decent shops, family run shops are driven out and the place is full of charity shops, empty shops and banks. There seems to only be one direction the town centre is going and that is down.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2559</a>	Object	<p><b>Overall conclusion:</b></p> <p>We are presented with Options A and B - I am opposed to the concentrated development described in option A and greatly prefer the dispersed approach as described in option B.</p> <p><b>Housing Need</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I suspect that the estimation of numbers of dwellings required is exaggerated.</li> <li>• I am not convinced that such a large number of houses will be required in the coming years but I am convinced that it will not be necessary or helpful to concentrate those that are built at a single location.</li> <li>• It seems far better to allow development to proceed in a more natural and dispersed way which would be</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>allowed by Option B.</p> <p><b>Proposed Eastern Relief Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal for an eastern relief road is sketchy at best - this is a disappointing oversight in the plan and requires more attention.</li> <li>• I assume that the relief road is primarily intended to deal with through traffic but, given the obviously limited development of the proposal, it is impossible to gauge its potential to deal with the increase in local traffic which will be generated by the development in option A.</li> <li>• I can only conclude that proposal A will generate additional pressure on the current Spennells access roads and lead to increased traffic through the estate, this can only add to the significant traffic congestion which already occurs at peak times.</li> <li>• I prefer the dispersed development which is allowed by option B which will not lead to such a marked concentration of traffic.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional pressure on Spennells infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spennells has always lacked amenities which should have been seen as essential on a large residential estate. There is no medical provision, no community provision (particularly since the youth club has been incorporated into the school) and the local primary school is operating at capacity with consequent impact on parking in Warbler place etc. It is difficult to see how the estate can be enlarged unless these deficiencies are addressed.</li> <li>• We are told that the increase in population will trigger additional facilities e.g. a new school but Option A will require some years to be fully implemented. I am certain that there will be additional pressure on existing facilities until such time as additional facilities become justified.</li> <li>• I prefer a development model which will avoid the concentration of difficulties which would be produced by Option A.</li> </ul> <p><b>Environmental issues</b></p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The implementation of Option A will lead to a significant and inevitable increase in traffic in the Spennells area. This will have a deleterious effect on health and the general quality of life.</li> <li>There will be increased emissions with an adverse effect on Air Quality; this is unlikely to be mitigated by government clean energy policy for many years.</li> <li>There will be an inevitable increase in road journeys to and from the town centre. This could be avoided if development made use of brownfield sites which are available closer to the town centre.</li> <li>I prefer a development model which will avoid the increase in traffic and pollution which would be produced by Option A.</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact on Town Centre Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been considerable and beneficial development in Kidderminster town centre during recent years. However, this has caused a measure of 'blight' in older areas which provide increased opportunity for dispersed redevelopment.</li> <li>I would prefer a dispersed model of development such as that described in Option B which can take advantage of such opportunities to create a vibrant town centre</li> </ul> <p><b>Green Belt</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I believe that Green Belt land should only be used as a last resort.</li> <li>Option A uses only valuable Green Belt land so; I prefer option B uses significantly less Green Belt land.</li> <li>It seems wrong to build on Green Belt land when Option B would allow redevelopment of brownfield sites which are closer to the town centre and would also bring the benefits described above.</li> </ul> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fields to the south of Spennells provide a landscape which provides a valuable and well used amenity. It is widely enjoyed, the footpaths provide opportunities for leisure activities and exercise which contribute to general health and a sense of well being</li> <li>I would regret the loss of a valuable and well used amenity and prefer Option B as it has less impact on the</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>natural environment</p> <p><b>Wildlife</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green Belt land to the south of Spennells provides an invaluable habitat for wildlife including rare birds and small mammals.</li> <li>• I prefer Option B which will have less impact on wildlife</li> </ul> <p><b>Agriculture</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green Belt land to the south of Spennells is productive agricultural land</li> <li>• I prefer Option B which will have less impact on agriculture.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2560</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development on Spennells Green Belt for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road infrastructure is not sufficient, it is already heavily congested.</li> <li>• Increase in air pollution from additional cars will have detrimental impact on health.</li> <li>• The fields are used daily by many residents as a recreational amenity.</li> <li>• Development should be more dispersed through Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Investment should be put into making Kidderminster an attractive place to come before building extra homes for them to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2561</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to Option A and would prefer you to consider very carefully the implications to local infrastructure if you did go ahead with it. A more dispersed approach is better so I would opt for Option B. Likewise the knock-on effects on local infrastructure need to be monitored with that too.</p> <p>My main points are</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Please look at the numbers of houses required in the future again.</b> It seems to me too large an estimate. I would prefer you to investigate other ways of providing new dwellings. Our ageing population needs specialist small housing close to doctors and shops not large 3 and 4-bedroom houses on isolated estates. Our young people want to be close to their work places and night life in larger towns and cities, not “out in the sticks” in Kidderminster. I can’t see how Kidderminster Station can increase its parking to help people commute to work, it’s always full when I want to park. I have seen no mention made of Housing Association homes or other rental options in these plans, are they not essential to provide a wide variety of provision?</li> <li>• <b>Green field sites should be the last resort not the first.</b> If it needs to be green field it should only be after all brownfield sites have been used. I would prefer you to look at sites like Lea Castle which seems ideal and should be at the fore front of your plans. (Special attention needs to be made to ensuring road safety around that site if ever used.)</li> <li>• <b>Spennells cannot cope with a large housing estate on its periphery.</b> The planners at the drop-in session told me that a school would not be built until a certain high number of houses were completed. The children housed in these early new dwellings need to be able to access education easily. If Spennells School is full, other local schools like Wilden and Comberton can’t easily cope with additional numbers trying to get in either. All three schools were built without provision for parental parking hence the nightmare at school pick up time. To have to wait for a high trigger point seems harsh for the building of provision for the education of future children of Kidderminster. Housing spread out throughout the district would achieve an easier entry to <b>education</b>.</li> <li>• The planners were also vague about other <b>infrastructure issues</b>. This Eastern Relief Road should be part and parcel of these diagrams provided for consultation, so that everyone can see what is actually intended for the future. If the Eastern Relief Road was built, rat runs through the estate to get to shops and school would mean similar congestion at peak times. If Turnstone Road was used as the early access to the new estate, much congestion would arise at busy times for people trying to get off the estate. Perhaps it would need bollards on Turnstone Road to divide old estate from new if there was to be a relief road. Please plan this carefully if Option A is implemented. The huge capital investment of the crossing of the railway line seems to be hidden very carefully, it would be a major construction headache with enormous impact locally.</li> <li>• No provision is made currently for any form of <b>community facility</b> on the estate now the old Youth Club provision has been subsumed into the school. Please consider this in planning <b>any</b> new developments.</li> <li>• Using the language of Wyre Forest District Council Planners there would be an “adverse impact on air</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>quality, the landscape and wildlife,” if that argument can be used to turn down another development, I see it very appropriate here. I moved onto the estate July 1988, the very first day whilst waiting to move into my house I could hear a <b>skylark</b> singing high up in the sky. Each year since then I have delighted in hearing them from my garden and seeing them in the fields. The skylark is a rare bird, so I hope cognisance has been fully taken of that. I was shocked to see, last year, that the farmer had let the productive fields deteriorate but was rewarded by the fabulous show of bright red poppies. I do hope that wasn't an attempt to downgrade what I imagine is high grade agricultural land into land that is only fit to “grow” houses. These fields are the lungs of the estate and need to remain as such for the mental health of the residents of the estate who need the ability to walk away from traffic and fumes.</p> <p><b>Please reconsider making Option A the prime choice for new development.</b> Don't destroy huge swathes of Green Belt. Take some carefully chosen sites, but not huge swathes of it please!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2565</a>	Object	I wish to object to the plans to build on Green Belt area. There are plenty of abandoned factories and land which is vacant and attracting flytippers that could be used for housing without using Green Belt which should be preserved for future generations.
	<a href="#">LPPO2568</a>	Object	<p>I believe the quality of life on Spennells Estate will reduce not increase if the plans go ahead for the new development on the southern edge of the current Spennells Estate.</p> <p>I believe the new development will lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal of fields that are used extensively by local people on the estate for recreational purposes</li> <li>• The impact on the wildlife within those fields and hedgerows and surrounding Green Belt area. There are a number of red listed birds within these fields and area such as Skylarks and Linnets</li> <li>• Increased traffic and noise – the Estate can get congested now without hundreds more cars adding to it. The roads that service Spennells will not cope with the extra traffic through Hoobrook onto Worcester as it's too busy now in rush hour.</li> <li>• The internet quality is very poor already and this will add extra pressure to another service that probably isn't scheduled to be upgraded.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be an impact on drainage as the fields offer a soak away</li> <li>• The quality of housing and space allocated for frontages, drives and gardens need to be consistent with the current estate and planners ensure that there are drives on the front of houses not used group parking areas which residents will not use. The housing companies need to make a few less homes and money to ensure that the area is decent.</li> <li>• There seems to be no additional plans for road infrastructure changes or additional public transport services and impact assessments on the increase in population to additional services for GPs, schools, hospital, benefit offices, council services, etc.</li> <li>• Loss of the Green Belt status means an impact on protecting further urban spread, it sets a precedence and is an “easy option” as its cheaper for the builders than insisting the spend extra money preparing derelict or brownfield sites.</li> </ul> <p>The plan mentions 10% of the population in the district currently attend swimming or gym and the new leisure centre has not been built to sustain the increase in usage for the next 10 years so already this is a short-sighted approach by a council who knew they would need to expand within the next 15 years. The current site cannot be expanded to take this increase.</p> <p>It would be useful to ensure that the contracts with the building companies who want to buy the land actually put something back into the community by way of renovating something else - be it a building or park space or similar as part of their corporate social responsibility and therefore the council get something extra than just easy money for easy land.</p> <p>The town centre needs to be regenerated otherwise all the money that additional residents will bring will be spent outside of the town because it looks deserted and run down.</p> <p>The land is currently Green Belt and there are plenty of areas in Kidderminster that are rundown or derelict and these areas/buildings could be renewed to make the place more pleasant to live in as a whole not just expand the edges with nice new homes and keep the old all rundown. Kidderminster town has become disjointed from many years of different decision making on development in the centre. Sadly it is more expensive for the builders to</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>renovate and regenerate sites than build on land that doesn't need work and this influences the decisions.</p> <p>I also believe that the houses that are proposed will not help families who need affordable homes as the ones builders now build are 4-5 bedroom and this town needs more apartments for the younger generation and more 2-3 bedroom houses for families.</p> <p>The plans state that the council will build new business parks for new jobs to be created ready for the people who move into these new homes. We have many business areas with buildings empty i.e. Easter Park, ex-boat building site on Worcester Road. We cannot fill these; half of the town has no shops, so where will these people go for jobs - answer "outside Kidderminster".</p> <p>I don't believe that the surrounding infrastructure, roads, schools, shopping areas, supermarkets will be changed enough to managing the increase in population.</p> <p>Finally I object to plan A</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02570</a>	Object	<p>I <b>OBJECT</b> to the planning of Spennells fields and Captains Pool. This will have such a negative impact on the surrounding area where residents use the fields as a community facility to walk dogs etc.</p> <p>There are plenty of other sites within Kidderminster that are derelict that can be used for this and wouldn't have an impact on people's life.</p> <p>It will destroy the approach into Kidderminster if you develop near Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive and also the area close to Captains Pool, a beautiful part of Kidderminster where an ugly housing estate will be placed, I feel this will want to make most residents move on and out of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02571</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the building of more houses on the greenfield space behind the Spennells Estate. I believe it to be wrong to build on Green Belt land. I object to the proposal of building on this land as I would like it to stay as Green Belt. As one of the many people who benefits from the use of this land for exercise and well being, I would</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>hate to see it being lost to development.</p> <p>I would also wish to put in a concern about the new Eastern Relief Road which is proposed in your expansion plans as I don't believe it will relieve congestion. The Council have already implemented a by-pass to Stourport which has done little to reduce congestion on our roads. Since the implementation of this link-road &amp; the new set of traffic lights there are longer queues on the A449.</p> <p>What other infrastructure improvements are to be created to cope with the influx of circa 3000 vehicles per day to the proposed new homes?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2575</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my concern for proposals to build on Green Belt land near Spennells.</p> <p>This area is important to many local residents. It is used for walking, cycling, jogging but to mention a few and I see it as important for wellbeing.</p> <p>In my opinion brown field sites and sites closer to town will not only preserve our countryside but regenerate our town.</p> <p>Another concern would be the amount of traffic all these homes would generate locally which would be an annoyance as well have another negative impact on our local environment and of course an impact of the wildlife who habitat in these fields.</p> <p>I hope you listen to concerns of all the people these proposals will impact locally.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2576</a>	Object	<p>With reference to your proposed building on Green Belt land surrounding the Spennells I seriously ask that you reconsider as this will not only have a dramatic influence on the immediate area but to Kidderminster as a whole.</p> <p>My concerns are :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shops</li> <li>• Doctors surgery</li> <li>• Ambulance</li> <li>• Police</li> <li>• Roads</li> <li>• Fresh air</li> <li>• Food outlets</li> </ul> <p>Have you estimated the extra costs and impact this will have on the community?</p> <p>You may conclude that the S.A.F.E march was nimbyism. I can assure you it was more than that; it was a demonstration of a community pulling together.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2577</a>	Object	<p>I would like to Object to Option A submitted by the Council and in particular to the proposed development on Green Belt land on the fields behind Spennells Estate and Captains Pool. The Spennells fields form part of the valuable Green Belt land designed to stop the "urban sprawl" from the Spennells Estate which is already sizeable, consisting of some 2000 houses. The fields are a very important part of our countryside and are widely used by residents on Spennells and other surrounding areas. They are a haven for wildlife and offer residents a chance to get out into the fresh air and enjoy our beautiful countryside. With the increasingly stressful lives that people live, it is imperative that we have access to open green spaces in which to exercise, walk etc which greatly helps with mental health and an overall feeling of well being. These fields are priceless to the local residents that use them and to the diverse wildlife that lives there. We are all being told to exercise more to stay healthy. The fields are also utilised as agricultural land and therefore are used to grow Barley etc.</p> <p>The Council has suggested that it will build on brown field sites first. I would suggest that more attention is paid to how new housing can be incorporated in and around the town centre which is in dire need of regeneration. I fail to see why so many houses need to be built around Kidderminster when employment is clearly declining (the loss of the carpet industry) and the population of the town has remained static since 2001 as referred to by a BBC report on the Midlands News. Why do we need so many houses? Our hospital is in special measures and certainly won't be able to cope with an influx of people. Similarly the schools will become oversubscribed as well as Doctors surgeries</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>etc.</p> <p>A relief road is mentioned but there is no detail. Would this road have to go across yet more valuable countryside? Will it be going through much needed woodland or across pools?</p> <p>To finish there are far too many houses proposed to be built on the Spennells fields. I do not agree that they are needed or that this is the best place to put them. I submit that the other brown field development sites, including Lea Castle Hospital should be looked at more closely and the Green Belt land of Spennells fields should be left alone for everyone to have the benefit of enjoying.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2578</a>	Object	<p>I write to object to option A of the WFDC local plan.</p> <p>Option A results in the destruction of Green Belt and good quality arable land, the loss of highly used recreational areas that will result in a negative effect on residents' health both physical and mental, the loss of wildlife habitat, and increased pollution and congestion on the Eastern / South Eastern side of Kidderminster.</p> <p>My objection to option A is not a case of 'not in my back yard' as some of the core housing sites are closer to where I live than option A. I do however believe that the destruction of Green Belt land and the negative effect this will have on the Spennells &amp; Stone residents, plus the environmental pressure (traffic air pollution, lack of services etc) that option A combined with the core sites will put on the south-eastern side of Kidderminster, option B should be selected and option A should be scrapped.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2579</a>	Object	<p>Why would you want to take away one of the unique things that attracts so many people and wildlife to Kidderminster? I was shocked and appalled to learn the news that you are thinking of building houses on the Green Belt by the Spennells estate.</p> <p>When walking around those fields, you forget that you are less than 10 minutes from the town centre. A town centre, which has continued to decrease in popularity and has so much empty unused space. Why can this (the brownfield sites) not be used for new development? Why are you insistent at choosing the easy option of grabbing</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the Green Belt land instead of developing a policy of urban regeneration?</p> <p>Besides its beauty, lives a hidden world full of nature. Bats, skylarks, badgers to name a few call this land their home. It would be devastating to take these creatures natural habits away from them. Not only this, but this land is used regularly by the residents, who jog, walk and exercise their dogs on this land. What about the standard of living of the residents who already live here?</p> <p>Roads around Kidderminster are already increasingly busy, building a development of new houses and a new road will increase the amount of cars on our roads. This will in turn, increase the pressure on our local services, leading to a poorer quality of care.</p> <p>The Housing and economic land availability assessment 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014 sums it up in these simple words: 'Housing needs does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development.' I hope that you hear these words and come to realise that option B is the more justifiable option and should be the one you take forward.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2583</a>	Object	<p>I object to you building on the Spennells fields, Spennells estate is already big enough.</p> <p>You are not building for "people of Kidderminster".</p> <p>Leave the land alone and maybe do up existing council houses that are left empty, <b>hands off Spennells Fields.</b></p> <p>Instead of taking up precious land, that is full of wildlife - <b>why don't you knock down some of the many council offices and build houses on that.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2596</a>	Object	<p>We are very concerned about the large volume of traffic and local amenities due to this increase. There is already a large volume of traffic which uses the Spennells Valley Road each morning creating tailbacks and much congestion.</p> <p>We have a primary school which is already full and a mini supermarket.</p> <p>We understand that increases in housing requirements happen but there are many other sites which could be</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			redeveloped and would save our Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2606</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development of the fields around the Spennells estate.</p> <p>The Green Belt area was put in place to control urban growth and to maintain an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail i.e. to keep land open.</p> <p>The local community of Spennells and surrounding areas would be totally devastated because of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of a tremendous amount of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The loss of wildlife, fields and hedgerows. Under the UK Bio Diversity Action plan, councils have a duty to protect wildlife. The field and surrounding areas are home to badgers, bats. Hedgehogs, skylarks, swallows and a lot more.</li> <li>• The loss of valuable, well used, recreational spaces for all ages - The footpaths around Spennells fields are used daily for walking dogs and keeping fit but also for the views and the wildlife and the many plants that grow there.</li> <li>• Building on the Green Belt land would cause disruption or loss of bridleways and footpaths.</li> <li>• <u>The creation of an ugly urban sprawl, losing natural breaks from other communities.</u> There will be a massive strain on the infrastructure, due to the over capacity, which will be put on schools, doctors and the few shops on Spennells. Kidderminster hospital was downgraded; Worcester hospital is under special measures. Kidderminster hospital would need to be upgraded to a full district hospital if these plans were to go ahead.</li> <li>• There will be vastly more traffic on the roads that at this time are not capable of taking that traffic and which are usually in a poor state of repair.</li> <li>• Loss, on a large scale of food producing fields. The farmer has just harvested a good crop of wheat.</li> </ul> <p>As well as the foregoing points, the following must be carefully considered before the implementation of such a proposed development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We urge the council to consider all brownfield sites. Initially this would meet the current demand for housing. Also to consider land around the town centre which is derelict? Kidderminster town centre has so</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>many empty shops and is a real eyesore.</p> <p>I feel that the figures used are totally out of proportion with reality – Kidderminster does not need more housing built on Green Belt land. The proposed housing scheme will not benefit the families of Kidderminster but is aimed at Birmingham and surrounding areas. The houses that would be built if the plans went ahead would not be affordable housing for the people of Kidderminster. Even the proposed new railway station might look good on paper but it is only being built because of the proposed housing schemes and bringing families etc from Birmingham and surrounding areas.</p> <p>There have been, over the last few months, a lot of alternative plans for where to build houses and rejuvenating the town centre. These ideas should be looked at before anything else is considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2610</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to express my concern for the proposed <b>overpowering</b> housing development which has been proposed for Spennells estate expansion into Stanklyn Lane and beyond in Kidderminster.</p> <p>This proposal will swallow up most of the Green Belt agricultural land along the corridor of Stanklyn Lane, where for the last thirty five years that I have been resident in this area has been a haven for wildlife, farming, walking and well being for many people.</p> <p>The idea that this quantity of housing will anyway help the well being of the Kidderminster area is totally absurd. <b>THIS IS A GREEN FIELD LOCATION, and should be kept that way.</b></p> <p><b>There are many other options that could be explored and which are already brown field sites.</b></p> <p>If this goes ahead the strain which will be put upon our already suffering resources would be beyond thinkable.</p> <p>Road congestion, (which since the introduction of the traffic lights on the Worcester road leading to the new large housing estate , which is still being developed, on the defunked Sugar beet premises) now backs, up all along the A449 , which never happened before.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The hospital in Kidderminster is no longer the Hospital that we all knew, and this has put an overload on the Worcester Hospital that we all now have to go to, which shows in the fact, that this is now deemed one of the worst hospitals in the country, not said by me but by the government. I add not the staffs fault, but the fault of the overloading from the closing down of local hospitals, which is another issue, but to add to this by building this many dwelling is ludicrous.</p> <p>Schools are already overcrowded in this area, public transport is so limited, and then we turn to the town centre of Kidderminster.</p> <p>This has also been subject to very limited development for many years, which shows up blatantly when you are walking around the main town centre, it's such a shame. Is this because the funding was lost in the Icelandic Banks scandal? And building this many dwelling is this a method of trying to recoup some of those ill fated funds!</p> <p>I would also add it appears that it is always the East side of Kidderminster that appears to bear the brunt of any excess.....WHY?</p> <p>We are all told that we all need to exercise and look after our well being, to take the strain off the NHS, walking is a good way, and open air country side, is good for the mind and spirit, and also to look after our planet with all its diminishing rare wild life, <b>well this is not the way</b>. Develop the brown field site first. I have grandchildren and would hope that they can still go locally to this area.</p> <p><b>BE FAIR AND PROPORTIONALLY BUILD.....NOT A MASSIVE ESTATE LIKE THIS.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2611</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the above plans on Green Belt fields behind Spennells and bordering Stanklyn lane for the following reasons:</p> <p>I have walked these fields and foot paths for 20 years plus as have many others for my health and pleasure and would be devastated at their loss as they contain much wildlife and are an area of farm land used to grow food by farmers and the loss of this beautiful countryside is beyond belief!</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There is not the infrastructure for such a large housing development, the roads would become gridlocked; we already have problems on the A449 since the erection of traffic lights just past Hoobrook island and the traffic gets extremely backed up especially at peak times and from mid afternoon onwards.</p> <p>There is no provision for Schools, shops, GP surgeries and hospitals, Worcester is the worst in the country already and is in special measures.</p> <p>Commuters would buy this cheaper housing to work in more expensive areas making the roads even busier as there is surely not enough employment in Kidderminster for this new influx of people.</p> <p>The town Centre is almost decimated it is full of empty premises and charity shops so no attraction there!</p> <p>I realize houses need to be built but they should be built around different areas in Kidderminster and not in one place all on the East side punishing the current inhabitants with years of building work and the mess and contractors traffic that will bring. It is too easy to just select one area and take away the natural beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Spennells estate is just a nice size to increase it by 87% is horrendous.</p> <p>You will be sacrificing our happiness for financial gain for Wyre Forest Council to recoup your losses with the Icelandic bank fiasco, split the housing between areas Please!</p> <p>We are encouraged to walk for health benefits, take these fields away where do we go, get in our cars adding to the traffic and create more air pollution does not make sense or help the environment!</p> <p>An unhappy resident of the east side of Kidderminster!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2613</a>	Object	<p>The proposed land is being 'actively' farmed and has been, since I have lived here. Evidence that the crops produced are in demand.</p> <p>The fields are surrounded by 'designated ' public rights of way and bridle paths, and with the many 'preservation</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>orders' on hedgerows and trees, ANY development is totally impractical.</p> <p>Access to and from Spennells can become congested, at peak times, particularly when there are roadworks/problems on the main Worcester road.</p> <p>Increasing rather than alleviating traffic and its associated air pollution.</p> <p>All of this, together with the obvious impact on the local, essential services, such as schools, doctors, dentists, recreational facilities, will result in 'social detriment'.</p> <p>The use and development of smaller pockets of brownfield areas (all of which I do not believe have been seriously considered) will mean that adjacent, local services will be more likely to be able to accommodate the increased population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2654</a>	Object	<p>I feel I must object strongly to the draft proposals to build on the Green Belt in the Wyre Forest, this goes against the Housing Ministers expressed wishes and it goes against the views of hundreds if not thousands of local residents and voters.</p> <p>All the areas mentioned in the draft plan are valuable arable and recreational land. I believe it was stated in the document that this land is only Class 2 arable land, well show me some Class 1 land in the Wyre Forest, there isn't any!</p> <p>Judging by the crop of barley that has just been harvested and the hundreds of tons of carrots that were harvested earlier this year in the fields adjacent to Spennells it seems to be doing OK.</p> <p>The fields to the south of Spennells are used as a recreational area by thousands of people every year enjoying easy access to a valuable green space on their doorstep. This area is home to many species of birds, skylarks, swifts at this time of year, and the very rare and endangered Corn Bunting. The fields are home to Bats, Badgers, rabbits, foxes and many more animals.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>All this would be lost forever if built on.</p> <p>The Spennells area would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic caused by all the extra inhabitants and that is not mentioning the extra stress on the existing infrastructure, schools, doctors, hospital etc. Traffic is horrendous now in the mornings without the increased burden of more traffic. The proposed, so called Relief Road, would simply move the problem somewhere else in the area.</p> <p>New roads very rarely solve traffic problems; they just create more, elsewhere. Because they attract more traffic.</p> <p>We certainly do not want to be part of a greater Birmingham conurbation, we like being surrounded by Green Belt, lets keep it that way, the plan to build on Green Belt should be reconsidered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2662</a>	Object	<p>As per the consultation last year the District should concentrate on the regeneration strategy as outlined in sections 5 and 6 of the aforementioned document. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of re-designating the fields is contrary to core strategy as approved by your electorate.</p> <p>Objections specific to the Copse at N522202 W0021337 and Fields to the rear of (south) Spennells Estate on the basis of Flood Risk, Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2012 government national planning policy framework (NPPF) requires “relevant planning authorities who should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile land.” The fields behind Spennells are good quality and this has not been covered in the Local Plan.</li> <li>“There are no recorded nature conservation or cultural heritage interests on the site”. There is record of Badgers, Skylarks, Linnets and Bats therefore the definition of LIMITED CONTRIBUTION is wrong. Therefore, the planners have been misled by this independent report and need to review the Local Plan based on this being a SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION and breach of planning guidance.</li> </ul> <p>Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on drainage in the area as the fields are a valuable soak away. Already flood defences have had</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>to be installed by Severn Trent on the Spennells estate and as we know the Victoria Carpet's old cricket field is designated flood plain. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of increase flood risk.</p> <p><b>Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding Spennells, particularly if Turnstone access is opened up as suggested at a “Drop In “meeting will cause extra congestion in traffic exiting from the only two exits onto Spennells Valley Road. Already there are queues at both exits particularly when the schools are operating with waiting times regularly in the region of 10-15minutes. Any further traffic will only add to the air pollution. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of congestion, pollution and health grounds.</li> <li>Option A will have a detrimental impact on the wildlife that feeds and lives on the fields and surrounding areas. There are Bats and Badgers in the area. In Britain all bat species and their roosts are legally protected, by both domestic and international legislation. Badgers and their setts (tunnels and chambers where they live) are protected by UK law. The skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult skylark, or to take damage or destroy an active nest or its contents. The only exception is legitimate farming practices that cannot be reasonably delayed, although farming methods can often be modified to reduce the impact on the skylarks. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of it being unlawful and not encouraging bio diversity which is one of the objects of the Council via Planning Policy Statement 9. 3.</li> <li>The current intensive use of the public footpaths within Option A is helping preserve people's health. I therefore object to Option A on health grounds.</li> <li>The current primary school is full and any more dwellings would have an adverse impact on the local schools and nursery plus the extra buses and traffic will cause increased safety issues for the children. I therefore object to Option A on the grounds of congestion, pollution and safety.</li> </ul> <p><b>Green Belt Review</b></p> <p>In the Green Belt review some of the assessment is wrong and coalescence will occur if Option A were to be pursued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NPFF requires assessment against the following criteria:</li> </ul>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</li> <li>○ Would development of the proposed site appear to result in the merging of towns or compromise the separation of towns physically?</li> <li>○ Would potential development of the proposed site be a significant step leading towards coalescence of two settlements?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On page 42 it states LIMITED CONTRIBUTION Development would have no impact on this purpose in this location, although locally the identity of Summerfield would change along its northern extent.</li> <li>• On page 50 it states LIMITED CONTRIBUTION Development of the site would not lead to the merger of towns, although locally the separate identity of the dwellings strung along Stanklyn Lane which comprise Summerfield would largely disappear (particularly when viewed in combination with additional proposed development to the east).</li> </ul> <p>My view is coalescence would occur between Stone, Summerfield, Stanklyn Lane and Spennells if the land to the rear of Spennells is built on therefore the definition of LIMITED CONTRIBUTION is wrong.</p> <p>The fields back onto our boundary with Wychhavon which would mean increased urban sprawl. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of unnecessary urban sprawl which has historically been against policy.</p> <p>Large Urban estates have evidenced increased anti social behaviour and increased crime rates and this appears to be acknowledged in the WFIDP but is not covered in the Local Plan consultation. Therefore, to me doubling the size of Spennells makes no sense whatsoever and is not needed as per my points 1 – 1.3.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2663</a>	Object	<p>The Option A site is currently valuable arable farmland and is also a key environmental benefit to the residents of the Spennells estate.</p> <p>It is important as a habitat for many wildlife species, some, like Skylarks, endangered.</p> <p>Residents and others enjoy this space for recreation and it thereby enhances the well-being of local people.</p> <p>The development will only attract 'commuters' to the town as local industry will not provide the types of</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>employment sought by the new home owners. Local services and roads will be ever more crowded and over used.</p> <p>If the 'possible' road development takes place, this will only attract more vehicles and provide additional 'rat-runs' through the area with the increased noise and pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2664</a>	Object	<p>1) Large numbers of people having to be assimilated into an already crowded estate.</p> <p>2) Removal of Green Belt fields, which serve not only as good agricultural land, but are used by the current residents for much needed exercise and fresh air.</p> <p>3) Increased traffic, noise and higher emissions of noxious fumes. Creating an environment of more fumes and less opportunity to take exercise is a poor choice.</p> <p>4) Local services such as schools, pharmacists, doctors put under increased strain.</p> <p>5) Public transport. Already not satisfactory, another massive housing development would just add to the misery.</p> <p>6) Loss of wildlife habitat.</p> <p>7) We have already seen creeping change at Easter Park so we know once we give in on Green Belt land the same thing will happen again.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2676</a>	Object	<p>1. Keep the Green Belt</p> <p>2. Traffic congestion already very bad in the area</p> <p>3. Protect the countryside people need a place to walk the dogs ect.</p> <p>4. Wildlife need these spaces</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			5. Build on brownfield sites before Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO2679</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the building of houses on land adjacent to the Spennells estate; not on the grounds that it is valuable fertile farmland but because of the state, or lack of, the infrastructure supporting the county of Worcestershire.</p> <p>Taking advantage of Solihull's ploy to pay for a new road network will only encourage more commuters from the Birmingham area which will put a greater strain on the already overstretched resources. In particular the Worcestershire NHS Trust which, according to the national news, is the worst in the whole of the country.</p> <p>I suggest writing to Central Government and tell them that if they insist we provide more housing then we, the tax paying people of Worcestershire, insist that they bring our basic amenities up to at least Third World standards.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2680</a>	Object	<p>I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed development of Green Belt land around the Spennells Estate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is Green Belt land and should remain as such</li> <li>2. There is an abundance of wildlife which will disappear</li> <li>3. The main objection, in my opinion, is that Spennells is a large enough estate already. The main roads around Spennells are very congested so even with the alleged contribution from Solihull to provide more roads the situation will not improve. My understanding is that should the new houses be built a great many of them will provide housing for Solihull's overspill and the likelihood is that these people will be commuting to Birmingham so will not do anything to improve the economy of the area but they will be using our already overstretched hospitals, doctors' surgeries and schools. Before any further development takes place I think the whole issue of the infrastructure should be addressed and improved.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2684</a>	Object	I am writing to you today to object about the proposals of the building of 1,735 new homes on Spennells Green Belt land.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The reasons for my objections are;</p> <p>1) The area is currently used by many residents including myself to walk, jog, cycle, ride horses, dog walk and nature watch. What provisions have been thought of to replace these routes and areas so that we may still be able to enjoy these activities within the Green Belt environment that we are used to? Why should we lose it? Running through a concrete, polluted jungle is just not the same!</p> <p>2) There will be increased traffic, noise and pollution spoiling the current "out of town, in the countryside feel" of the estate. What provisions have been made so that pollution, traffic and noise will be kept to a minimum and how will you be easing the congestion on the current surrounding roads as they will struggle to cope with the extra volume? Especially during rush hour times. Why make it worse? Will you be building a big car park to accommodate the extra school vehicles and where will this be? The school parking is already all the way round to Hawfinch and it causes such a bottleneck with traffic parked on both sides of the road, how will you make sure this doesn't get worse?</p> <p>3) The local schools will need to take in many more pupils and they are already struggling for resources. What provisions have been made to ensure this does not affect the children currently in these schools? If the Spennells estate as it is, fills a primary school easily then doubling the size of the estate will warrant major school expansion and disruption or another primary school being built over the new side of the estate. Is this planned?</p> <p>4) Doubling the size of the estate will cause a knock on effect in the town with more pressure on local doctors, dentists, opticians and hospitals. What provisions have been made so that the positions of current residents, that are already on long waiting lists, will not be made worse?</p> <p>5) The loss of wildlife habitat. There are skylarks, linnets and other red-listed birds nesting in these fields. How are you going to protect them? Where are you going to move them to?</p> <p>Increase in crime and anti social behaviour - there are no longer enough police in Kidderminster to cover the area as</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>it is, resources are stretched.</p> <p>There are other brown field sites in Kidderminster that really need regeneration. Can't these houses be built there and leave Spennells alone?</p> <p>I am not against change and growth but you would be spoiling an amazing area of land that serves the people of Spennells completely. Any more growth would ruin the perfect balance we already have between nature and human living spaces.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2686</a>	Object	<p><b><u>I wish to object to Option A in the Draft Local Plan.</u></b></p> <p>This is the proposed development of the fields between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells estate. These Green Belt fields are designated 'Rear of Spennells &amp; Easter Park AS/10', 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2' and 'Stone Hill South OC/13'.</p> <p><b><u>Reasons against Option A :</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Agriculture and Recreational use:</u></b> These fields are productive, agricultural land which also serves as a popular recreational and social facility the local community as well as many visitors to the area. They are also well used by local workers during lunch hours for recreation and fresh air, as well as many other visitors and Wyre Forest residents at weekends enjoying the open countryside and visiting the Granary Hotel and local Mare &amp; Colt public house.</p> <p>There are a number of very well-used Public Rights of Way and bridle ways across the fields which are very well used by residents, visitors and many local groups such as the Ramblers Association, astronomy groups, wildlife groups, cyclists, horse riders and children's groups. By using this land to build, this makes a mockery of the Council's desire to combat high rates of obesity in this area. Open views and spaces also give a great sense of health and wellbeing and are a natural stress reliever.</p> <p><b><u>Wildlife:</u></b> These fields are home to many red and amber listed protected bird species, and include important nesting</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>sites for Corn Buntings, Larks and Linnets as well as homes for Badger Setts and bats. The rare Tower Mustard Plant also thrives along the lanes adjoining Stanklyn Lane. The proposed new road (the Eastern Relief Road) would totally destroy this environmentally sensitive area with increased air pollution, more noise pollution, light pollution and the destruction of large amounts of natural habitats.</p> <p>Endangered species like the Corn Bunting, Linnets and Skylarks would not nest in green spaces in large housing development as they need large open tracts of land to breed. The Corn Bunting is very endangered and already extinct in Wales and Herefordshire, and removal of this very important breeding ground will only serve to hasten their extinction. Three species of Bats are also in abundance in this area and next in some of the Oak trees on the fields. There are also many of these old trees with TPOs and large hedgerows that contribute significantly to the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p><b><u>Landscape and urban sprawl:</u></b> To build houses in these fields would spoil the current vistas and diminish the separation of Summerfield and Stone from Spennells, thus effecting urban sprawl. This is also the boundary of Wyre Forest and Wychavon Council (AS10) and would effectively link both Council areas with no distinguishing boundary. The 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report' published in 2013 recognised that Landscape provides a shared resource which is important in its own right as a 'public good' - something which is very obvious by the current use of peoples as a local amenity on the Public Rights of Way. This Report also emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces and yet this is something that this Local Plan takes away.</p> <p><b><u>Drainage:</u></b> I have very serious concerns about the proposed developments effect on the drainage in the area. The soil here is typically sandy of nature, and the local habitat (Trees/Hedgerows) combined with the crop fields serve a long way to alleviate the flooding issues. Building here (especially AS/10 which has high flooding probability) will cause a lot of issues. Stanklyn Lane now floods at times of heavy or persistent rain, and I am aware that during the last 20 years, there have been severe flooding issues on Spennells Estate around the Linnet Rise area and recently Severn Trent Water has commenced a project costing £1.5 million.</p> <p>The area around Captains and the Lodge is also extremely marshy and water logged, with various pools and streams. There are also historical drainage ditches in Stanklyn Lane of archaeological importance that should be protected and</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>enhanced. I am very concerned that development of these fields will cause real flooding issues for both Spennells Estate and Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p><b><u>Loss of Green Belt:</u></b> The purpose of Green Belt is to check unrestricted urban sprawl. The proposed Option A development would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, whereas development under Option B would have a more dispersed effect and give people a much wider choice of where they wish to live.</p> <p>The area to be developed is disproportionate in size. The Wyre Forest Review states that "The parcel is largely open in character, part of the strong division between the built edge and open countryside." The claim in the LPR that "extending the built edge of Kidderminster south-eastwards would not constitute urban sprawl" is contradicted later in the Report by the need to "reduce the impression of urban sprawl" in the Green Belt evaluation (LPR Appendix C).</p> <p>In conclusion, I hope you take my comments and suggestions into consideration when finalising your plan. To walk through green fields with cloudless skies and listen to the skylarks overhead is heaven. I cannot tell you the immense value this land has for myself, the local community, visitors and many, many others. The wildlife you will destroy will be catastrophic for some species. I therefore ask that you strongly reconsider your need for so many homes, an Eastern Relief Road and building on the fields in Option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2687</a>	Object	<p><b>I would like to OBJECT to the proposed development option A.</b></p> <p>This is due to the following reasons:</p> <p><b><u>Wildlife:</u></b> The area in Option A between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane, is a haven for wildlife. Not only does it hold endangered plants (Tower Mustard), but many species of Red and Amber Listed birds, which are known to breed and nest there. Examples of these are (not exhaustive) Linnets, House Sparrows, Reed Bunting, Yellow Hammer, Skylarks etc, but my main concern is for the declining and near extinct Corn Bunting. This is one of the few areas left where this bird breeds and should be protected at all costs. Leaving 'open' spaces between the housing will not support this bird. They will leave and another bird will be extinct in the West Midlands and nationally declined. Other species that are seen regularly and are protected are Bats (3 species sited), Otters and other small mammals. The area itself has many Tree Preservation Orders on it, and these large trees and hedgerows further enhance the natural bio</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>diversity of the area and the support the wildlife within. Once this land is gone and these birds extinct, we cannot get them back.</p> <p><u>Recreation:</u> The area is used extensively for leisure and recreation, not only by local residents, but by many visitors to the area, and local workers during their lunch breaks. I regularly talk to visitors staying at the local Granary Hotel who are enjoying walking here, and also other Kidderminster residents who come here over the weekends to walk/cycle with their families and enjoy an icecream or coffee at the Mare &amp; Colt. Areas such as this support health and wellbeing relieve stress and anxiety and promote a better lifestyle. Many clubs and societies such as Ramblers, horse riders, cyclists, astronomers, runners etc use these fields for their activities, as well as lots of local children for nature studies. There are many PRowS, and a Bridle path that are extensively used. Building 'pathways' and 'green spaces' within a housing estate will not give the vista and feeling of well-being that being in an open rural field with open skies and views would give and would not support the local tourism business at the Granary Hotel &amp; Mare and Colt.</p> <p>As stated in your report, there are '<i>High Obesity Levels</i>' in WFDC. Taking this much used and essential recreational space away will increase this issue.</p> <p><u>Agriculture:</u> The fields along Stanklyn Lane are Grade B prime agricultural fields, where many of the sites in Option B are just grazing land. With the current economic climate regarding Brexit, we should preserving all arable land for future use. These fields provide a varied and quality crop each year, and also support the much needed drainage of the fields as well as supporting local bio diversity.</p> <p><u>Flooding:</u> When there are periods of prolonged or heavy rain, parts of Stanklyn Lane are flooded and sometimes impassable. Combined with the known issues on Spennells (i.e. Severn Trent having to spend £1.5 million to try and relieve flooding in the past 15 years) and the extremely wet and marshy land around Stanklyn Woods and Captains Pool, then building houses here would only exacerbate this issue. Fields AS/10 are recorded as being high flood risk area due to its topography.</p> <p><u>Green Belt:</u> In essence I oppose Option A as 20% less Green Belt land will need to be removed for this than with Option B. Green Belt land, however small a percentage, should be protected at all costs to enhance our country and</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>environment.</p> <p>The Green Belt review states that this area ‘contributes’ to the Green Belt. I would like to further add that it ‘significantly contributes’ as it stops urban sprawl from Kidderminster and stops the integration of Spennells with the hamlets of Stone, Stanklyn and Summerfield. There are wonderful vistas across this land to local landmarks (e.g. Clent and Clee Hills) and all of this can be viewed from Stanklyn Lane and the main road. Building on this land will further create a massive light and noise pollution issue.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure:</u> The area in Option A is very close to the local Roxel site. There have been a few serious incidents and the wisdom of building residential housing in close proximity to such a volatile site must be questioned. The proposed ‘Eastern Relief Road’ is a nonsense. This will do nothing to alleviate any air quality or congestion in Kidderminster Horsefair and will only serve to increase pollution, noise and congestion in a proposed densely populated area. Trying to get out of Stanklyn Lane now (either end) is very precarious, and there have been many accidents. Building a relief road would make this even worse as a round-a-bout or similar would have to put on the A449 and A448 which would congest the free flowing traffic. Not only would the cost be astronomical for getting said road over 2 x railway lines (money better used regenerating the town), but I would think that Network Rail will impose very strict restrictions on building close to their lines which could run into millions of pounds. That said, I feel the road is not required anyway. Commuters from Worcester currently use the A450 to get to Birmingham, and the proposed relief road would end far too high up the Birmingham Road for anyone from this side of Kidderminster to use, and cause chaos in Blakedown etc. The ‘road’ money should be used to amend the Black Bridge to allow larger vehicles to use the A450, and to make improvements along it if required.</p> <p><u>A compelling place to live:</u> If Option A is chosen, then people will have little option than to live on the periphery of Kidderminster in a mass and soul less housing estate. The scale of this development is too large and will have a very disproportionate effect on the size and feel of Kidderminster. Young people want a nice flat in a town or city location with amenities on the doorstep. They do not want to live 3-4 miles away from a station or a town centre. They are looking to move to the more vibrant towns of Bewdley, Stourport, Bromsgrove or Worcester where such properties can be found in close proximity to a thriving café culture and night life. If Option B is chosen, people will have a more dispersed choice of where they wish to live. It will also disperse the traffic, as many people would have to commute back out of Kidderminster to work in Bewdley, Stourport etc.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2695</a>	Object	<p><b>Current Job Opportunities:</b> - You're proposing to build a large number of houses, yet where are the jobs to fulfil the people coming here to live? There are very few jobs for those currently living here, hence more vehicles on our already congested and crowded roads, people will be travelling away from where they live to the likes of Birmingham or surrounding areas.</p> <p><b>Issues of Concern:-</b></p> <p><b>Option A or B development:</b> - Have you considered the impact this will have on the wild life within these areas. One must assume the planning Dept. is aware of diversity of wild life within these areas under consideration, such as Bats, Baggers and many types of flora. Many are not convinced that you are.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure:-</b> The infrastructure such as schooling, drainage, access roads and impact this will have on the environment. Whatever option is taken will have an enormous impact on road congestion, e.g. if 1000 plus houses are built this will generate possibly 2000 more cars in a small cramped area causing more pollution more congestion and more dangerous roads for children to navigate. It's already a nightmare trying to exit Heronswood Road at peak time of the day.</p> <p>It's a well-known fact that developers will hand out sweeteners to local authorities in order to offer financial incentives to help build some of the infrastructures required if they gain planning permission, and we all know that their main concern is to develop clean open green fields sites. What will come first the infrastructure or the houses? We already know – the houses, and what if the developers have financial problems, who will finish up paying for the infrastructure? People already living in the Wyre Forest!</p> <p>I strongly oppose the building and expansion of Spennells, and that Wyre Forest should consider other options, such as redevelop the town and build accommodation within. I appreciate this will not provide the same outcome for developers, as developers will not be too happy to invest, as they like clean green fields, but this will regenerate and attract more people into this deprived and dull town we call home. Hence if they live nearer to the town this would mean possibly less cars and more money spent locally.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2699</a>	Object	Spennells estate was built adjacent to a golf course and therefore did not impinge on existing housing. The bolting on

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			of an almost equally sized estate seems to be a lazy option and the worst kind of urban sprawl. The plan lacks imagination and from the local inhabitants point of view has nothing to commend it.
	<a href="#">LPPO2703</a>	Object	<p>Other Reasons to reject the plans to develop the Green Belt</p> <p>a. The projection of population growth is fallacious. The development of Green Belt land could only possibly become a Birmingham overflow. If this overflow is required it should be built near Birmingham as the commute from Kidderminster would be a transport nightmare by car and of course a parking nightmare if attempting to use the train.</p> <p>b. In essence, the council have decided that they want to build an A449 bypass and have then come up with a number of houses which will create a justification for the road. They have then generated a set of statistics to justify that number of houses. The council are refusing to reveal the plans for the road and insisting that such a plan does not exist and we are not entitled to ask because the entire scope of the consultation is about whether to build on Green Belt land. This is a totally underhand attempt to cover up their true intentions until they have received carte blanche permission to destroy Green Belt land.</p> <p>c. If it were to happen that the proposal to build a new road became unfulfillable once Plan A had been agreed (which is more likely than actually building it because of cost factors) then the only access to the new build housing would be via Turnstone Road and presumably Imber Road. These feed onto Captains Pool Road and subsequently Heronswood Road and from there to Spennells Valley Road. The two junctions onto Spennells Valley Road are already stressed and could not cope with a massive increase of traffic. Imber Road was never designed to take traffic and would have to be widened, probably causing the demolition of a house on Egret Court and the removal of a garden (my garden as it happens). Reverting to the proposed Loop Road, if the road did exactly what it is apparently for, taking traffic onto and off the new estate, then it would be feeding onto two very congested roads. The A449 at this point is extremely bad at rush hour with traffic often backing up several miles to Hartlebury. The A456 is the main access from the M5 and is a very busy road. It is already very difficult to access this road from the Husum Way side. On the other hand if the Loop road is more than a restricted access road for the new houses then it will be used by industrial traffic from the Hoo and Hartlebury industrial estates as this cannot pass under the Black Bridge. This will mean that the new road will become a main highway and totally unsuitable to service a new housing estate.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Because of the reference to reducing traffic to the Horsefair (p.42 of the local plan) I believe that the actual route for the new road (if the council weren't hiding it) would be that the road would leave the A449 at Lea Castle and rejoin the A449 at Easter Park. This might in itself be very desirable in terms of relieving traffic through the town it changes from being a loop road for the new housing into being part of a major trunk road, the A449. I cannot imagine anywhere else in the country where a local authority would be secretly planning routing a new trunk road through a housing estate that it was supposed to be part of.</p> <p>d The amenity value of the Green Belt land behind Spennells should not be ignored. The footpaths round the fields are used by hundreds of people every day. This includes walkers, dog walkers. Joggers, cyclists and horse riders. The somewhat bland claim that only 70 % of the Green Belt would be built on and so a larger % of that land than present would be available is totally idiotic. People can walk several miles around the current paths in open country. To imagine that this could be swapped for grass verges, small open spaces, etc and that we should be pleased to have access to walking round a housing estate is preposterous. The access to these fields is important to the health and wellbeing of many hundreds of people and this facility would be totally lost if the land were built on. This land is totally invaluable to the residents of this side of Kidderminster and is irreplaceable. Residents should not be forced to use their cars to go for a walk</p> <p>e. Risk of flooding. The fields are very sandy and can absorb immense quantities of rain very quickly. We are now having more heavy and concentrated storms that dump vast amounts of water very quickly. Whilst the fields largely cope with only occasional flooding, replacing the fields with tarmac ked roads, drives and house roofs will have a very negative effect on the drainage and will result in flooding along Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>f. The Natural Environment. The basic question is whether we can as a human race destroy irreplaceable natural habitat to build homes. This is especially true where the statistical basis for building the homes and destroying the natural habitat is totally flawed. Can we really risk destroying the Green Belt to build houses that aren't absolutely necessary? Once the environment is destroyed it can not be recreated.</p> <p>g. Wildlife. Different people are addressing different areas of wildlife and I am not an expert at these. For example there are 3 species of bats that hunt on the field. In many places the simple presence of bats is seen to be important</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>enough to stop development. Their hunting sites are just as important as their nest sites.</p> <p>We have watched the farmer plough up a badger set already this year and unfortunately nothing was done (photographic evidence available). There are at least two badger sets that will be destroyed by the housing development. It is my understanding that badger sets are protected by law.</p> <p>There are other mammal species on the field including field mice and hedgehogs. Again these are threatened species which will be lost if plan A proceeds.</p> <p>My own area of interest is birds. In the winter we have large populations of redwings and fieldfares which are winter migrants and don't nest here although they rely on feeding on the fields and will be lost if the fields are lost. Far rarer than these are the waxwings which are also winter visitors. We actually get bird spotters from other places coming here looking for our waxwings. There is a very large flock of linnets which I think are all year round residents but flock in the winter. My estimate for the size of the full flock last winter was 500 birds which makes it a very significant population. All the above species are Red Listed and their habitat must not be disturbed.</p> <p>Other birds that I have only observed in the winter include redpolls and stonechats. The skylark population consists of at least 12 pairs on the land included in plan A. This is a red listed species. It is fragile and will be totally lost if the land is built on.</p> <p>In summer we have healthy populations of swallows, swifts and house martins. Again these nest in buildings, not on the field but rely on the insect population of the fields for their survival.</p> <p>There is a massive list of birds that nest or rely on the fields, I have photographed (Red listed bold, amber listed italic):</p> <p>Buzzards, <i>Kestrel</i>, sparrow hawk, <b>Song thrush</b>, <b>mistle thrush</b>, blackbirds, robin, Great Tit, Blue tit. Coal tit, Long tailed tit, Greater spotted woodpecker, green woodpecker, <b>House sparrow</b>, <b>tree sparrow</b>, <i>dunnock</i>, <b>Corn bunting</b>, reed bunting, <b>yellowhammer</b>, meadow pipit, Tree creeper, nuthatch, pied wagtail, Bullfinch, chaffinch, brambling, greenfinch, siskin, blackcap, goldfinch, <b>hawfinch</b>, Heron, Little Egret, Black headed gull, lesser black backed gull,</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Starling</b>, wood pigeon, collared dove, magpie, Chiffchaff, wren, goldcrest, Carrion crow, rook, jay</p> <p>Difficult to say whether the development will destroy habitat at Captains pool but here we have:</p> <p>Coot, moorhen, tufted duck, great crested grebe, mallard, goosander, grey wagtail</p> <p>Already mentioned summer:</p> <p><b>Skylark</b>, <i>swallow</i>, <i>swift</i>, <i>house martin</i></p> <p>Winter:</p> <p><b>Fieldfare</b>, <b>redwing</b>, waxwing, redpoll, stonechat, <b>linnet</b></p> <p>This means that I have personally counted and photographed 60 species of birds on Spennells. There are very fragile species through to recovering species. There is no question that many of these species will be totally lost to this area if the destruction of greenfield as proposed in Plan A goes through. With red list species like the skylark we simply can not afford to lose anymore habitat.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2714</a>	Object	<p>I object to the local plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>Loss of breeding habitat for many varieties of birds. Loss of habitat for many mammals, including fox and badger. Loss of waterways, streams, lakes etc will have a severe detrimental effect on wildlife in the area.</p> <p>Increase in school student numbers, particularly in the Comberton Road area will severely affect road safety.</p> <p>Air pollution due to the large increase in traffic emissions will be significant. We already have emissions from Hartlebury, any more will just add to the problem.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2717</a>	Object	<p>I am opposed to both of the options that Wyre Forest District council have proposed for the following reason:</p> <p>Removal of the fields will greatly reduce the spaces local people can go walking, jogging cycling, walking dogs etc.</p> <p>There has been no thought to the immense increase there will be in traffic. There is already severe congestion around Heronswood Road, adding 1700 extra properties is going to greatly add to this, not to mention the extra noise and fuel emission pollution that will be created.</p> <p>Where are all the extra schools going to be built, along with the extra dentists, doctors and other facilities that will be needed? Is there a plan to incorporate these into either of the options?</p> <p>I believe there are around 1200 empty houses in Kidderminster. Why are these not being utilised along with the empty buildings that there are in the Kidderminster town centre? I would have thought some of these empty buildings would be ripe for conversion into flats. This would cut down on people needing to use cars and thereby reduce pollution. There are already around 300 houses being built on the new Silverwoods development (ex British Sugar Factory). Does this not take off the pressure for the need of another 1700 homes?</p> <p>This area on the map, is referred to as Captains &amp; the Lodge WFR/ST/1 and is described as a core housing site. At present we have been advised this area will have 135 houses built on it.</p> <p>I am most dismayed to hear this and would like to list a few of the birds and other wildlife that can be found in this area. – Please see separate page –</p> <p>First of all the Lleyandii hedge: If the land is used I would like to keep the hedge and existing fence. At present this hedge houses many types of birds and other wildlife. I am not just referring to the Spring/Summer breeding season. This has been home to all manner of wildlife for many years now and to lose this hedge would be a disaster environmentally.</p> <p>Secondly, Captains Pool itself. I presume the lake itself is being sold. Currently Phoenix Fishing Club tell us that they</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>have a lease on this pool/pond for another 3 years. Under the terms of their lease they have to maintain this area and also maintain the water to a high standard, which is I believe inspected every 12 months. Please advise how this is going to be maintained and who will be responsible for it?</p> <p>Amongst the mammals listed on the other page are badgers. There is currently a Badgers Sett on the far side of the lake. How is this going to be looked after?</p> <p>We also have a few types of bats that are often seen flying around on many evenings. I hope the site will be carefully checked to make sure their nesting areas are protected and not disturbed.</p> <p>There is a boat shed on this site. There is a lot of wildlife that goes in and out of this boat shed despite doors on the front. Will this be checked to make sure this is not a nesting area?</p> <p>The construction of any new housing on the Spennells area anywhere near the lake will be catastrophic to the environment from which it will be difficult to recover and these lovely creatures will never return.</p> <p>Where does the urban sprawl end and how much more of the countryside do we need to lose before the damage caused is irreversible?</p> <p><b><u>BIRDS OF CAPTAINS POOL AND AREA WFR/ST/1</u></b></p> <p><u>Breeding Residents</u>: Coot, Mallard, Moorhen, Canada Goose, Great Crested Grebe, Finches, Tits, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Green Woodpecker, Treecreeper, Nuthatch, Starlings, Song Thrush, Mistlethrush, Blackbird, Yellowhammer, Sparrow Hawk, House Sparrow, Hedge Sparrow, Pigeons, Doves &amp; Corvids.</p> <p><u>Winter Visitors (Oct-April)</u>: Goosander, Siskin, Redpoll, Blackcap, European Starlings, Fieldfare, Redwing, Brambling, Goldcrest, Teal.</p> <p>Other birds seen are Grey Heron, Gulls, Shoveler, Pochard, Kingfisher, Tufted Duck, Mute Swan, Wagtails- Pied &amp; Grey, Little Egret, Tawny Owl and Buzzards.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b><u>MAMMALS</u></b></p> <p>Hedgehogs, Moles, Common Shrew, Water Shrew, Field Vole, Yellow Necked Mouse, Wood Mouse, House Mouse, Brown Rat, Grey Squirrel, Rabbit, Fox, Badger, Pipistrelle Bats, Soprano Bats &amp; Daubenton's Bats.</p> <p>There are around 20 butterfly species and around 75-85 species of bird resident, breeding and passing through that can be seen at Captains Pool. The above list is just a few.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2718</a>	Object	Highways planners have made a big mistake on Worcester Rd Kidderminster by moving a traffic island hold up from one place to another. This side of the town is currently virtually gridlocked at busy times so building more houses on Spennells will add to the congestion and more importantly the pollution that goes with it. No houses to be build on the Green Belt land the Spennells side of town for these reasons.
	<a href="#">LPPO2720</a>	Object	<p>With reference to the proposed development on the Green Belt fields adjacent to Spennells Valley estate. We strongly object to Option A as it will have a massive impact on the residents of Spennells in terms of losing fields that are currently used for leisure and interaction, as well as impacting on the wild life in the area.</p> <p>Anyone who travels to work from Spennells knows how congested Heronswood Road and Spennells Valley Road are during peak times, without additional residents from up to 2000 houses. It is already hazardous around the school and shops area, and an increase in traffic will undoubtedly cause a safety issue for children and the elderly.</p> <p>Having attended a Consultation meeting and a previous informal meeting and studied all the available information, we strongly object to Option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2735</a>	Object	<p>I have found the surrounding fields of particular benefit for exercising and observing wild life.</p> <p>Traffic around Kidderminster is already very heavy and further housing would create gridlock and higher exhaust fume emissions.</p> <p>Pressure on all local services - schools, hospitals and GP surgeries would be immense</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2737</a>	Object	<p>I wish to enter my objections to the proposed housing schemes around Spennells Valley.</p> <p>We recently moved here because of the immediate access to country side for walking and cycling.</p> <p>Your proposed housing scheme will create havoc with this area, causing heavily increased traffic flow and reduced access to the country side.</p> <p>I therefore strongly object to your proposed scheme.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2739</a>	Object	Objection to the unnecessary expansion of Spinals option A leading to the erosion of Green Belt, and loss of services.
	<a href="#">LPPO2740</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A to develop a significant number of houses to the east/south of Kidderminster and on the Green Belt land to the rear of Spennells. We do not understand why such beautiful Green Belt land has to be destroyed when there are many brownfield sites around Kidderminster that still have not been built on. There are many empty houses and apartments that have been built but are still empty so we do not see your need to have to use Green Belt land to develop even further. We believe that any additional development would be better more widely spread around the district and not wholly on the fields at the back of Spennells. Kidderminster is meant to be a small carpet town and not a large over crowded suburb. The fields at the back of Spennells are a haven away from busy town life. Many residents who chose to live on this estate to be close to the countryside.</p> <p>Spennells Estate is already a very large estate. Development in this area and destroying such beautiful land is going to cause many issues and even more problems with roads becoming even more congested than they already are. Getting off the Estate in rush hour is already a nightmare, Doctors, Hospitals and Schools are already strained and jobs are hard to come by already. By increasing the houses in this area, it is going to make living in Kidderminster a very chaotic and stressful place.</p> <p>The removal of the fields would diminish the health and wellbeing of local people who have lived in this area for years. It is regularly used by people who enjoy walking, jogging or walking their dogs. Children love the freedom, the trees and the wildlife and how something so beautiful could be destroyed for bricks and roads we shall never</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>understand! There will be increased traffic noises, exhaust fumes causing issues to health and making life a nightmare to live in this area.</p> <p>As well as health and wellbeing it is also the very sad thought that the beautiful wildlife that habitat in the Green Belt land will lose their homes and be destroyed. There are skylarks, linnets and lots of other red-listed birds who nest there as well as lots of other different wildlife. I thought the idea of Green Belt was that it is protected and to prevent urban sprawl so why is this even being considered? There are many brownfield sites and areas of Kidderminster which could be built on to include the very large Lea Castle site, old Sladen School, old Glades leisure centre, old Magistrates Courts as well as many empty shops and the development of Stour Valley hasn't even finished yet which is a massive development in itself. Across the district I am sure there are many other sites that could be considered before even thinking of destroying such beautiful countryside.</p> <p>We do not agree that any Green Belt land should be destroyed but if this has to be the case we suggest this is not wholly in one area like Spennells fields and that other areas are considered to prevent destroying something so beautiful for so many residents. We have all chose to live here for the beautiful countryside on our doorstep and you are going to destroy this for us and our future generations.</p> <p>We want future generations to have a good quality of life and enjoy the natural countryside and wildlife and not be brought up in a mini city full of pollution and houses! We want to protect our wildlife, give our children and families the freedom to lead an active and healthy life. You are going to take this away from us and please accept this letter as our complete objection to your Option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2743</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would like to put forward my objections to the proposed expansion of Spennells:</li> <li>• Traffic is already congested at Spennells Valley Road, Worcester Road, Wilden Lane. The new relief road has caused more problems for Spennells and additional traffic from the new development will worsen the situation.</li> <li>• Increase in pollution with additional cars on the road from the new development as bus services are poor.</li> <li>• The land is in agricultural use, loss of this will mean produce has to be imported to the area causing more pollution.</li> <li>• The land is used by people walking dogs, joggers, horse riders, cyclists and people just walking generally to</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>keep active in a non polluted atmosphere.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spennells School is already full.</li> <li>• More doctors' surgeries required.</li> <li>• Development is proposed between rocket factory and an incinerator site.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• Public transport – bus service is inadequate and the train station parking is insufficient as it is full of commuter parking.</li> <li>• Kidderminster seems to be losing jobs rather than creating new opportunities. We have many empty units e.g. Easter Park on the Worcester Road where only a few units are actually taken.</li> <li>• There are many buildings in Kidderminster town centre and just add to the run down look of the town centre. Businesses cannot afford to stay and operate here. A new bypass will just ensure that drivers will do just that - BYPASS Kidderminster and any other towns which the bypass passes It also means that people will drive past Kidderminster and not go into the town to do shopping - thereby depriving the town of much needed revenue and trade.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2749</a>	Object	<p>I am objecting to the Draft Local Plan A concerning the fields adjacent to Spennells and Plan A and B concerning the Core Housing Site on the area referred to as Captains and the Lodge.</p> <p>It would be wicked to see the peaceful surrounding countryside smothered with houses. The fields adjacent to the Spennells are used not only by dog walkers but people who walk or jog for their health and mental wellbeing. We really appreciate having the opportunity to stroll along the fields and watch the variety of birds who flit about, some nesting in the fields, and listen to the skylarks as they swoop in the sky. What a shame it would be for them to lose their habitats along with other wildlife that lives here. We've also had a wonderful field of poppies here, photographed by hundreds of people, which would never be seen again.</p> <p>Building more houses would mean pressure on hospitals, doctors, schools, transport and so on. How would the schools cope and where would the extra resources come from? Add on to this the overload on drainage and sewers.</p> <p>There is enough traffic on the estate already with congestion on the roads in and around the Spennells being</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>especially bad in the mornings. We do not want increased traffic with more traffic noise and exhaust fumes which are a risk to health.</p> <p>With reference to the Core Housing site this backs on to a peaceful cul-de-sac and residents are very concerned about access to the houses and the noise problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2754</a>	Object	<p>Fields at Spennells are Green Belt. <b>Green Belt</b> is sacrosanct and not for building on.</p> <p>These fields are used by the population of Wyre Forest not just by Spennells residents for dog walking, improve both physical and mental health. It is recognised that the green environment is essential for the health and wellbeing of the resident population.</p> <p>These fields in are home to the following red listed birds, which means that they are in extreme danger of extinction:</p> <p>Sky larks, Field fares, Red wings Linnets, Corn bunting, Yellow hammer, Starling, Song thrush Mistle thrush, House sparrows, Tree sparrows.</p> <p>Yellow listed birds: Dunnocks, Swifts (I have seen these return after almost 15 years) Kestrel, House martins</p> <p>Also: Wrens, Flocks of swallows, A family of buzzards, Green wood peckers.</p> <p>Plants</p> <p>The English bluebell</p> <p>Once these species lose their habitat we would lose them forever.</p> <p>The soil in the fields behind Spennells is very sandy and the run off water collects at the bottom of the fields close to Stanklyn Lane. Once this valuable drainage is covered in concrete and tarmac the risk of flooding is considerable. Yet</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>there has been no mention of this risk in the proposed plan.</p> <p>Once the fields are gone, we will never have them again.</p> <p>We should be taking care of flora and fauna, not building on it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2756</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Plan A plus area described as Captains and the Lodge i.e. WFR/ST/2, WFR/ST1, AS/10, OC/13</p> <p>I wish to object based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect of the planned development would create loss of Green Belt which should protect our countryside from Urban Sprawl and even though existing Rights of Way are supposedly protected there is a great danger that these areas will be eradicated by housing development. The benefits to mental health and physical well being are at serious risk as the development will eradicate the fields used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle etc. This on top of the effect on the wild life habitat which is continually being eroded.</li> <li>The planned development which will nearly double the size of Spennells would have a dramatic effect on the ability of local schools and medical centres to cater for the increased requirements of the increased population which cannot even cope with the existing residents.</li> </ul> <p>The Council must re-evaluate their plans and concentrate on building on brownfield sites which will have the added benefit on regenerating the existing Town Centre.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2766</a>	Object	<p>I am writing regarding the above local plan and wish to object to Plan A basically on the grounds that this plan will I think take out too much of the Green Belt land in one go so as to allow a large urban sprawl to the east and to the south of the town.</p> <p>I live on the Spennells estate and I feel that the fields provide an important recreational space for residents. It is one of the few areas where the skylark, a now threatened species, can still be heard.</p> <p>With regard to the so called Eastern Relief Road I think that it's only use will be to provide access to the</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>developments by linking the A449, A448 and the A456. It will not ease the through traffic within Kidderminster town itself unless such a road is continued to link the A451, the A449 on the north side of the town and last but by no means least the A442. Are there plans to do this?</p> <p>A relief road would in my opinion create noise pollution to the existing Spennells estate particularly as the prevailing winds are more usually from the south west. If the Green Belt was spared a road across that area would not be needed in the same way as Captains Pool Road would not have been needed if Spennells had not been built.</p> <p>At the present time there is a south and Eastern route which is the A450 which provides a direct route for through traffic approaching from the south going from Torton to Birmingham and Stourbridge via Hagley. It does require some upgrading however particularly at the Mustow Green island due to poor visibility on the approaches to it.</p> <p>I would therefore support a more dispersed development as outlined in Option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2767</a>	Object	<p>We wish to object to Option A, as it does not achieve the Objectives set out in WFDC Local Plan. These include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To encourage the long term sustainable development of Wyre Forest and its communities. <i>Impact of removing the Green Belt behind Spennells would be significantly adverse.</i></li> <li>2. To address the key challenges facing the District especially in terms of housing, employment and transport. <i>Housing; population growth within the Wyre Forest has been 1,000 over a 15 year period. Developing all the brownfield sites within the WF could accommodate 3,000 people, which at the current rate of expansion would last 45 years. Employment; significant scope for employment by redeveloping all the available redundant brownfield sites, where the infrastructure is already in place. Transport; 3 routes serve the SE side of Kidderminster – the inner ring road, Spennells Valley road and the A450. The region does not need a 4<sup>th</sup> parallel road.</i></li> <li>3. To address housing needs in order that existing and future residents' requirements are met and the economic development of the area is supported. <i>As per 2. Above.</i></li> <li>4. To recognise the changing nature of employment, encourage economic diversification and make sufficient high quality employment sites available. <i>As per 2. Above.</i></li> <li>5. To maximise the use of previously developed land in order to ensure the best use is made of available land</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>both within and beyond the main towns. <i>As per 2. above</i></p> <p>6. To protect and support the role of the Green Belt through a strategic review and to identify limited strategic Green Belt release to enable the delivery of the plan whilst reinforcing the role and integrity of the Green Belt for future Plan periods.  <i>The proposals for 6000 people + RR do not 'protect and support the role of the Green Belt', nor would they reinforce the integrity for future Plan periods. The opposite of this would be the result.</i></p> <p>7. To help resolve the traffic issues in Kidderminster by the provision of an alternative route for through-traffic and to enhance the availability and versatility of rail-based services.  <i>A number of measures would help resolve the traffic issues. Firstly, the better use of public transport, including the option of park and rides, as well as the enhancement of cycle routes. Improvements to the A450, which is already a high standard route, which would provide the bypass for A449 to A456 traffic. The Black Bridge, near the A449/A450 junction has been a constraint on the A450 improvements due to the sub-standard headroom. There have been discussions with WCC to jack up the bridge (using weekend closures) to allow for improvements to the junction and further upgrades to this route.</i>  <i>Spennells Valley Road is also a high standard road which ties into the A448 roundabout. Further relief of Kidderminster town centre could be provided by providing a link from this roundabout behind Offmore, onto the A456.</i>  <i>The relief road is therefore not warranted, and cannot be justified on traffic figure as none are available – no figures were in the public domain according to the staff who attended the public exhibition. If these are available, then why are they being withheld?</i></p> <p>8. To maximise opportunities for the inclusion of green infrastructure and heritage assets into high quality development in order to provide a good quality of life and maximise the benefits of walking and cycling.  <i>Building on the Green Belt behind Spennells does not maximise the inclusion of green infrastructure and heritage assets. This is a contradiction on terms, since urban sprawl, at the expense of a redundant town centre, goes against all the principals of sustainability. Preservation of the existing heritage within the town centre would be better served by investing in the town centre, and not creating further assets that have to be maintained on the periphery of the town.</i></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2769</a>	Object	I want to object to the option A which I understand is the review of the Green Belt at the rear of the Spennells



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>estate, and for this land to be used for building houses.</p> <p>These are my reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The houses will destroy the local environment.</li> <li>• The houses will affect the local wildlife.</li> <li>• There will need to be a greater road network to support the houses.</li> <li>• The existing road network is struggling to cope.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2770</a>	Object	<p>We use these fields to walk, ride bikes, geocaching and nature spotting.</p> <p>The roads around this plot are already full and usually have large traffic jams. Even if you add just another 100 cars, the pollution they would cause would have a detrimental affect on everyone.</p> <p>This plot is very close to the Summerfield rocket testing station - I have known several times when the houses surrounding have had to be evacuated.</p> <p>The schools could not cope with the extra demand.</p> <p>The doctors' surgeries and hospital would not cope with the extra demand.</p> <p>Even the local community groups such as the scouts and guides wouldn't have enough space for extra children.</p> <p>The new leisure centre couldn't cope with the influx of users either, it can only just cope now.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2778</a>	Object	<p>I object to Option A as the loss to the Green Belt will be unacceptable. There would be a huge detrimental impact upon the wildlife.</p> <p>The Draft LP indicates that only 50% of the Green Belt land on Option A would be developed, however this has only</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>been done to facilitate the construction of a relief road. Public Open Spaces are an unacceptable replacement for the existing Green Belt.</p> <p>The fields behind Spennells, not only provide space for walking and exercise for the local population, but are a valuable asset for the flora and fauna. NB rare species are also found, for example the <b>corn bunting</b>, an endangered species.</p> <p>Any attempt to remove this section will be challenged vigorously, not only by all the concerned residents, but by the RSPB.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2780</a>	Object	<p>There should be no further development of the Spennells Estate and of the core areas proposed in Option A and Option B; thus preserving the Green Belt and in doing so safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>On the Spennells site alone, where there are already around 2000 houses, the proposed increase of 930 dwellings will lead to an increase in the number of cars on the roads (car ownership currently averaging 2- per household) with a resulting increase in traffic using the local roads which are already very congested at times. There will also be additional households, some with children, requiring an increased need for educational, medical and social facilities and the provision of utilities. Drainage and sewerage problems, already existing on Spennells, will be exacerbated.</p> <p>When the fields behind the current Spennells estate are destroyed by this housing/road development a valuable area for walking and exercising and enjoying peace and quiet, as enjoyed by a wide variety of local people, will be lost forever. Currently the 3 fields mentioned are productively farmed, a valuable commodity in the post-Brexit era. With development of these fields, this area will become contaminated by concrete, built —up houses, probably tightly packed together with small land footprints, by traffic noise and loss of air quality.</p> <p>In the plan it is stated that it is necessary to get people walking and cycling for health reasons. Destroying this land will have a detrimental effect on this objective. Once Green Belt land is lost it cannot be restored and is therefore lost to future generations of people and wildlife. The danger is that once the go-ahead is given for this proposed road/housing development on current Green Belt land, it will become all too easy to extend the boundaries further, leading ultimately to coalescence of the smaller settlements of Stone, Summerfield. Stanklyn and other outlying</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>settlements to the East of Kidderminster.</p> <p>There is clearly neither a requirement to develop the Green Belt Fields abutting the Spennells Estate, for which an allocation of 930 dwellings, under site references OC/13S. WFR/ST/2 and AS/10 has been proposed. Nor a requirement to develop the core area in Option A to the East of Kidderminster.</p> <p>Leaving a corridor of undeveloped land to respect the need for the separation of settlements is admirable but outside of these corridors the extensive development outlined in this Plan will still result in urban sprawl to an unpalatable degree, not to mention the unsociable behaviour and crime that tends to be a feature of large housing estates these days, with all the problems this can produce. National Policy states that Green Belt land is specifically supposed to prevent this, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, alongside maintaining large tracts of land for productive farming, protecting wildlife habitat and providing an open, pleasant environment for people to enjoy, be it walking, cycling or just enjoying the views and breathing in fresh air, unpolluted by traffic noise and pollution. This policy seems to have been ignored.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2796</a>	Object	<p>Question: Do you think the benefits of allowing easier delivery of school provision and the option of an Eastern Relief Road outweigh the disadvantage caused by the large-scale of expansion to the east of Kidderminster that would be needed?</p> <p>No. Easier delivery of a solution can often bring greater disadvantage because problems are overlooked due to the ease of such a delivery. I wish to object to a number of your proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To help resolve the traffic issues in Kidderminster by the provision of an alternative route for through-traffic - I attended a drop in session at Heronswood First School and discussed with a council representative the benefits the easier option A would deliver. She was unsure about the Eastern Relief Road saying it was most likely going to be a single track estate road which was <u>probably</u> not going to run through the Spennells estate. This in itself would congest traffic on the east of Kidderminster bringing further travel problems. The A449 backs up to Hartlebury during evening rush hour and onto Spennells in the morning already and that is without all the houses being occupied on the new estate on the old Sugar Beet site. With even more people on the east of Kidderminster this route would be very unsatisfactory, practically unmovable.</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To maximise the benefits of walking and cycling - Your proposal that people will walk or cycle or train to work is far-fetched. From Spennells it is a 40 minute walk to the railway station and 50 minutes into town. The fields behind would add another ten minutes to such a journey. This is too far to walk with heavy work bags or shopping. Your proposal that young people will settle if we improve retail by offering more retail jobs is at odds with the amount of disposable income people have in such low income work. People with low income jobs can be better served closer to town centres. There they can save money on car journeys.</li> <li>Kidderminster Enterprise Park is the main focus for employment. People with higher incomes in Kidderminster mainly commute to work which means travel by car on the whole because jobs are often on various trading estates outside town centres now and not served by public transport. New people moving into the area would also want to travel by car to work.</li> <li>To prevent urban sprawl - You talk about the three towns of the district remaining separate but already Stourport is linked to Kidderminster through the development of the Sugar Beet land and the canal areas. I agree to build sheltered housing for older people and retirement homes but these should not be near the Spennells pool for such vulnerable people. The pool hangs in mist and ice in winter and it is not healthy causing respiration difficulties in this vulnerable group. I cannot believe such short-sighted thinking. Bats roost near the pool and urban sprawl would destroy their habitat.</li> <li>High costs of providing healthcare for an ageing population with high obesity. You speak of wanting to improve health and obesity but removing the benefit of open space and big skies for the dog walkers and children conker hunting, instead of 'green space' for walkers to trek through more housing with more traffic will lead to a greater problem for our hard pushed health service already under pressure with over 4000 contacts per month.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2799</a>	Object	<p>My objections are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The roads local to Spennells are already gridlocked due to the new relief road being open. Traffic is now queuing from Easter Park most of the day and Wilden Lane is queuing sometimes from as far back as The Wash House. Traffic is not being able to access the Worcester Road Roundabout due to cars blocking it. Accidents are very likely on the Worcester Road Roundabout.</li> <li>Getting off Spennells at times is already a problem and adding another 1000 plus houses is just going to</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>exacerbate the problem.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Then there is also the problem of air pollution as the traffic will be queuing.</li> <li>• The fields behind Spennells are well used by walkers, joggers, dog walkers, families with children going for walks. Cyclists and horse riders also use the fields.</li> <li>• The fields also used for essential crop growing.</li> <li>• The local bus service is not adequate or dependable.</li> </ul> <p>All in all, I am thoroughly against this plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2800</a>	Object	<p>Question: Do you think the benefits of allowing easier delivery of school provision and the option of an Eastern Relief Road outweigh the disadvantage caused by the large-scale of expansion to the east of Kidderminster that would be needed?</p> <p>No. Easier delivery of a solution can often bring greater disadvantage because problems are overlooked due to the ease of such a delivery. I wish to object to a number of your proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To help resolve the traffic issues in Kidderminster by the provision of an alternative route for through-traffic - I attended a drop in session at Heronswood First School and discussed with a council representative the benefits the easier option A would deliver. She was unsure about the Eastern Relief Road saying it was most likely going to be a single track estate road which was <u>probably</u> not going to run through the Spennells estate. This in itself would congest traffic on the east of Kidderminster bringing further travel problems. The A449 backs up to Hartlebury during evening rush hour and onto Spennells in the morning already and that is without all the houses being occupied on the new estate on the old Sugar Beet site. With even more people on the east of Kidderminster this route would be very unsatisfactory, practically unmovable. Traffic is consistently backed up at Mustow Green or Belbroughton which are both to the east of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• To maximise the benefits of walking and cycling - Your proposal that people will walk or cycle or train to work is far-fetched. From Spennells it is a 40 minute walk to the railway station and 50 minutes into town. The fields behind would add another ten minutes to such a journey. This is too far to walk with heavy work bags or shopping. Your proposal that young people will settle if we improve retail by offering more retail jobs is at odds with the amount of disposable income people have in such low income work. People with low</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>income jobs can be better served closer to town centres. There they can save money on car journeys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kidderminster Enterprise Park is the main focus for employment. People with higher incomes in Kidderminster mainly commute to work which means travel by car on the whole because jobs are often on various trading estates outside town centres now and not served by public transport. New people moving into the area would also want to travel by car to work.</li> <li>• To prevent urban sprawl - You talk about the three towns of the district remaining separate but already Stourport is linked to Kidderminster through the development of the Sugar Beet land and the canal areas. I agree to build sheltered housing for older people and retirement homes but these should not be near the Spennells pool for such vulnerable people. The pool hangs in mist and ice in winter and it is not healthy causing respiration difficulties in this vulnerable group. I cannot believe such short-sighted thinking. Bats roost near the pool and urban sprawl would destroy their habitat.</li> <li>• High costs of providing healthcare for an ageing population with high obesity. You speak of wanting to improve health and obesity but removing the benefit of open space and big skies for the dog walkers and children conker hunting, instead of 'green space' for walkers to trek through more housing with more traffic will lead to a greater problem for our hard pushed health service already under pressure with over 4000 contacts per month.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2803</a>	Object	<p>The Spennells area of Kidderminster already has a large built up area and the fields proposed for building provide an amenity used extensively by the local population for all manner of outdoor pursuits and activities and general.</p> <p>Should not to turn this area into a larger urban sprawl.</p> <p>Morning traffic leaving Spennells endures jams and holdups due to current volume.</p> <p>The Council appears to favour plan "A" as they believe it would enhance their objective for the construction of the proposed (twice rejected) Eastern Link Road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2804</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to object to "Option A" - the proposed development of houses on the Spennells fields.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These fields are used extensively by the Spennells community for dog walking and recreation. It encourages love of nature and provides a healthy and fun environment for children to play. If this were taken away then residents would have to travel to access similar open spaces.</li> <li>• The fields seem to be very fertile for farming</li> <li>• There is an abundance of wildlife. There would be extensive loss of habitat for the wildlife that flourishes on these fields. I would therefore like to see a full review of the wildlife in the area before any final decisions were made.</li> <li>• Kidderminster is struggling for Green Belt land so as Option B provides more housing with less loss of Green Belt it seems to be the better choice. This would therefore be my preferred option.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2810</a>	Object	<p>Objects to building new houses on land next to the Spennells estate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unnecessary building of dwellings on Green Belt land</li> <li>• Impact on local habitats of flora and fauna</li> <li>• Increase in traffic in the localised area</li> <li>• Increase in air and noise pollution</li> <li>• Increase in the demand of places in local primary and high schools. The schools will need to increase in size but with tight budgets they cannot do this.</li> <li>• Decreasing the lack to open space for children, dog walkers etc to walk and play</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2820</a>	Object	<p>Strongly opposed to OPTION A</p> <p>1. LOSS OF GREEN BELT.</p> <p>Result in urban sprawl and be in total opposition to the purpose of GREEN BELT POLICY.</p> <p>2. SCHOOLS AND SURGERIES.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Development would IMPACT DRASTICALLY on both the above.</p> <p>Heronswood school has in 2016, been extended and is ALREADY FULL, is another extension even possible?</p> <p>SURGERIES will also be put UNDER considerable PRESSURE, in ADDITION TO their PRESENT RESTRAINTS, caused by families living in an EXTRA 1,700 dwellings.</p> <p>3. TRAFFIC.</p> <p>Development will require major road access at very high cost causing POLLUTION and CONGESTION with inevitable HEALTH RISKS. Brown field sites already have sufficient road access. The council is considering a bypass from Birmingham Road to A449. Proposed development of Spennells should not be an inducement for a developer who might offer assistance in construction of a bypass.</p> <p>Indications that people from Birmingham and Solihull could be encouraged to this development and as businesses in Kidderminster seem to be downsizing or closing this will result in more commuter traffic from Kidderminster to work in other areas, with all the problems of more pollution and congestion.</p> <p>Forecasts show a DECLINE IN HOUSING REQUIREMENTS IN KIDDERMINSTER. Requirements could possibly be met by developing brown field sites, including smaller ones. EXISTING EMPTY BUILDINGS could be CONVERTED to provide AFFORDABLE flats and apartments which would meet the following needs;</p> <p>Nearby shops and amenities, entertainments, surgeries etc. with the HEALTH ASPECTS of walking and lowering pollution levels.</p> <p>Down sizing, therefore releasing family size housing.</p> <p>Encouraging greater RANGE OF VIABLE SHOPS (more visits per week, good for business.)</p> <p>Taking PRESSURE OFF AN ALREADY UNRELIABLE BUS SERVICE.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			EASING PARKING PROBLEMS IN TOWN.
	<a href="#">LPPO2824</a>	Object	<p>Object to plan A as follows:</p> <p>It is Green Belt/productive farmland.</p> <p>Will result traffic issues/bus service already poor</p> <p>Effect on wildlife/recreational use</p> <p>Use brownfield sites first</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2828</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposal at Spennells. Spennells estate is surrounded by beautiful countryside, is used by dog walkers and is a great place to bring up children into the future.</p> <p>There are areas of Kidderminster Town Centre that are in desperate need of reinvestment and housing would be a fantastic option.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2830</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A as follows:</p> <p>Loss of recreational land</p> <p>Increase in traffic/exhaust fumes whereas building higher density homes in town centre will reduce these.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt /threat to existing Rights of way</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p> <p>Regenerate on Brownfield sites in Kidderminster</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2832</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A and development of Green Belt before all brown field sites have been used.</p> <p>The proposed development at Option A would result in urban sprawl, significant traffic issues/pollution/loss of recreational land.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2836</a>	Object	<p>Object to proposed extension of Spennells. Irreplaceable loss of habitat for wildlife, breathing space for Kidderminster.</p> <p>Developers are reluctant to use brownfield sites, follow the example of Wolverhampton, and built homes in the town. Incentivise businesses with affordable rates to expand their businesses and have an innovation space, even a science park.</p> <p>Proposing to build on a flood plain, which is a highly dangerous strategy</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2837</a>	Object	I object to the use of the fields around the Spennells estate for building. These fields provide a wonderful place to walk, ride, exercise and enjoy the countryside on our doorstep. Local services are already stretched to the limit.
	<a href="#">LPPO2838</a>	Object	<p>I object building on Green Belt sites, especially Offmore/Hurcott, and extending Spennells as follows:</p> <p>Lack of future employment prospects/overall congestion/Traffic emissions</p> <p>Pressure on our already busy hospitals, doctors, schools.</p> <p>Affect tourism/wildlife/possible flooding.</p> <p>Build on brownfield land/convert unoccupied buildings before Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2842</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO SPENNELLS:</p> <p>The inability of Kidderminster's infrastructure/public services to cope with extra residents.</p> <p>Noise and pollution concerns</p> <p>The loss of Green Belt, wildlife and valuable agricultural land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2845</a>	Object	<p>We do not support Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>undermines reason for Green Belt:</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accuracy of the Assessment of Housing Need</li> <li>• negative impact on the biodiversity/wildlife</li> <li>• increased traffic</li> <li>• Spennells estate already has social issues</li> <li>• infrastructure esp. medical/schooling</li> <li>• is relief road proposed as it can attract capital funding</li> <li>• gypsy/traveller site impractical in narrow lane</li> <li>• Fly tipping could increase.</li> <li>• Lack of job creation would encourage commuting</li> <li>• Negative impact upon local amenities, health and wellbeing, community identity</li> </ul> <p>Support option B/greater brown field development</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2847</a>	Object	<p>Objects to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• exacerbate existing traffic congestion/increase risks to pedestrians</li> <li>• pressures on healthcare/school capacities</li> <li>• negative impact on nature/attraction of area</li> <li>• Focus on use of brownfield sites/more balanced across the district.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2851</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells:</p> <p>Loss of recreational land/wildlife</p> <p>Roads already congested; schools/doctors/hospitals already busy</p> <p>Once Green Belt is gone it is gone forever</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2866</a>	Object	<p>I would like to see a semi- rural location which, benefits the local community with low pollution which ensures a good life style, maintained for the population of Kidderminster.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>I object to option A of the Local development plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kidderminster's historic carpet and market industry has almost completely disappeared with an unattractive town centre, full of empty properties and few shops that will encourage people to the area. The town appears to encourage charity shops, hairdressers and coffee shops.</li> <li>It appears that the consultation process has not been particularly open or helpful with few details being shared. It amazed me to hear that originally the Council did not think it necessary to provide Spennells with a local drop in session, when in fact under option A they were probably the most affected. I also do not understand why the out-lying areas of Wyre Forest do not have to be included within this discussion. In my opinion all of Wyre Forest should be included with all building taking place within the existing boundary.</li> <li>There are a number of empty buildings and run down areas, which could actually be utilized without the need for further building on any Green Belt land. Green Belt land should be used for food production, something which over the next few years will be more important as we exit Europe.</li> <li>I also feel that before any housing is considered on the Green Belt land all available brownfield sites are developed, including those which already have been granted planning permission but are not being developed. The Council need to ensure that developers have to develop the land within a certain length of time. I also question that the figures you have stated for population growth are accurate especially regarding my earlier statement. Any people wishing to move into the area are commuters, bringing very little into the community. WFDC need to improve job prospects, shopping and other amenities within the towns first.</li> <li>Under Option A I do not believe that the infrastructure is good enough. Every road from Kidderminster needs improvements. There is already congestion towards, Birmingham, Worcester and Bromsgrove to use the Motorways. The hospital, schools and other medical depts. e.g. Doctors, Dentists need improving as they are unable to cope with the present population.</li> <li>I am also aware that the drainage system on Spennells is already inadequate, over the year's houses there have flooded when drains are not able to deal with the surface water. With more building this would be further exacerbated.</li> <li>The fields behind Spennells offer local people a place to enjoy the countryside through walking, cycling, bird watching on the doorstep. This is something the Government are keen to encourage to ensure the health and wellbeing of the population does not cause a further drain on the health services.</li> </ul> <p>Under option B the development would stay within the existing boundary and not cause further urban</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>sprawl as Option A would to Summerfield, Stone and Stanklyn.</p> <p>I believe Option B is the best option for Wyre Forest, however if Option A does take you should ensure residents do not have a lower quality of life. Measures such as low level lighting on the proposed road with a quiet road surface as standard; speed restrictions to avoid air pollution and; access denied to heavy vehicles should be enforced. Noise, Air and Light pollution must be minimal. The Council must ensure that adequate green areas are designated and maintained along with the current tree preservation orders which are present on Spennells. I do wonder if the Council have considered building on the Golf course and giving them the opportunity to move to one of the Green Belt areas to ensure the boundary does not extend.</p> <p>Above all I oppose option A as I believe that the whole of Wyre Forest should share the development needs and keep the existing boundary for all.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2869</a>	Object	<p>While we understand the need to provide housing, we wish to state our objections to Option A on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that Kittiwake Drive could provide access for the proposed development, becoming busier and making a rat-run. This road is narrow and unsuitable for more traffic; it is also well used by children going to and from school and to the play area on Heronswood Road.</li> <li>• Spennells has a small shopping area catering for residents: it is often difficult now to access the car park, especially when school children are arriving and leaving.</li> <li>• Spennells Primary School would be too small to cater for the proposed numbers of families.</li> <li>• King Charles School is already on two sites, so would be unlikely to take many more pupils.</li> <li>• Spreading development over the wider area will use brownfield sites (identified in the document) and encroach less on Green Belt and greenfield sites.</li> <li>• The stated number of new homes needed has been exaggerated and the proposal for up to 6000 more is unrealistic; employment opportunities will not provide jobs on such a scale. Looking at the number of unoccupied business units in the area (e.g. Easter Park), we question the need to provide so many new ones.</li> <li>• Building companies are required to provide a certain number of housing association homes at a ratio of 30% in order to win contracts. They should be required to redevelop brownfield sites first.</li> <li>• Worcestershire Acute Hospitals Trust is already in special measures, unable to cope with demand. We have a</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Minor Injuries Unit. Is the Council prepared to negotiate with the NHS for an upgrade to KGH to meet the needs of more people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kidderminster traffic flow is slow. The possible eastern bypass will only help commuters to reach Worcester, Wolverhampton and Birmingham, and those who live on the west and north will not benefit greatly.</li> <li>• More traffic means more pollution and road maintenance is already poor, so increased traffic will exacerbate the situation.</li> <li>• Public transport is unreliable for the Spennells area with buses often late or not arriving at all. Current provision would therefore be inadequate for additional passengers, and would encourage more frequent use of cars, adding to air pollution and congestion in the town area.</li> <li>• Local people value and use the existing fields and footpaths around Spennells for leisure and exercise, improving health in a holistic way, and with a potentially positive impact on health services.</li> </ul> <p>It would seem more appropriate to develop brownfield areas and make as little impact as possible on our precious Green Belt sites. We have no objection to developing the Lea Castle site, as it already has some infrastructure, but stands derelict now, and would be an excellent setting for a new estate area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2873</a>	Object	<p>Green Belt Land should not be built on lightly and plan B uses 20% less. If it is possible to protect this land, it should be done so at all costs. The 2015 Conservative Manifesto states that “Ministers attach great importance to the Green Belt and will maintain existing areas of protection” - how can Option A be considered when this removes the largest area of Green Belt? Also, it states “Green Belt’s primary purpose is to prevent urban sprawl .... A huge proportion of it has considerable environmental value . . .” The proposal for option A would be doing exactly that, by building an extremely large proportion of housing in one massive area it will take away value from the local environment and create an urban sprawl, which is why I am firmly opposed to it. There is sufficient space for 3000 houses on current brownfield sites I do not understand why the destruction of Green Belt land is being considered.</p> <p>Current plans to link Spennells estate through Turnstone Road would also cause severe disruption to the currently quiet cul-de-sac. The current residents would have increased noise and air pollution and road safety issues, which would undoubtedly lead to a drop in house price. The current access at the two points of entry onto the estate are extremely busy and traffic heading towards town is likely to cut through thus creating further traffic chaos.</p> <p>If option A provides better school provision, how is this going to be made? There is currently no funding and there are no definite plans for a new school. If such a large population growth is going to take place, this needs forward</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>planning and funding. Will families move in with vast numbers of children after or before a school is built? The current schools could not cope with such a dramatic rise in numbers, particularly after having recently been through the three tier to two tier school system reorganisation, where the existing primary schools have already had to make substantial growth to accommodate two extra year groups.</p> <p>Objection with reference to paragraph 5.4b:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“b. A social role — supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities in Wyre Forest by:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">i. Providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">ii. Creating a high-quality built environment, with accessible local services and infrastructure that reflect a community’s needs and support its health and social and cultural well-being. I</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">iii. Creating a strong sense of place by strengthening the distinctive and cultural qualities of towns and villages.</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">iv. Creating safe and accessible environments where crime, disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.”</p> <p>I fail to see how these objectives will be met under the proposed plans. Existing residents have no local doctor or youth facilities and no plans have been given in Option A to include these. The local community’s needs have not been considered, nor has support for its health and social needs.</p> <p>There is already an element of anti-social behaviour on the estate and if further expansion were to be made, this would impact greatly on the surrounding area. There used to be a youth club, but this was not replaced when Heronswood school was expanded, due to the Wyre Forest School shake up. I believe such an area of new development would cause an increase in the level of anti-social behaviour in the local area.</p> <p>The local hospital struggles to cope with the existing population and doctors’ surgeries are stretched to bursting. No plans have been proposed to suggest how the local community will cope with such basic and necessary needs. Aside from this, it will be severely detrimental to the health and well-being of the local community. Obesity has been recognised by the nation and local Council as a growing and worrying problem. The fields are used by walkers, joggers, wildlife enthusiasts, photographers, horse riders and local residents to maintain fitness. Not only does this help physical fitness, but exercise in rural countryside has massive benefits for mental health, yet another escalating problem within our community. Studies have also proven such an environment helps promote creativity. The impact locally would be massive and this is why residents chose to live here.</p>

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			excellent local schools are having. Added to that there are no plans mentioned for any medical facilities in this” new” area, neither dentists or any retail outlets, Green Belt land was set aside for the purpose of stopping urban sprawl and inappropriate and ribbon development. It also provided spaces where people could breathe and exercise away from the smoke and pollution of most towns. These areas are well used for that purpose. I am not just talking about those who live on the estate, this is a popular area for many from within the whole area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2949</a>	Object	<p>Option A would mean Spennells more than doubling in size with the social consequences that would follow.</p> <p>From West Midlands agricultural land survey, it can be seen that the site of the proposed housing development lies within an area of agricultural land graded as 'very good' by Natural England. Land within this classification represents just 16.6% of agricultural land in Worcestershire. The continuous loss of quality agricultural land will further reduce the ability of the country to become more self-sufficient and to decrease our import bill.</p> <p>The proposal to build on 'Green Belt' land would lead loss of habitat for wildlife (no coincidence that the roads of Spennells Estate are named after birds!) and would have a major impact and opportunities for exercise in a District identified with high obesity rates.</p> <p>The very nature of the proposed development on the land locked fields around the Spennells &amp; Stanklyn Lane, together with the additional traffic congestion it would create would require the construction of the proposed relief road as a condition precedent. The planning, approvals &amp; obtaining the necessary finance means it is unlikely to be built, just as the by-pass proposal in 1996 was dropped. Should an attempt be made for access/egress to any new development via the Spennells would be strongly opposed. The layout &amp; width of the existing roads were designed to serve the estate only. Extra traffic would mean longer queues at junctions &amp; the two exits from the estate, increase in the risk of traffic accidents particularly to pedestrians, deter children from walking to school &amp; increase in air pollution.</p> <p>There would be an increased flood risk to the Spennells area. The Victoria Carpets old sports ground is designated a flood plain. Houses around Pintail are said to be built on piled foundations. There would be a major impact on drainage as the fields act as a valuable soakaway. Current primary schools are full and more dwellings will, have a major impact on local schools.</p> <p>Likewise there will be further pressure on our already inadequate &amp; under funded hospitals as well as doctors not to mention the pressure on the already under funded full school &amp; nursery.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that Option A is rejected in its present form and WFDC revisits their options to a proposal that</p>

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>land, esp. important as leaving EU.</p> <p>Regenerate brownfield sites e.g. Kidderminster town centre for housing.</p> <p>Kidderminster roads are often gridlocked and there is little public transport. Any increase in traffic would affect health with more pollution.</p> <p>Existing health services are totally inadequate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3025</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells:</p> <p>Loss of local recreational facilities</p> <p>Traffic congestion</p> <p>Use other sites towards Wolverley/Cookley/Bham road which do not support such a large estate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3027</a>	Object	<p>Object to plan A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic/impact on air quality on already congested roads</li> <li>• No objective assessment of future trends inc industries likely to come</li> <li>• Loss of open space/impact on landscape</li> <li>• Affect on wildlife</li> <li>• Building so many properties in a concentrated area on one of the largest housing estates is poorly thought through.</li> <li>• Regenerate brownfield areas instead</li> <li>• The current infrastructure will be unable to cope</li> <li>• The loss of Green Belt land will have a significant impact on the water environment</li> <li>• Support plan B as more dispersed strategy</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3028</a>	Object	<p>Object to Spennells:</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of precious Green Belt/recreational space</li> <li>• Questions need to build 6000 homes other than for overspill</li> <li>• Use Brownfield site, e.g. Lea Castle/Kidderminster town centre</li> <li>• Would need more doctors surgeries/schools</li> <li>• Can't see justification for Eastern relief road</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3042</a>	Object	<p>I Object to Option A with particular reference to the fields adjacent to the Spennells estate, designated as 'Rear of Spennells and Easter Park AS/10'; 'Land off Stanklyn Lane WFR/ST/2' and 'Stone Hill South OC/13'.</p> <p>These fields are beautiful, unpolluted countryside and agricultural land, for walking and appreciating the local flora and fauna. If houses are built around Spennells, the attraction of living in Kidderminster will be gone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The construction of a large housing development to the east and south-east of Kidderminster would be a clear case of urban sprawl; something which the current Green Belt was established to avoid and which the Local Plan acknowledges has been successfully achieved up to this point. There would be urban sprawl clearly visible from both the A449 Worcester trunk road and from the railway as it approaches Kidderminster from the Worcester direction. It is essential that the Green Belt 'cushion' should be maintained to prevent Kidderminster merging towards the West Midlands conurbation.</li> <li>• A development on Spennells Fields as outlined in Option A would have devastating effects upon local wildlife. There are red listed birds nesting in these fields, including skylarks, linnets and the highly-threatened corn buntings, as well as numerous other birds that inhabit and forage there. There are also 3 species of Bats, foxes, rabbits and at least 2 active badger setts. If a road was built to service houses built in these fields, it would cross and totally negate the green corridor which the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and the Hoo River currently provide. A road would also have to cross the water courses linking Stanklyn Pool, Captain's Pool and the Spennells Valley, which would be devastating to local wildlife.</li> <li>• Spennells estate has endured various problems with water runoff from the local fields, particularly lower down the estate, where water naturally drains to. Flood alleviation projects have been undertaken on the estate and, within the past six months, the STWA has had to carry out flood prevention work to deal with excessive runoff during heavy rainfall. This position would certainly be seriously exacerbated if there was</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>further house development on the land adjacent to the Spennells, since much more runoff would be created. This is a position which has not been referred to in the current Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A development around the Spennells estate would cause air, light and noise pollution, harming the physical and mental welfare of all existing residents. This would be totally against the declared intent of WFDC, who indicate that they want to promote healthy living and greater access to walking and cycling activities.</li> <li>• The Public Rights of Way around and across the Spennells Fields are extensively used by local residents for walking, jogging, horse riding and cycling. This would be severely harmed and ‘fly in the face’ of the council’s declared policy of fighting the obesity which the Wyre Forest is already suffering.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3046</a>	Object	<p>I am shocked that such a large amount of Green Belt area is proposed to be used for development, especially as there are so many brownfield sites clearly visible in Kidderminster town centre.</p> <p>I object very strongly to Option A. The fields at Spennells that are threatened by the development are productive, agricultural land which also serve as a popular recreational and social facility for walkers, joggers, cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders. There are several well-used Public Rights of Way across the fields which allow fast and easy access to open countryside. The area offers a number of different habitats for wildlife, including nesting sites for corn buntings, larks and linnets (all on the red list as endangered birds); badger setts and bats. A new Eastern Relief road would totally destroy this environmentally sensitive area with increased air pollution, more noise pollution and the destruction of large amounts of natural habitats.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review confirms that the Green Belt area around Spennells fulfils its five main functions. Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, has rather controversially stated that up to 1% of Green Belt land may have to be taken to meet housing needs. It is not acceptable to plan to take up to 2.4% as detailed in Option A. Furthermore, the extension of the Spennells estate into the Green Belt would certainly constitute an area of urban sprawl, clearly visible from the A449 and the railway line. Building 1,735 houses would put a massive strain on the infrastructure and services in the immediate area and Kidderminster itself. This could be avoided by concentrating on improving Kidderminster town centre, developing brownfield sites and other areas that are currently awaiting development, e.g. the site where the Glades was situated and the old Sion Hill school site. Now the Council has been offered some brownfield sites, e.g. the Harriers Football Stadium and the Market Auction at</p>



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The level of new housing required as per the plan is flawed. Wyre Forest population has only grown by just over 2%. If we take into account the likely reduction in immigration due to Brexit (and the likely weakening of the economy) then the numbers presented in the plan appear designed to present a highest-population scenario to justify the remainder of the plan (being based on boom years of 2001-2007). In the Council's own documents you state that the population level has been static yet predict a requirement for nearly 6000 new homes and a raising of the population of Kidderminster by a third. I would argue that the whole plan is predicated on a misassumption and actual houses required would most likely be half that.</p> <p>Given the decline in the traditional industries in Kidderminster, the ageing population, and the relatively lower-cost housing in Wyre Forest, the plan's estimates on population increase can only be met by offering Kidderminster as a commuter town. By following Option A, the plan "dumps" the east of Kidderminster with most of these new commuters and the plan offers no clarity on how this ⅓ increase in population can be handled by core services or the transport network.</p> <p>Option A will not increase the wealth or wellbeing of the district but will instead only have negative effects on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary healthcare provision</li> <li>• Local transport issues</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> </ul> <p>For each of these pressures, Option A concentrates their effect on Stone parish and the Spennells.</p> <p>I can already quantify the effect peak time commuting has on the A448 and A449. The single lane tracks, Barrs Lane/Butts Lane, are already a rat-run for commuters taking a shortcut from the Mustow Green roundabout, and I believe that the "relief road" in the plan will not mitigate the increase in traffic from thousands of new houses. Instead of lumping all the new development in one cluster to the east of Kidderminster, Option B should be followed with a view to make a viable village centre in Lea Castle.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Option A would overload the local schools and GPs to beyond breaking point, whereas a dispersed plan would layer the extra population across a wider range of supporting services. If development (if required) is then later concentrated in Lea Castle funding for a new school and GP should be easier to achieve, and allow Lea Castle to become more of a “centred” village rather than a sprawl on the outskirts of a town.</p> <p>Stone parish will unfairly take the brunt of the plan from the Core planning to Offmore and I think the loss of the Spennells fields is fundamentally wrong if the land to the north of Mount Segg/Dunclent Lane is also to become housing (Stone Hill North OC/13). Not only will the Wyre Forest lose one of its most pleasant aspects (driving to Kidderminster from the brow of Stone Hill) with the core plan, but given the likely decline of the stability of the weather due to climate change, the plans to develop over sandy fields seems at odds with the issues now facing us and raise the risk of landslip/flooding affecting the all-important railway line, as well as all the pressures on the roads, schools and local NHS services as mentioned above.</p> <p>Also object to losing yet more agricultural land and the destruction of land supporting a diverse range of fauna: but it also seems in complete opposition to one of the key goals of the plan in reducing obesity in the Wyre Forest given the high numbers of people who use that area for exercise.</p> <p>Instead of removing land which is used daily by ramblers, joggers, cyclists, dog-walkers who bathe in its beauty and think “Wyre Forest is a great place to live” Option A in the plan would instead replace the fields with an urban sprawl for commuters. Commuters who, given the distance from fields to the town centre, would not walk into town or to the station, but would drive their cars - either increasing the load on an already busy train station at Kidderminster - or drive to work (most likely in the West Midlands/Birmingham).</p> <p>Despite protests by council members that “there are not enough brownfield sites” to cover housing requirements, I would like to object to the Plan due to the fact the plan does not offer the option to take up brownfield sites in the short-term with a view to review when all these are exhausted. Instead the plan seems intent on taking land out the Green Belt now - possibly to incentivise the relief road development.</p> <p>Unfortunately I think the plan seems a massive missed opportunity. The plan fails to take into account changes to modern living that could reshape Kidderminster town centre for the better by cultivated change of purpose of</p>

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

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

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

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



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Worcestershire and I think that this should be protected. There are plenty of brownfield sites in the West Midlands still to be developed.</p> <p>Most importantly, access to the countryside should be promoted to the residents of the Estate, not to be hindered by extending the Estate. The country lanes and paths are some of the best areas which promote a sense of community. Easy access to the countryside also helps with residents' physical health and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>In everyone's interests I would encourage reconsideration of the proposals based on the current extensive scale and further consideration of alternative options and particularly how housing development may be used to stimulate the Town Centre in a focussed way, rather than contributing to further urban sprawl around the town's perimeter.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3090</a>	Object	<p><b>Object to “Option A”:</b></p> <p><b>Lack of supporting infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>Vehicular Access/traffic</b></p> <p>Loss of Agricultural Ground</p> <p>Strain on Educational Resources</p> <p>The number of dwellings included in the development is well in excess of need</p> <p>The development would require a by-pass</p> <p>Pressure on Health Services</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt Land</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			There are a number of brown field sites in the Kidderminster/Wyre Forest area that would be a more suitable fit.  Impact on Wildlife
	<a href="#">LPPO3092</a>	Object	Object to Option A  Loss of Agricultural/recreational land  Schools at capacity  Increase in pressure on local health services  Increase in traffic, noise and pollution  Possible bypass  Waste Water & Sewage  Impact on Natural Habitats  Urban Sprawl  In Option A there is no indication that new housing would meet local housing needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO3097</a>	Object	Is it not correct that Green Belt land is meant to protect from urban sprawl and also the wildlife?! I feel the impact on building in one particular area will have significant negative effect for many reasons and on many people and local wildlife.  I do not feel that the relief road will help with the already rush hour grid lock experience we have as we leave Spennells in the morning for the work and school run and certainly does not outweigh the benefits of the Green Belt

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>fields! Our experience of our helpful local council planning office is that they have recently caused another nightmare road around the Wildon Island due to the new Worcester road traffic lights causing tailbacks as far as the eyes can see and also adding to the congestion getting off Spennells estate in the mornings.</p> <p>Why ruin masses of beautiful Green Belt when we have depressing, run down and derelict and areas of the community with empty buildings which could be regenerated into lovely residential areas.</p> <p>I am disgusted and disappointed that the council are considering ruining one of the most stunning areas in Kidderminster. I feel that the mental and physical health of local residents will be greatly impacted with the loss of all the fields around Spennells which will in turn put greater pressure on the local health service, GP's and hospitals. By taking away huge amounts of Green Belt land on Spennells people will either have to drive somewhere which is adding to pollution.</p> <p>I would also like to give my concern about the amount of wildlife and nature impacted from particular proposed huge expansion of the east side of Kidderminster and pollution in this one particular area. There are also huge amounts of animals and birds and wildlife which thrive in the Green Belt fields including rare skylarks and bats.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3103</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We understand that the Council has conducted a review of Green Belt as part of their review of the Local Plan and that Spennells/Stanklyn fields might be built on.</li> <li>• The Green Belt is important as it prevents urban sprawl, the merging of towns and it safeguards the countryside.</li> <li>• Green Belt also provides habitat, biodiversity, prime agricultural land, recreational space and it is essential to protect and promote the character of the countryside.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should not be removed when suitable alternative sites could – and should - be used e.g. further development of the Sugar Beet site, the Lea Castle campus and city centre developments.</li> <li>• Any removal or reduction of Green Belt will increase the urbanization of the area with a consequent increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Increased volumes of traffic will create congestion, exhaust and noise pollution and increase pedestrian and vehicular hazards.</li> <li>• Where will a new road go? Any further junctions on the Worcester Road will create further back up of traffic</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3169</a>	Object	<p>I am very much against the loss of Green Belt in the Kidderminster area, particularly in areas adjacent to large housing estates. It provides areas for healthy exercise, particularly walking and jogging, which, given the rise of obesity in Wyre Forest, is essential for the health of the citizens. Also the Green Belt is a haven for a variety of wildlife both in the fields and hedgerows and it is wrong to destroy their habitat. Nowhere is this more evident than the fields at the top of Spennells and it would be a tragedy to see them built on.</p> <p>I am concerned that the proposed plans that we are being consulted on do not specify the type of housing proposed on any of the sites. At the drop in meeting I asked about this and was told it would be dependent on proposals made by developers. I firmly believe that the council should take the lead in this, rather than be reactive to the developers' plans. In your planning documents you correctly point to an ageing population. However if you look at all the new builds in the areas surrounding Kidderminster there are very few, if any, bungalows being built, mainly because they are less profitable for the developers. This is where the council could and should specify a significant quantity of good quality bungalows which would provide an incentive to senior citizens to vacate larger family homes for young families.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3180</a>	Object	<p>I should like to voice my concerns about the use of Green Belt land to the east of Kidderminster for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a proposal by Persimmon homes earlier in the year to build 150 homes on land adjacent to the Spennells estate has now been increased by the local council to 1,735 new homes. We have not been told which developers will be spearheading this new proposal but could Persimmon have anything to do with it?</li> <li>• increased traffic will have a major effect on the area and its infrastructure, as the Eastern Relief Road would need to have Government approval before it could go ahead - how long <b>after</b> the houses have been built would this occur?</li> <li>• The loss of prime agricultural land and of wildlife habitat, not to mention the loss of well-being provided for the very many people who use the fields for walking. The Green Belt makes our towns and cities better places to live and it provides quick access to the countryside, therefore, we must protect it for future generations.</li> <li>• The local development plan states that provision for employment will be included. However, with local carpet factories announcing alarming redundancies, I fail to see that new businesses will employ local people</li> </ul>

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

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



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of education of countryside for children.</li> <li>• Why destroy this beautiful area when there are plenty of other sites more suitable.</li> <li>• Use brown land up first before going into the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3189</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Re: Objection to Option A and Option B to develop the Green Belt site on Spennells Fields and Captain's Pool and The Lodge</u></b></p> <p>I wish to object to the proposals of both Option A and Option B to build housing on the Green Belt area known as Spennells Fields and Captain's Pool and The Lodge on the following grounds:</p> <p><b><u>Agriculture, Health and Leisure</u></b></p> <p>Spennells Fields are Green Belt and are currently a productive agricultural resource. The fields are not only used by farmers to produce crops, but also by the local population for exercise, cycling, dog walking, leisure and recreation, thus providing health benefits to local residents. In the Council's documents, it states that obesity amongst the population is a problem. Therefore it does not make sense to remove a resource which is contributing to improving the health and wellbeing of the people. Not everyone can afford to visit the leisure centre or join a gym. Spennells Fields provide free health and leisure benefits to the community and are regularly used by many residents.</p> <p><b><u>Environmental Concerns</u></b></p> <p>Loss of this important Green Belt would, in my opinion, be an irreversible tragedy for both the current population and future generations. The area contains a huge variety of wildlife, some of which would not recover if their habitat were to be destroyed.</p> <p>I believe that corn buntings, which are a red listed bird, nest in these fields and that although they can forage for food elsewhere, they require a 200 hectare exclusion zone to nest and breed successfully.</p> <p>Skylarks have also been seen in Spennells Fields and I understand that they are fully protected under the Wildlife and</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult skylark, or to take, damage or destroy an active nest odr its contents.</p> <p><b><u>Infrastructure</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Roads:</u></b> Spennells is already one of the largest housing estates in the Wyre Forest area. The roads accessing the estate (Spennells Valley Road and Captain's Pool Road) are very congested during morning rush hour and it can often take 10-15 minutes just to queue to get off the estate to go to work in the morning. This is frequently exacerbated by traffic jams on the Worcester Road and Chester Road, leading to motorists blocking the traffic islands by Homebase and the McDonald's island, with tailbacks then preventing residents from leaving Spennells estate.</p> <p>Traffic problems are also a regular occurrence at weekends and even worse on bank holidays, when the entire area seems to be gridlocked. There have not been any firm details of new roads to access the proposed developments and therefore I believe that further expansion of Spennells would lead to even heavier congested roads, queues and pollution of the environment.</p> <p><b><u>Public Transport:</u></b> Kidderminster is a semi-rural town and although there are road links to cities such as Birmingham, Worcester and Wolverhampton, these roads are already very busy. For commuters travelling to work, buses to these cities are not always a cost efficient or convenient means of transport and people prefer to use their cars. The railway station in Kidderminster has limited car parking, which is already used to maximum capacity. There is nowhere to extend the current railway station car park. Therefore if there were to be a large growth in the population, I am concerned about the effects this would have on the roads and public transport.</p> <p><b><u>Schools:</u></b> I am concerned that with such a huge proposed development of 6000 houses, the local primary schools would struggle to cope with the demand for extra places, as would the local secondary school. Worcestershire is already one of the poorest funded local authorities for education and the schools in the area do not have particularly good GCSE or A level exam results when compared to the national picture.</p> <p><b><u>Health Service Provision &amp; Doctors:</u></b> As a resident of Wyre Forest, I know from personal experience how difficult it is to obtain GP appointments, particularly at short notice (and how many people plan their illnesses in advance)? Our</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The Captain's Pool and The Lodge areas.</p> <p>In summary, I do not think that the numbers projected by the Council are realistic, based on the lack of population growth over the last 10 years and the lack of industry and jobs to attract new people to the area. If these numbers are in dispute, there is no need to build 6000 new homes on Green Belt land. I accept that some new homes will be required, but think that existing brownfield sites and the former Lea Castle Hospital site should be used instead of destroying our beautiful countryside.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3192</a>	Object	<p>It would be a crime to build houses on the green fields of Spennells. You must remember that they do not make Fields now.</p> <p>The Traffic is bad enough now with out adding to it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3197</a>	Object	<p>It contributes to my mental well being and, obviously, increases my physical activity and I would say that goes for a considerable number of walkers.</p> <p>Whilst walking in this area in the summer months, I regularly see and hear skylarks: I have never witnessed these anywhere else in over fifty years of interest in nature. There are also other uncommon birds and insects in the fields.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3198</a>	Object	<p>The building of a further 1700 houses on the east side of Kidderminster will undoubtedly result in total carnage and chaos on local roads.</p> <p>The extra 1700 cars of residents of the proposed new housing trying to leave the estate and access the centre of town, will be catastrophic, and this sort of problem will not be solved by the proposed Eastern bypass.</p> <p>The local schools, hospitals and other medical facilities simply will be unable to cope.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3199</a>	Object	<p>Objection to:</p> <p><b>Preferred Option A</b></p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More concentrated, with a significant amount to the east/south east of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Includes the option for an Eastern Relief Road for Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Enable more effective school provision.</li> </ul> <p>The grounds against this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on residents losing more of their Green Belt land. Negative impact on wildlife including bats, grass snakes, adders, hedgehogs skylarks, linnets, buzzards and owls. Red listed birds use these habitats we have to preserve and protect them. Risk of losing existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Many use these fields for exercise, impact on health would have possible negative impact on health services.</li> <li>• Roads and junctions already heavily congested. A new Eastern road will not resolve the problem. Increase in pollution effect on health and environmental.</li> <li>• Pressure on schools, hospitals, doctors, dentists and opticians.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Build on brownfield sites, within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre. Alternatively use Preferred Option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3200</a>	Object	<p>The open green space is enjoyed by people for dog walking, bird watching, exercise, learning about nature, the trees and flowers. All this can be done without using a car (so very environmentally friendly). Trees will have to be cut down, so ruining the natural habitat of the area. Where will the birds and other wild life go? Children have lots of opportunities to learn about nature on their door step. We are all trying to encourage more exercise to help with obesity, fresh air for healthy life styles and time to enjoy outside life.</p> <p>If people are going to be encouraged to live in Kidderminster and work in Birmingham, the roads will be awful. It is very busy now driving through Hagley at several times of the day. Again it is not good for the environment and very time consuming.</p> <p>If people are going to be encouraged to use the trains, the Kidderminster Station car park is full most days now.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There are no trains to Wolverhampton and very crowded at peak times to Birmingham and Solihull.</p> <p>What about schooling, doctors and dentists (most now private in Kidderminster)? What about Leisure facilities now there is one out of town centre, with not enough parking spaces, and no easy access without a car?</p> <p>I also understand that the Hurcott area is to be developed. This is such a wonderful natural area that people come from a distance to enjoy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3206</a>	Object	<p>Resident on Spennells since 1987. Comments regarding Spennells</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Housing Development:</u></b> Difficult to see how WFDC can justify the building of some 6000 homes in the area when the level of population growth is very low and there is no justification as to the need for some 6000 new houses. Much is placed on the ability to attract industry to the area following a decline in the core industries. Much of the new employment is a result of small businesses, why should a large manufacturing company for example consider Wyre Forest as a desirable place to develop their business when the transport infrastructure is very poor.</p> <p>The expansion of Spennells would have a negative impact on the quality of life of the existing residents. The majority of the current privately owned properties are spacious 3 or 4 bedroom plots. Current building practices have changed to maximise the number of properties for a given area. The review states that new builds of more than 10 dwellings are to be mixed to include rented and affordable housing, which will be out of character especially in the Captains &amp; the Lodge, Stone Hill South and Stanklyn Lane developments. Personally I have never understood the logic behind this as it is supposed to aid integration when the opposite is likely to occur.</p> <p>The review makes reference that the proposed Spennells expansion there will be a narrow Green Belt between the existing properties and the new development and that access to the proposed extension will be via a new road linking the A449 and A448 although neither of these are illustrated on the plans. Certainly it would be totally impractical to link the proposed development with existing access roads.</p> <p><b><u>Environmental Issues:</u></b> There are reasonable opportunities to walk around the Spennells area and enjoy the wild life and open space. With the proposed expansion of Spennells this amenity would be lost forever. Captains Pool would</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>developments and two options A &amp; B. Option A is I believe to be totally inappropriate as the expansion will concentrate the majority of the development in Kidderminster to the detriment of existing residents in terms of congestion, and services. If there is a real need for such development then spreading the burden across the District as proposed in Option B should be the preferred option. Equally before any Green Belt expansion is implemented all brownfield sites and derelict or unused buildings should be developed first to establish the real need.</p> <p>The majority of the comments within this document were highlighted and supported by the many participants in the organised protest march held on 4th August. Mark Garnier and representatives from other political parties address the participants of the march and all showed their support to the concerns raised by the SAFE group. It is hoped that WFDC will take heed of the concerns raised.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3207</a>	Object	<p>I object to the current plans to build houses on the Spennells fields. I believe that the increased pollution and traffic will effect my children's health. They enjoy walking the dog on those fields and learning about nature, and the changing of the seasons through observations of the changes in plant life.</p> <p>I have lived in Spennells for the last 11 years, and enjoyed running and walking my dog around the fields because of the fresh country air and scenery, so the fields are important for my own personal exercise and health. This will be greatly diminished if houses were to be built on this ground.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3209</a>	Object	<p>It would seem to me that the Stanklyn Lane project would <u>not</u> be the better option considering the points outlined below, therefore, I would like to object to option A and support option B.</p> <p>Option B takes a substantial amount less of Green Belt land (circa 20%) than Option A. The Green Belt has a very important part to play in protecting the sprawl of towns into the open countryside, and your proposals (Option A) disproportionately focuses all housing on the eastern edge of Kidderminster, which would then merge it with the hamlets of Summerfield and Stone. This would also mean that many new home buyers would have 'no choice' of where they wish to live. Option B is more dispersed and gives buyers options to live close to family, friends, work and the area they choose to live.</p> <p>The Stanklyn Lane corridor in particular, plays a very important role in providing habitats for wildlife and recreation.</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There are a large number of red and amber listed breeding birds in this area, particularly the Corn Bunting which is in national decline and near extinction. There are also many old trees and hedgerows. We cannot allow the decline of these vital elements when better alternatives exist. There are also many public rights of ways and footpaths across the Spennells / Stanklyn Lane fields, and these provide recreational facilities for very many people such as walking, riding, cycling, rambling etc. Removing this land for a housing development would not support the Councils policy of trying to combat high obesity in the area. Putting 'green spaces' into housing developments would not give the same sense of wellbeing as open spaces, open skies and long distance vistas such as this area gives. Access to open countryside relieves stress and helps peoples sense of wellbeing. Given that Worcestershire Hospital trust is in a poor state (in remediation) at present, any reduction in stress or obesity related conditions can only support them. Many of the areas in Option B do not have the same very high recreational usage or designated rights of way as Option A.</p> <p>The proposed building on the land in option A will substantially increase the traffic and cause enormous congestion on and around Stanklyn Lane and Spennells estate. There will be increased exhaust, light and noise pollution as a result. If a new 'relief road' is built, then this will further increase pedestrian safety, increase vehicle accidents and decrease air quality, thus impacting on the health of what could be a highly populated area. Any new road in this area will cause traffic congestion and any junctions on the A449 will cause chaos on the Worcester Road both ways, and any junctions on the A448 will cause even further delays on the A448 to Mustow Green Island. No one going towards Birmingham will use a relief road onto the A456, as this comes out too far up, and the much quicker alternative route will always be the road through Harvington. Use money allocated for the proposed relief road to improve the Black Bridge height and the road via Harvington rather than running an additional unneeded road in parallel.</p> <p>The numbers of houses required in your plan are very high. The calculations are very confusing and seem to contradict the expert opinion that 'there is no population growth' and 'no in-migration'. I would urge the Council to revisit and justify these figures. The document also has a major bias to selecting option A which again I would call the Council to review.</p> <p>The area in option A around Stanklyn Lane is prime grade B and well used agricultural land that must be preserved. This not only supports the economy, but helps with the natural drainage of the very sandy soil in this area. There are</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3483</a>	Object	<p>Stanklyn Lane is only a narrow lane. It cannot tolerate large amounts of traffic.</p> <p>It would also take away the fields that are used to grow grain.</p> <p>We are on the limit of use of land now and traffic amounts are getting larger. The building of these houses is a step too far. It would spoil our views and therefore will reduce the value of our home.</p> <p>There are plenty of brownfield sites in and around Kidderminster yet to be used without encroaching on the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3486</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object strongly to both options A &amp; B. Although these schemes are being presented as an either or choice, each includes development in the area referred to as WFR/ST/1 designated as a “Core Housing Site”. The main reasons for my opposition which can equally apply to both plans are a follows:</p> <p><u>Loss of Green Belt status:</u> DCLG states that “this Government is committed to protect the Green Belt” and “only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter Green Belt boundaries”. Are projected local expansion needs really exceptional enough to warrant this land grab and won’t the infringement of these guidelines make it easier to commandeer more land in the future? The awareness that 98% will somehow be preserved seems unlikely to happen when tempting offers are made by developers.</p> <p><u>Increased pressure on Local Services:</u> Both options A and B will impose extra strain on hospitals, doctors, dentists and schools, in addition to the water, gas, electricity and sewerage provision required. Some of these services are struggling to cope already and GPs may even vote soon to stop registering new patients.</p> <p>The local plan review leaflet says only that new facilities may come forward, but even if they do, it will take considerable time and upheaval to install them. Shopping has become poor, the bus service to and from Spennells is substandard and any new residents will no doubt have at least one or two cars. An Eastern Relief Road may be built, but is this really something to welcome? More countryside destroyed, more noise and traffic fumes and soon yet another road will be needed as traffic expands to fill the space allocated to it.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><u>Increased risk to health:</u> Whichever option is adopted it is certain that the atmosphere will become even more unclean with more noise and congestion affecting both pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p><u>Loss of use of fields &amp; footpaths:</u> Captains and The Lodge (WFR/ST/1), Farmers Fields 1 (AS/10), 1 (WFR/ST /2), And 3 (OC/13). Being unable to use and enjoy these fields and the footpaths bordering them, full of trees and flowers and home to birds and other wildlife, will diminish the health and well-being of residents and other visitors. It is a safe area to walk.</p> <p>I object to both Options A &amp; B for these reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3493</a>	Object	<p>I object to these proposals as it will spoil this lovely estate. We have lovely trees and plenty of wildlife living here.</p> <p>This will cause devastation to nature and pollution.</p> <p>We do not have enough infrastructure to support the heavy flow of traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3496</a>	Object	<p>I am whole heartedly objecting to Option A and also to any core housing around the Captains and the Lodge.</p> <p>There's nothing better than to walk the fields or take the children for a long bike ride. The tranquil surroundings, nature and friendly people we pass all add to amazing, safe and stress free well being.</p> <p>We love to see the amazing variety of breeds of birds in the fields as well as the ones that visit our own garden, also bats we have frequently seen at dusk. We love the skyline through the fields, watching sunsets and on clear nights the star constellations. All of this will be marred with obscene buildings and light pollution. Not what I want my children to then be deprived of.</p> <p>The traffic would be another issue. The volume of traffic would be disruptive. Imagine an average of 2 vehicles per household on top of the vast amount already. The pollution, build up and safety of us and our children would all be jeopardised.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The thought of extra housing on top of the sheer size of Spennells estate is mind blowing. The local schools, doctors and dentists can not deal with this. The waiting lists to sign up for any of these are already problematic let alone then trying for an appointment.</p> <p>It seems as though figures have been miscalculated and are in fact less required than estimated so I don't see why all of the brown belt land can't be used for maisonettes or apartments before hitting this beautiful countryside. There are appalling buildings empty and making Kidderminster look a disgrace like crown house and the majority of Worcester street. This could provide so much more to the town itself if these are converted and updated. If the town is left the way it is any longer I'm sure there will be plenty of property as people would move anyway, there is nothing here for people. It can't possibly just be for the growing population of Kidderminster, it's the overspill from surrounding cities. Where does it end? How much land is going to be eaten up?</p> <p>There were promises of protecting the Green Belt areas and I'm sure as you have seen from the amount of objections and the amount of time and effort gone into objecting to this you can see how much this means.</p> <p>Please reconsider and re plan. Let us keep these fields for all our sakes and especially children to have the freedom of this natural playground.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3505</a>	Object	<p>I am unsure how the council would propose to deal with possible drainage issues caused by further housing.</p> <p>Consider the impact on local wildlife - There are a number of rare birds, rare bats and badgers amongst other animals.</p> <p>The fields are used extensively by; joggers, dog walkers, horse riders, bird watchers, cyclists, photographers.</p> <p>This is grade 2 agricultural land, the best quality land Wyre Forest has to offer, with an uncertain future thanks to Brexit we would be foolish to lose this land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3522</a>	Object	<p>Traffic is already a major problem in this area, with regular queues not only to leave Spennells estate, but also traffic backing up on all the nearby main roads. If several hundred extra households are also trying to leave for work or</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>school it will cause chaos, even if a new exit is built. Pollution from the extra traffic will impact negatively on health.</p> <p>The fields are a vital area for outdoor exercise and enjoyment. Hundreds of people walk or run the fields everyday, improving their health and fitness, and mental well-being. To enjoy such lovely scenery and have a chat with fellow walkers is the highlight of some people's lives, keeping the lonely in touch with others. It is a safe place for dog-walking and for children to play. If this area is built on we will lose a vital commodity that cannot be replaced.</p> <p>Local schools are already over-subscribed so new schools will need to be built to cater for the hundreds of extra children, or these extra children will be crammed into classes that are already too large.</p> <p>Our local GP surgeries are already so full that it is incredibly difficult to obtain an appointment. How will this happen if it's already so hard to see a doctor? Likewise, how do the people find a dentist? I still haven't been able to find an NHS dentist locally.</p> <p>The fields provide a safe-haven for Skylarks, Woodpeckers, Finches and many other species. The Green Belt is vital for their survival.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3523</a>	Object	<p>This area is classified as Green Belt and is legally protected. The fields are a local and national treasure and have an on going history of heritage that belongs to and should remain solely within the boundaries of public domain.</p> <p>Please accept this as a justifiable rationale for keeping the fields protected, safe and intact for the greater good of Kidderminster, its citizens and the natural wildlife that inhabits the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3544</a>	Object	<p>I must object in the strongest terms to the application to build housing on Green Belt land on the fields at the back of Spennells</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3554</a>	Object	<p>Obviously this is Green Belt land</p> <p>Why would you build on Spennells? It's too big with housing already.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>There is a large wildlife population needed to be considered</p> <p>Access is bad now – on and off Spennells. Access off Stanklyn Lane is dangerous now.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3556</a>	Object	<p>The new proposal will impact on an area which already has a lot of homes and traffic.</p> <p>People want to live close to country.</p> <p>Already the new relief road by the leisure centre is getting busier and the houses etc there aren't finished. A lot of parents drive to school at the moment, that probably would not change so easier school provision would not be a benefit.</p> <p>Please re think and keep our Green Belt as it is so it can be enjoyed by everyone now and in the future.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3575</a>	Object	<p>I have enjoyed the walks and seeing all the wild life that live there, such as deer, badgers, buzzards, hedgehogs which are already on the verge of extinction, skylarks which nest in the fields.</p> <p>If these fields are built on where is the food for future generation going to be grown???</p> <p>The surrounding infrastructure would not be able to cope with the increase of cars and people.</p> <p>Worcestershire hospitals are already in great difficulty and local schools are struggling with not enough classroom space and green space for out door activities.</p> <p>Sometimes you have to wait 2 weeks or more to see a doctor.</p> <p>Building these homes will cause even longer waiting lists for doctors and hospitals.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3581</a>	Object	<p>The loss of Green Belt areas, protects our countryside from Urban Sprawls, Threatening the existing Public Right of Way.</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Present roadside car parking makes this road dangerous, hence no further traffic increase can be sustained.</p> <p>Increased residential numbers on Spennells has lead to pupil increase at the local school. At peak times, car parking access on Heronswood Road, leads to limited access and since no traffic calming is in place, increased housing would only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Recent years, we have witnessed total gridlock of traffic attempting to exit Spennells estate. Option A can only be a viable option, if alternative road infrastructure is implemented. Traffic wishing to continue south toward Worcester, would encounter high volumes of traffic approaching the Black Bridge junction, severely restricting already congested traffic flow. Likewise, traffic heading north into Kidderminster, is restricted by single carriageway approaching the Viaduct roundabouts, again severely restricting already congested traffic flow.</p> <p>Objections: Expansion of Easter Park. We object to any use of the present road access to the rear of Easter Park, since this is of limited design and not suitable for large volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Proposal: Mixture of Option 'A'/'B' Providing good access to Bromsgrove, Dudley and South Staff, with employment links towards Birmingham, consideration be given to a link road between A456 and A448.</p> <p>As Spennells is the largest estate in the Wyre Forest, development supported by the 'core' link road, would not impact on the present estate traffic, facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggestion that Easter Park expansion consider smaller business office units. Larger units are not used, hence wasted opportunity to attract new business to the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3620</a>	Object	I want to draw issues to the environmental damage that will be caused when building core housing by Spennells fields.

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The fields are home to many species of RSPB red listed birds. Birds nesting there such as Skylarks, and Corn Buntings to name only a few of many are depleting in numbers and need to be protected. The RSPB recommends a 200 Hectare exclusion zone around these nests so they can continue to breed safely and increase their numbers. With all the houses that the LP recommends building on core sites and option A, this will see the demise of these birds in the Wyre Forest district which is why the LP needs to be revisited and reworked.</p> <p>As the LP states around 6000 houses need building by 2034, how does the WFDC plan to offset the carbon footprint created by building these houses and the extra cars (10000 approx.) which will be on our roads? Air pollution is a rapidly growing problem as seen around the world as well as in the UK. This is caused by over population and the need for cars to get around. So why over estimate by far in the LP, the amount of housing needed thus creating more air pollution? The Spennells is a designated nature reserve and more housing, cars and people would affect the area severely. Tree Protection Orders are in force over the Spennells and its surrounding areas. What will become of these? Are they going to be ignored and the building companies pay a nominal fine for cutting them down? Once again as in its title, it's "Wyre Forest District Council" with a <b>TREE</b> as its emblem. Should that not now change to a <b>HOUSE</b> if the LP goes ahead?</p> <p>This is why the LP needs to be reviewed and reworked to help the environment. It states on the WFDC website that the council is committed to providing well maintained parks and facilities for all to enjoy! If we encourage the building on Green Belt land then there will be no more well maintained facilities for anyone to enjoy!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3624</a>	Object	<p>I regularly use those fields to run around and relax walking my dog, its a lovely area and as its just a short walk from my house its nice to be over there in the peace and quiet away from the hustle and bustle of everyday life. I also feel that the burden on the local services especially the roads around the area will be very disruptive making commuting to and from work more time consuming.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3686</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Spennells fields serve as a health benefit. 100s of residents across Kidderminster use them for dog walking, open space (parks have a strong link to crime in Kidderminster) and health benefits by reducing obesity. Therefore Option A should not be taken as this will have an adverse impact on obesity levels</li> <li>• Cyclists use - Another reason to maintain the field and not take Option A.</li> <li>• The bus network is unreliable very slow and completely unsatisfactory for the number of extra residents who may use it. It would need to be a service which is much more comprehensive, runs more frequently and to</li> </ul>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p><b><u>My grounds for objection to option A are: -</u></b></p> <p><u>Social issues</u></p> <p>The proposed Option A has a disproportionate negative impact on the residents of Spennells. LPR Option A, if enforced, will increase the size of Spennells by 87%. Option A will encourage localized sprawl, and the merging of Spennells to Offmore &amp; Comberton. The linear approach of the option will result in amalgamating two estates with very different characteristics. Spennells has very little green space per resident for recreational use such as physical exercise, cycling and off lead dog walking. It would be inappropriate for dogs to be off lead close to the children's play area, which is also close to the main Spennells Valley Road.</p> <p>Street walking with small children and a dog ensures all are at the emissions level of any passing vehicle, therefore consideration for increase in respiratory diseases such as asthma must be given. Otherwise it is a car journey to Hartlebury, Habberley, Hurcott or further afield to take a dog for a walk — with increased congestion on the roads and additional emissions.</p> <p>Green space is necessary to promote physical and mental wellbeing for all generations. The fields to the South of Spennells provide a huge recreational resource for the residents of: - Spennells, Stone, Stanklyn, Summerfield, Hoo Road, Aggborough, Hill Grove, Oldnall Road. The fields are used by ramblers, ornithologists, photographers, star gazers, cyclists, joggers, horse riders, dog walkers, children, families, and the elderly. The fields encourage a community spirit, which was very publicly highlighted by the protest march to the Town Hall.</p> <p>The LPR identifies the benefits of Green Belt space and the problems faced with modern society - mental wellbeing, obesity, general ill health - then appears to begrudge the residents of its very existence. Having had cancer, I personally walk the fields twice a day with my dog. Walking recommended by my oncologist to improve joint pain and prevent weight gain. Walking helps me to keep a clear perspective on my condition and help reduce possible recurrence. I know many other people who use the fields for exercise to help with medical conditions. This is a free resource, one that is costing the NHS <b>nothing</b>.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter town on the Southern flank of Kidderminster will be divisive for the town, as</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster town centre is in desperate need of rejuvenation. If funding to improve housing and small retail units within the town centre is continually overlooked, it will become the future slums — only encouraging existing crime to escalate. A lack of policing within Kidderminster is already a problem, with needles to be found in all parks and drinking on the streets prevalent. The residents of the proposed commuter estate will be encouraged to shop in the bright lights of Birmingham / Worcester and their money spent outside Kidderminster's local economy. Such residents will be disengaged from Kidderminster. I believe Option A sets a precedent to place affluence above need within Kidderminster. Such a bunkered approach will lead to a rise in tension within the community, which is already evident on social media.</p> <p><b><u>Environmental Impact</u></b></p> <p>The environmental impact of releasing the Green Belt for development is huge. Two thirds of Green Belt land, is of high value, agricultural land. The London School of Economics supported by the NEA (National Ecosystem Assessment) agree that Green Belt land is high value agricultural land, both in terms of food production and 'cultural services'. The ramifications of Brexit are yet to be felt and the future population growth of the UK very uncertain. Now more than ever the UK needs to hold on to productive agricultural land to ensure consistent food supplies. The land to South of Spennells/Kidderminster is identified as some of the best (most productive), agricultural land within Wyre Forest. Whilst talking food we must also look at food miles and carbon footprint.</p> <p>WFDC have signed up to the Carbon Emissions Programme — yet the end goal based on the Local Plan Review is to get the Eastern Bypass/Relief Road funded from Central Government. The Bypass is an unnecessary expense with two other routes already linking the A449 to Birmingham and motorways. Both of which could be significantly improved with lesser funding and impact on the local environment. The LTP4 states that it is a misnomer to say just building a road alleviates a problem - the very building of that road leads to 'that road' becoming the next problem. LTP4 identifies the need for WFDC to address public transport issues and support the use of cycle lanes. The air quality on Spennells is not always good especially on a dank day. The nature of its position within the valley and the heavily trafficked Spennells Valley Road plays a large part in this. It would be questionable then to add a relief road to the rear of Spennells and not consider AQI levels for residents.</p> <p>Green Belt space provides the lungs of the planet — climate change makes the value of Green Belt even higher. It is</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>an important factor in the storing of carbon; <b>prevention of flooding</b> and soil protection.</p> <p>The fields to the rear of Spennells play host to a plethora of wild life <b>Bats, Badgers</b> — there are active sets within two of the fields. Corn buntings, Skylarks both of which are red listed birds. Waxwings that winter visit have been photographed. My list could be endless and is supported by Worcestershire Biological Records Centre.</p> <p><b><u>Economic impact</u></b></p> <p>PFI's (Private Finance Initiatives), and their scandalously high interest rates have ensured hospitals across the UK have debts that are beyond their control, none more so than 'CRISIS-ifiT' Worcestershire Acute Hospital Trust, which has just been named one of the worst trusts in the country for A&amp;E waiting times. This alongside the down grading of Kidderminster Hospital has now put existing residents' lives at risk. Worcestershire Hospital Trust will not be able to support the Pro-Growth Agenda actively pursued within the LPR and supported by WFDC.</p> <p>Doctors are under pressure to take up any existing slack from the hospital service — appointments requiring a weeks notice in some cases. There is a shortage of trained Doctors. So where will funding come from to extend existing practices or Doctors to open new practices? This argument extends to NHS Dentists.</p> <p>Educational standards within WFDC are lower than national average. 1000 homes required before a feeder school built. The LPR implies the 6000 'required homes' will be phased in over the time span covered by the LPR, averaging 360 homes per year. This potentially takes us up to a three year period of (continual) development on one site before additional school requirement is deemed necessary — then put out to tender. Shoehorning children into existing schools will only mean fewer resources per capita and poorer learning outcomes. Children from Silverwood's development are currently attending Heronswood Primary School. A distance that requires a car journey — not only adding to congestion on the estate during peak traffic times, but poorer health outcomes for children not being able to walk to school — perhaps we need to revisit obesity here! We currently have a population bulge within primary schools. These children will all need to receive higher education and at present that provision will again be met by existing secondary schools operating at full capacity. Where will additional children be educated? Portacabins? GCSE results in Wyre Forest are lower than national average, standards in schools need raising not diluting by increased</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>pressure.</p> <p>In-migration will add to the pressure of Wyre Forest's frontline services. If finances can't provide a safe level of cover now it is bunkered to believe more housing equals more tax for better services, because more tax equals more people and more people equals more demand - status quo.</p> <p>Creating a linear commuter estate with a road that provides a direct corridor to Birmingham, Worcester and associated Motorways will ensure money from the South of Kidderminster will not be spent within the local economy. There is very little to draw people into the town centre and it is not true to say online shopping is the cause. Lincoln and Leicester are good examples of how to manage a vibrant community - independent, small, eclectic shops working alongside flagship stores despite the availability of online shopping. Stourport and Bewdley are more vibrant than Kidderminster. Even Hagley manages to support the village centre. The LPR highlights the need to market Kidderminster as an attractive tourist destination to encourage money into the local economy — an over developed visual approach on the South-Eastern flank to Kidderminster will not achieve this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3785</a>	Object	<p>Very good planning, good preparation, decent accommodation from first time homes to bungalows for our elderly residents. It works, so why spoil it?</p> <p>We only have to take a walk round Kidderminster town centre to see ugly deserted and empty shops, attracting graffiti and unwanted trash.</p> <p>It IS much easier to 'decorate' an area of land where housing can be developed at speed but it would seem to many people that we need to see a genuine developmental achievement such as we have witnessed on the Sugar Beet land, or the new Tesco in Stourport, now they are areas for the planners and developers to be proud of.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3825</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Spennells Local Plan Review</u></b></p> <p>With regards to the above we would state that we feel the proposals are not appropriate for the current Kidderminster population. The area surrounding the existing housing planned are to crop and I understand this is a categorised Green Belt, grade 2 agriculture, this must surely be protected?</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3865</a>	Object	<p>I object strongly to the proposed development on existing Green Belt land in Spennells, Captains and the Lodge, and surrounding areas.</p> <p>The premise we need 600+ houses is entirely flawed and based entirely on erroneous data. We simply do not need that many houses as the population of Kidderminster has been largely static for several years and those that we do can be accommodated in existing Brown Field sites without laying waste to valuable Green Belt.</p> <p>This is without even mentioning the impact on traffic volumes of all these houses in one place plus the extra demands on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Once gone these valuable green areas are gone forever, therefore every effort should be made to utilise land that is laying derelict and unused first. Many of which are an eyesore and attract criminal behaviour.</p> <p>Hundreds of people use the fields to the south of Spennells and adjacent to Stanklyn Lane every week for recreational purposes, if this land is built it will be a monumental disaster to all those walkers, joggers, cyclists and dog walkers and many children who get their first taste of real countryside and even more so to the loss of habitat for all the wildlife that live in and feed in these fields. Having access to green areas is vital to peoples well being as has been well established in various studies.</p> <p>At the moment we have a large flock of swifts visiting the fields to feed on the abundant insect life, plus the ever present skylarks.</p> <p>There are several large well established badger setts in this area, not to mention bats, rabbits, foxes and myriad native bird life, all of which would lose this valuable green area.</p> <p>It is just wrong to look at a large green field site and say lets build on here because it's convenient for the building company and ignore all the brown field sites because they are a bit more inconveniently spread out over a wider area of Wyre Forest.</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>Kidderminster, would significantly impact on both air and light pollution, and adversely affect air quality in this area.</p> <p>It is to be hoped that WFDC would pay equal attention to attempts to reduce pollution and safeguard air quality in all areas of the District, particularly in light of the recent Government's Clean Air Plan, published July 2017.</p> <p>Option A will, undoubtedly, have a detrimental impact on the wildlife that feed and lives on the field bordering the Spennells Estate and surrounding areas. Bat species and their roosts, in the UK are protected by both domestic and international legislation. Badgers and their setts are protected by UK law. The skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.</p> <p>Given the above legislation, it would appear unlawful to proceed with the selection of Option A, as the preferred option. It equally does not concur with the Council's Planning Policy Statement, 9.3.</p> <p>There is extensive use made of the footpaths around the fields bordering Spennells and also within Option A. Easy access to the footpaths is aiding the health and fitness of Wyre Forest residents. Obesity levels within the Wyre Forest are higher than other areas of Worcestershire. This is particularly significant when considering the data reporting on obesity levels of 5yr old and 11yr children. The Draft Local Plan makes reference to its aim to reduce these levels. In addition, at the 'drop ins', one poster stated as one of the aims of the Local Plan was to encourage walking and cycling.</p> <p>The National Trust recently reported that more than 80% of adults stated that today's children have significantly reduced freedoms to explore and play outdoors, compared to their own childhood.</p> <p>If our cars are further needed in future years to access the outdoors for both exercise and recreation, (assisted by selecting Option A) we will additionally contribute to increasing carbon emissions and therefore adversely affect our environment.</p> <p>I fail to comprehend how reducing opportunities for accessible, affordable, use of outdoor space for children and adults, which would otherwise contribute to their physical and mental wellbeing, can be compromised by trading Green Belt land for unknown, unchallenged, alleged dwelling need.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The local Primary School on Spennells is currently full. The effect of considerable housing increase would add pressure on existing local school accommodation. Given that the Wyre Forest Draft Local Plan makes reference to improving educational attainment in the area, exceeding the school's pupil admission limit, would likely result in marginalising children's' learning outcomes and thereby deflating attainment.</p> <p>6.55 states 'Option A will enable more effective school provision'</p> <p>This is merely an unqualified value judgement. No further elaboration of this issue has been available and is surely open to challenge.</p> <p>6.56 states 'The absence of this additional infrastructure will impact on future traffic congestion, air quality and educational provision'</p> <p>From favourably conveyed messages by planners, at the drop ins, regarding Option A, should this option be selected, it would attract significant infrastructure improvements, for example a school, medical services, a relief road. However, clarification of this infrastructure package was distinctly lacking. No clear information was available regarding the location of the Eastern Relief Road. In the meantime, children present and in-migration related increased child population are merely expected to accept present, not improved, levels of educational provision for an indefinite number of years.</p> <p>It would be interesting to collect data from Worcestershire's records of where urban expansion has taken place, of Droitwich, and whether infrastructure packages, including schools have been developed accordingly.</p> <p>The fields that border Spennells back onto the boundary with Wychavon District Council. Would housing development in this area not constitute urban sprawl, which has historically been against policy?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3971</a>	Object	<p>Kidderminster Hospital is on the opposite side of the town centre, so there are issues immediately issues with travel time but is also part of Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust is struggling and is one of the worst performing trusts in the country. With such a large increase in population with these new houses, the hospital will continue to</p>

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I cannot see the justification in placing such a large proportion of the new homes required in this area alone and on this Green Belt land. You have an option B, which almost provides the same housing yet is more evenly distributed throughout Kidderminster.</li> <li>Adding this number of houses in one area will put huge pressures on already overly subscribed services like local schools, Doctors, and local hospitals which are currently under "Special Measures". How will this be addressed if we are adding 1700 new homes in this one area alone</li> <li>the development will create heavy traffic and extra pollution</li> <li>Green Belt land is surely in place to stop urban sprawl, what green space will we be left with</li> <li>what regulations exist for building next to / under electricity pylons and supply lines</li> <li>Coalescence of two or more settlements namely Summerfield, Stanklyn and Stone with Spennells</li> <li>development here would conflict with Policy GB.6 of the LP which states that proposals within the Green Belt must not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the Green Belt</li> <li>"The development would result in a substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to enhance this valuable landscape." A quote from a very recent much smaller planning site rejection in Stourport</li> </ul> <p>I object strongly to this Option A and believe the additional houses required would be better spread out over Wyre Forest and therefore have smaller impact.</p> <p>If you don't accept a reduction in the housing demand numbers, then I still object to Spennells / Stone Fields being in the draft Local Plan, for the reasons stated above</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4077</a>	Object	<p>We would like to take this opportunity to express our most extreme concerns with regards to the proposed building plans in the Kidderminster area. The affect on the countryside and wildlife would be tragic.</p> <p>Why is it felt necessary to look at Green Belt sites when there are a number of abandoned buildings, some of which have been empty for over 20 years? Why not develop these sites? Other examples of land which should be considered in the first instance is Sion Hill School and the site of Sladen School, land ripe for being used for new properties.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>The infrastructure of Kidderminster is not adequate to cope the development of these sites.</p> <p>We are at a lose to understand the reason for building more business units on the Worcester Road when after some 8 years or so the units that are already in existence have not been occupied.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4083</a>	Object	<p>Regularly walking along the fields, observing the agricultural activities and sharing and observing the environment of the abundant wildlife.</p> <p>Why is this beautiful Green Belt area being considered, when there are many brown areas, which could be developed?</p> <p>Who has considered the extra amount of traffic which will be present around Spennells, not to mention the need for a school or medical provision, bus services, etc for the expanding population? There are great problems as it as, as we all know!</p> <p>Use the empty shops to bring the town back to life, for it is a dead hole at the moment. Too much time is spent thinking about making the canal attractive, but actions should be taken to make Kidderminster an interesting place to live.</p> <p>A new road will bring noise and pollution, which will affect the wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4084</a>	Object	<p>The whole point of having a 'Green Belt' is so it is protected from development, why even have it if it's disregarded at the first opportunity. All brownfield sites within Kidderminster MUST be developed first before looking to Green Belt land.</p> <p>The new road to Stourport has already gridlocked the Wilden Lane roundabout - I see little evidence that more housing, even with a so-called 'relief road' will help this.</p> <p>I have constantly looked for work in or near the town. There is nothing. What will be done to provide people with</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>local jobs? The public transport services to Birmingham are already at breaking point.</p> <p>If the fields are gone the dog walkers, joggers, cyclists and others will be heading into their cars to drive to countryside which is currently on their front door step. This serves to pollute the environment further and add to the already gridlocked roads.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4087</a>	Object	<p>I do not feel this should go ahead as follows:</p> <p>1) Traffic at rush hour around Spennells valley road, Chester Road South and Worcester Road is a nightmare. Add more cars from these houses it will be mayhem. The new link road at Silverwoods is fantastic at present and has a lot of high hopes but adding more houses for the eastern side of Kidderminster will put pressure on this road. I hope you will put traffic lights on Worcester Road/Wilden Lane island as this is disgusting now let alone if this planning application goes through.</p> <p>2) We have 1 primary school already on Spennells and adding more houses where will children go to school. I doubt Baxter College and King Charles will cope with the extra demand.</p> <p>3) Hospitals. Worcester hospital is already bursting at the seams, where will people from these houses go to Hospital? The current budget cuts mean the hospital and the ambulance service is already under pressure. Adding more houses will create more demand on our hospitals.</p> <p>4) Wildlife. Will there be any reviews done for birds and badgers?</p> <p>5) Water. Is the water supply that serves Spennells sufficient for the increase of houses?</p> <p>6) By removing this Green Belt will there be an increase in flooding and if so what provisions will be put in place.</p> <p>7) Police. Will the police cope with the extra amount of houses planning to be built?</p> <p>8) Fire Brigade. Will the fire service be able to keep up with the extra demand considering he plan to be a centralised</p>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			I really hope you do not build on Spennells beautiful countryside areas, there aren't many in Kidderminster and it will be really sad if you take them away from us.
	<a href="#">LPPO4463</a>	Object	<p>As per the consultation last year the District should concentrate on the regeneration strategy as outlined in sections 5 and 6 of the aforementioned document. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of re-designating the fields is contrary to core strategy as approved by your electorate.</p> <p>Objections specific to the Copse at N522202 W0021337 and Fields to the rear of (south) Spennells Estate on the basis of Flood Risk, Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 2012 government national planning policy framework (NPPF) requires “relevant planning authorities who should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile land.” The fields behind Spennells are good quality and this has not been covered in the Local Plan.</li> <li>“There are no recorded nature conservation or cultural heritage interests on the site”. There is record of Badgers, Skylarks, Linnets and Bats therefore the definition of LIMITED CONTRIBUTION is wrong. Therefore, the planners have been misled by this independent report and need to review the Local Plan based on this being a SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION and breach of planning guidance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Flood Risk</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on drainage in the area as the fields are a valuable soak away. Already flood defences have had to be installed by Severn Trent on the Spennells estate and as we know the Victoria Carpet's old cricket field is designated flood plain. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of increase flood risk.</li> </ul> <p><b>Bio Diversity, Congestion, Pollution and Health Grounds</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanding Spennells, particularly if Turnstone access is opened up as suggested at a “Drop In “meeting will cause extra congestion in traffic exiting from the only two exits onto Spennells Valley Road. Already there are queues at both exits particularly when the schools are operating with waiting times regularly in the region of 10-15minutes. Any further traffic will only add to the air pollution. I therefore object to Option A on</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>the basis of congestion, pollution and health grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option A will have a detrimental impact on the wildlife that feeds and lives on the fields and surrounding areas. There are Bats and Badgers in the area. In Britain all bat species and their roosts are legally protected, by both domestic and international legislation. Badgers and their setts (tunnels and chambers where they live) are protected by UK law. The skylark is fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which makes it an offence to kill, injure or take an adult skylark, or to take, damage or destroy an active nest or its contents. The only exception is legitimate farming practices that cannot be reasonably delayed, although farming methods can often be modified to reduce the impact on the skylarks. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of it being unlawful and not encouraging bio diversity which is one of the objects of the Council via Planning Policy Statement 9. 3.</li> <li>The current intensive use of the public footpaths within Option A is helping preserve people's health. I therefore object to Option A on health grounds.</li> <li>The current primary school is full and any more dwellings would have an adverse impact on the local schools and nursery plus the extra buses and traffic will cause increased safety issues for the children. I therefore object to Option A on the grounds of congestion, pollution and safety.</li> </ul> <p><b>Green Belt Review</b></p> <p>In the Green Belt review some of the assessment is wrong and coalescence will occur if Option A were to be pursued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NPFF requires assessment against the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.</li> <li>Would development of the proposed site appear to result in the merging of towns or compromise the separation of towns physically?</li> <li>Would potential development of the proposed site be a significant step leading towards coalescence of two settlements?</li> </ul> </li> <li>On page 42 it states LIMITED CONTRIBUTION Development would have no impact on this purpose in this location, although locally the identity of Summerfield would change along its northern extent.</li> <li>On page 50 it states LIMITED CONTRIBUTION Development of the site would not lead to the merger of towns, although locally the separate identity of the dwellings strung along Stanklyn Lane which comprise</li> </ul>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			both the local population and wildlife in direct contravention of the stated development objectives in Table 3.0.1 para ix. This area currently has a diversity of wildlife including herons and bats which are unlikely to survive the development. Given the scale of the proposed development it is not credible that it will be possible to provide an “adequate natural green buffer” as an adequate buffer would not leave sufficient space for the number of homes and road proposed. The area to the south of Stanklyn Lane does not provide an alternative because there is no public access.
	<a href="#">LPPO4713</a>	Object	<p>I do not approve of any development of the Green Belt and it is government policy to protect the Green Belt except in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Plan A relates to land between the A449 Worcester Road and A448 Bromsgrove Road. Previously there was significant development to the north of this leading to a self-contained housing development with a shopping and service centre and primary school. Option A involves significantly expanding the housing in this area, detrimentally affecting the inhabitants of the Spennells and Stanklyn Lane. It is, indeed a large scale expansion and an extension of the Spennells estate in all but name.</p> <p>There are a number of objections to be made, both environmental and social objections being extremely strong. The fields are crossed by a bridleway and a number of interconnecting footpaths which are used on a daily basis, improving the fitness and health of the local population. Activities include cycling, walking with or without dogs, and horse riding. Such activities are participated in by local people, not only from the Spennells, but from Aggborough, Comberton, Stanklyn Lane and the wider local area.</p> <p>At the moment this area is also a haven for wildlife, with its mature hedgerows, green lanes, copses and isolated trees, giving a wide variety of habitats. Larks are abundant, whilst buzzards are frequently seen above the fields or even perched on mature trees. In the summer swallows and martins perform their aerial manoeuvres. Butterflies such as tortoiseshell, red admiral and gate keeper are seen in summer and bees feast on the ivy flowers.</p> <p>This option would also involve the removal of high quality agricultural land, producing barley, wheat and vegetables, which will be increasingly important after Brexit, as it will contribute to food production when we leave the EU.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>This is not marginal Green Belt land.</p> <p>In conclusion I would beg the Wyre Forest Council to preserve the high quality Green Belt for environmental and recreational reasons and I maintain that the land between Spennells and Stanklyn Lane fits into this category.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4880</a>	Object	<p>I believed Green Belt land was sacrosanct: too important for a whole raft of reasons to be changed or destroyed. I was thus horrified to learn that this proposed plan encourages building on the Green Belt. These fields at the back of the already huge Spennells estate are an essential lung for all the community here. Access is good, people walk to it, and it is heavily used by dog walkers, keep fit enthusiasts, nature lovers and children regularly. It is a haven for wild life and birds. I trust you will look at all options in a constructive way. Nobody is against a development plan, but council members should focus on our town's core strengths, build on them, protect what we have, and not destroy it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4956</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal to build to the rear of Offmore, Comberton, Baldwin Rd and also Spennells.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5092</a>	Object	<p>I would not like to see this housing development go forward as there is already a traffic problem getting off the estate a school times. Also the local school could not cater for rise in places needed. Our Green Belt is much loved and a haven for wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO249</a>	Support	<p>I believe that option A is the best and only way forward.</p> <p>This gives the area the houses that it requires, also deliver the eastern relief road which will help alleviate some of the potential traffic problems. The Spennells protesters main argument seems to be don't build on Green Belt because we like to look at it and walk our dogs there, understandable but you could use that same argument about the proposed building sites in plan B.</p> <p>So it seems to me that option A is the only logical solution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2925</a>	Support	<p>Many of the existing residents on Spennells bought a house that took up Green Belt land and farming land. They did not think about it too much as they wanted to have a bigger, better house, and that is how it will be if this plan is</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
			<p>adopted.</p> <p>As a country, we need more houses. The plan must include social housing, and a greater number of houses will help in a small way to keep a lid on local housing costs which is forever rising so making it almost impossible for young couples to get their foot on the first rung of the housing ladder.</p> <p>Get the developer(s) to add in a shop, a school and plan for multi access points to distribute the traffic as much as is possible.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4954</a>	Support	Just an idea, please build on housing estates like Comberton or Spennells. As they have been designed for and could just be extended.

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

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO4312</a>	Object	Different considerations apply to different parts of site. Ridge between Stanklyn and Bell Brooks should be kept open as green wedge. Grade 2 areas should not be developed. Some of northern part is marsh. Irrigation system dating from 17th century. Area to south of Spennells is part of former Stone Common and Hoo Farm. This is grade 2 and should not be used for housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO5065</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object based on the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The effect of the planned development would create loss of Green Belt which should protect our countryside from Urban Sprawl and even though existing Rights of Way are supposedly protected there is a great danger that these areas will be eradicated by housing development. The benefits to mental health and physical well being are at serious risk as the development will eradicate the fields used extensively by local people to walk, jog, cycle etc. This on top of the effect on the wild life habitat which is continually being eroded.</li> <li>The planned development which will nearly double the size of Spennells would have a dramatic effect on the ability of local schools and medical centres to cater for the increased requirements of the increased population which cannot even cope with the existing residents.</li> </ul> <p>The Council must re-evaluate their plans and concentrate on building on brownfield sites which will have the added benefit on regenerating the existing Town Centre.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1980</a>	Comment	Why build 1300 houses here on Green Belt when other places are available, e.g. Birchen Coppice to Bewdley, the golf course has gone leaving plenty of land for shops/social activate with shorter bus journeys to town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO2041</a>	Object	Again you will be building on parts of the flood plain, with the added problem of increased run off into Captains Pool, which has an earth dam. If that goes there will be major problems to Hoo Brook and down stream. Building here will disrupt the flow North / South of wild life into the Spennells Valley Nature Reserve.
Health and Safety Executive CEMHD5	<a href="#">LPPO4164</a>	Comment	We have concluded that there is the potential for land allocated in your plan to encroach on consultations zones. The land allocations that could be effected are as follows: <b>STONE HILL SOUTH – OC/13</b> – HSE Ref:



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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP01003</a>	Object	This land is part of the former Stone Common. It has a surprisingly high agricultural grading for such land and should be retained for food production as should the site west of this. Its development would cause Kidderminster to join up with ribbon development at Summerfield.
	<a href="#">LPP01684</a>	Object	Instead of Green Belt in Stanklyn Lane use former Burlish Golf Club site, has room for amenities, near town. Good public transport reduces costs/traffic
	<a href="#">LPP01959</a>	Object	I object to proposed development of Green Belt land on Stanklyn Lane. New homes are definitely needed in the area, the destruction of Green Belt land is not the way to achieve this. We use the fields for exercise and recreation. Stanklyn Lane is a relatively narrow road with no footpath along the whole length of it. It is used as a "rat run" by commuters which makes being a pedestrian dangerous at the best of times, placing extra strain on the infrastructure by so many new homes. Local schools are oversubscribed already, where are all of the children whose families will move into these proposed new homes to be educated? No mention of proposed building of doctors surgeries to cope with increased demand. Building a lot of houses on Green Belt land is an attractive proposition for developers, as houses in this location command a higher price than houses built elsewhere. Building on Green Belt land makes the developers more money, rather than clearing brownfield sites of which we have many as a former industrial town. Green Belt land should be preserved for the health and enjoyment of generations to come. We will never get this land back once it is developed, the best use is not for houses that could be built literally anywhere else. Exhaust the brownfield sites and leave Green Belt alone.
	<a href="#">LPP02043</a>	Object	Objects to site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> <li>• Impact on views towards Stone</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02091</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destruction of nesting areas for birds – corn buntings, skylarks etc. and destruction of habitat of butterflies and bees.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02236</a>	Object	I have attended the local drop-in sessions held in Kidderminster and have been truly dismayed at the proposals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a large roundabout (small roundabouts to not improve traffic flow on busy roads)). The impact on traffic would be massive – leading even more traffic problems on the south side of Kidderminster at rush-hour. One only has to look at the impact at evening rush-hour of one set of new lights on the A442 to access Silverwoods Way to see daily grid-lock is a real prospect. There could be a resulting impact on the local economy and investment.</p> <p>Roads off Stanklyn Lane like Heath Lane and Butts Lane would become rat-runs. These are single track lanes not capable of hosting increased traffic. Unless these roads are widened destroying field boundaries and hedge-rows which would further increase the environmental impact that the proposal already executes.</p> <p><b>The removal of Green Belt land:</b> - The fundamental purpose of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl, to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and to assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land (option B!). Authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; and to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity. This proposal ignores all these principals. These fields host a wide variety of plant and wildlife and all will be lost: I have seen foxes, deer, mice and shrews, butterflies, bees, raptors and other birds. Option B (dispersed development) supports the fundamentals of Green Belt policy.</p> <p><b>The removal of leisure and recreational space:</b> The fields are used by dog walkers, runners, and ramblers. Despite being right next-door to a large housing estate (Spennells) they are a place of calm and safety for young and old, groups and individuals. Also used by children for kite-flying and by parents teaching their children to ride bikes. This proposal will remove space of this type. You do not see this kind of diversity in activity or people on the Spennells playing fields off Heronswood Road. I understand that a number of Councillors and local people share these concerns.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02584</a>	Object	<p>Our objections to the proposed development of land between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells estate are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are concerned about the scale and density of the proposed building in the corridor between the Bromsgrove and Worcester roads. We believe the current plan will significantly and adversely change the character of the area.</li> <li>• As the population of Kidderminster is stable and unemployment is low we question the source of the predicted rise in population, and, as Wyre Forest has little manufacturing industry the plan would “Warndonise” Kidderminster and transform it into a dormitory town for Birmingham and other large</li> </ul>

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

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

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

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



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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			traffic flow on the A449, especially at, but not only restricted to, peak times which this development will exacerbate. The resulting air pollution, noise and increased inconvenience with increased travel times and additional school run traffic will have a significant negative impact on local residents. An additional exit from the Spennells estate onto Stanklyn lane would be highly unwise and additional traffic exiting the estate onto Spennells Valley road would result in grid-lock from Chester Road South, A449 and Wilden Lane. The resulting air and traffic pollution would be unacceptable. This scheme would appear to be based purely on a cheap solution to a perceived housing shortage that when analysed properly is questionable in the first place.
Stone Parochial Charity	<a href="#">LPP01157</a>	Support	We are in full support of the proposal and the land owner's intentions towards this overall development and the inclusion of this land are positive.

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP01006</a>	Comment	Important site for separating Kidderminster and Lea Castle Hospital. Inevitable that they will almost join - development of some of this site may not be so bad. Prefer to see site left open. Even if Hurcott ADR is developed any built development should be limited to eastern side of ridge only.
	<a href="#">LPP01914</a>	Comment	Object to option A and B and the loss of 'Green Belt' local to Cookley. Lea Castle brown field areas should be developed and retain the perimeter trees. A smaller scheme could be adopted without major impact upon Wolverley and Cookley current services. Eastern relief road will join the A449 at some point before the County boundary with Staffs, this would mean a major junction local to or near the Caunsall tee junction and the Island Pool pub, this already is a dangerous road and currently is classed as an accident blackspot.
	<a href="#">LPP01917</a>	Comment	Site WFR/WC/16 should not be developed. The village of Cookley is entirely separate and clearly distinct from the outer suburban areas of Kidderminster. By not building on Option A this will create a natural break and a wildlife corridor separating the Broadwaters estate and the newly developed Lea Castle Hospital site. This will maintain the visual appearance and 'feel' of the village of Cookley remaining separate from the expanding suburban sprawl of Kidderminster
	<a href="#">LPP03131</a>	Comment	One of the positives put forward for the major housing development to the north and east is a potential eastern bypass. Without this, such development will be catastrophic in terms of travel in this area for local people and people wanting to visit the area. I have to object to options A & B including the Lea Castle site without proper provision for schools, medical services and other community services including open spaces and consideration of the impact on road infrastructure. I have to object to options A & B or any developments that effectively join the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. I have no objection to the development of the Lea Castle site without the intrusion onto Green Belt, and removal of wooded areas, however this needs to be done in a far more considered and sensitive way. Without an eastern bypass the impact of major housing development will impact significantly on the quality of life. An eastern bypass creates a possibility that I could support development on the Lea Castle site.
	<a href="#">LPP03243</a>	Comment	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road,

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05102</a>	Comment	<u>Proposal</u> - Having studied the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review we propose and support a plan to

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			develop the Lea Castle site (WFR/WC/15) and adjacent sites (WFR/WC/32) and (WFR/WC/16) bounded by Wolverhampton Road, Stourbridge Road and Axborough Lane being the only real option. This area would provide a good number of dwellings (2000+) with local amenities to compliment this size of development such as a primary school a good bus service etc., all served by existing good roads with a minimum of major infrastructure provisions. If the town council adopts this proposal it would be vital to improve/widen Hurcott Lane to improve traffic flow from the Lea Castle site to the Birmingham Road. This would also provide a very useful relief road for those travelling from the Northeast of Kidderminster wishing to connect with the A456 Birmingham Road to then travel in the direction of Birmingham.
	<a href="#">LPP0409</a>	Object	OPTION A: Strongly object to this if Lea Castle WFR/WFC/15 is developed as it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster. Cookley <b>is not</b> an Urban Extension of Kidderminster it is a village in its own right.
	<a href="#">LPP0445</a>	Object	This proposal links Lea Castle development to Kidderminster, and therefore links Cookley to Kidderminster. Whilst the nature of Cookley as a village will be dramatically altered by the development, annexing the entire thing to Kidderminster will simply destroy the village. This proposal will be socially catastrophic for the residents of Cookley. Your proposals do not support your vision. You foresee "...outlying villages have grown organically to meet their own needs..." and "...the larger villages of Cookley and Blakedown continue..." but your plans are to double the size of Cookley with the core site at Lea Castle. Doubling the size of a village is most certainly NOT growing organically. Should Option A at Lea Castle be selected, Cookley will be annexed to Kidderminster (you will be able to walk from Kidderminster centre to Cookley centre without passing through any fields, Green Belt etc). Cookley will not be a village, it will be a suburb of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPP0492</a>	Object	I object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. I object to Option A on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via

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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1918</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development at Lea Castle - Options A &amp; B on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>• Access and highways infrastructure is insufficient to cope with proposed development. Additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley.</li> <li>• 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment.</li> <li>• Development would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. The Local Plan Cookley refers to Cookley as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village and it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. Accommodating 600 houses would be for Kidderminster's needs.</li> <li>• Development of the Lea Castle site is needed, however this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.</li> </ul> <p>Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt with large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Brownfield part of Lea Castle, without the destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brown field sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2054</a>	Object	<p>Appalled at the timing. Objects to option A that would link the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. Regenerate Kidderminster Town centre instead.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2094</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Options A &amp; B Lea Castle:</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uses Green Belt land not just Lea Castle.</li> <li>2. What are plans for infrastructure; schools, public transport, doctors and impact on Cookley village.</li> <li>3. Will houses be taken by commuters and what would impact be on roads, services and carbon footprint.</li> <li>4. Develop Kidderminster town centre prior first</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP02136</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development at Hurcott ADR/BW4 and the development at Lea Castle WFR/WC/15/16.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lane going through Hurcott from the Stourbridge Road to the Birmingham Road will not handle the increased level of traffic and would become a fast, quick entry to the Birmingham Road. The junction at the Park Gate is already an accident spot.</li> <li>• With regard to the Miller Homes application there were proposals for a path/cycle route from this site running along the back of the houses on Kendlewood Road. This is private property and the owner will not give permission for such.</li> <li>• Local schools will not handle the increase in numbers if you allow both proposals. Nor the hospitals which already are not able to cope as mentioned on national news. Worcester Royal is under considerable strain as is Russell Halls hospital.</li> <li>• This area should be left alone for natural wildlife.</li> <li>• The proposed extensions, in one area are unfair to local residents causing a new bottle neck to the entry of Kidderminster. This kind of development is unnecessary in a town with poor employment, hospital provision and over prescribed schools.</li> </ul> <p>There are empty buildings in the Kidderminster area that could be developed into homes/apartments so there should be no need to build new homes on these areas of natural beauty/wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02151</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of local infrastructure available to support this.</li> <li>• village school that could not expand to cope with a further 600 houses and neither could Cookley Medical centre</li> <li>• increased level of traffic this development would produce</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cookley is a village and is no way an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley should not suffer to support Kidderminster's needs</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02245</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>:</p> <p>Lack of local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, doctors, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would necessitate an additional School/doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the doctor's surgery v. busy. Plans would effectively link the village Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.</p> <p><b>Policy 7</b> refers to <i>"insetting"/"washing over" of specific village's</i> development but 1200 — 1400 homes would stretch village envelope to Kidderminster and Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p><b>Table, page 29</b>, Cookley is referred to as <i>"Inset Green Belt"</i>. How will this be Inset when our southern Green Belt is completely removed?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02271</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my comments on the proposed development of the Lea Castle site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current road infrastructure would not support the development of 600 houses on the proposed option Core housing site. Indeed any building on the site would severely impact upon the lives of people living in Cookley, Broadwaters and Wolverley with increased traffic on already busy roads that already have traffic hotspots. (A449 traffic lights, Broadwaters mini roundabouts, the junctions of Cookley onto the A449 and the appalling turning from the Stourbridge Road by the Park Gate Inn).</li> <li>There is no mention of building a school or availability of Drs Surgeries. Local primaries are currently full/oversubscribed, Drs Surgeries are already stretched. The village amenities of Cookley could not cope with the influx of people from 600 homes.</li> <li>Cookley is 'Inset Green Belt' pg29 LPR. This will no longer be the case if the proposed development option A is carried out. Indeed it would join up with Broadwaters and the rest of Kidderminster. Cookley</li> </ol>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			the site. The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended to A449 would lead to congestion further up the A449 affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt with a strong identity and provides key local services. WFDC should be support Wolverley and Cookley to meet its local needs in a sustainable way, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2334</a>	Object	In addition I would like to object to Option A and the northern urban expansion in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2360</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's need and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to support local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.
	<a href="#">LPPO2364</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B at Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient.
	<a href="#">LPP02386</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on policy section 31 , regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle Hospital site (WFR/WC/15), and southern extension (WFR/WC/16) between the A 449 and A451, and south of the A4521 (BW/4). I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some cosmetic changes, additional visibility splays and traffic lights, will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also very close to one of the entrances to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</li> <li>- In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. The existing doctor's surgery would be overloaded.</li> <li>- In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster, particularly if the option B site was also used. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting Cookley's infrastructure and needs. The current plans do not do this. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2395</a>	Object	In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPPO2446</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the plan will see Cookley being joined to Kidderminster and it will cease to be a village and destroy /overwhelm our community</li> <li>What is the main force driving this development, population growth? Population of Wyre Forest has not grown at all in the past five years and all indications are that UK population growth will retract over the next 10 years. Population growth cannot be used as a reason for this massive development.</li> <li>Destruction of Green Belt land.</li> <li>1000 homes completely out of context with local environment inadequate infrastructure roads, schools, medical. No guarantee within plan.</li> <li>Who is the development aimed at clearly not the local population with only 18% affordable housing.</li> <li>This kind of development will attract people from outside the area not people who already live and work here, increasing pollution and traffic density.</li> <li>There are enough Brownfield sites around the area to cope with any population growth.</li> <li>This expansion is being driven by profit not social and enterprise needs.</li> <li>Lea Castle site is an area of natural beauty this should be preserved and enhanced, it is an asset that could be used for the benefit of local people in perpetuity.</li> </ul> <p>This Development should not be allowed to go ahead.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2457</a>	Object	<p>I object to both Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle on a number of grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>• The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic. Some additional visibility displays and traffic lights will do little to alleviate this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</li> <li>• I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster and no longer a village in its own right.</li> <li>• Please do not use Green Belt land. There are a number of Brownfield sites that are not being considered and I would like to know why not How sympathetic will the new build be to the fairly abundant wildlife on the Lea Castle site some of which are protected species - dormice, bats (including pipistrelle), polecats etc. all of which have been found on the site.</li> <li>• 600 plus houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It has no usable playing field as it is.</li> <li>• The doctor's surgery is very busy and it is hard to get an appointment within a reasonable time scale.</li> <li>• I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster; it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to meet the requirements of Wyre Forest rather than its and local needs.</li> <li>• I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</li> <li>• Furthermore the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Caunsall.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2465</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. As previous posted, other local action groups are recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs. I have a 4 bedroom house that I wish to downsize from but am unable to find a suitable bungalow or house in the Cookley area. With an aging, but young mentally and physically, population growing, more suitable accommodation is needed in order to release the much-needed family homes. If the Lea Castle site is developed it should include much more of homes suitable for retired people.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2504</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well known local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02527</a>	Object	I must object to both options A & B. There is not the infrastructure in place to accommodate either. Option A) This would be linking Cookley to Kidderminster and is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village in it's own right and only develop when there is a need. That at this moment in time is not the case. It is not Kidderminster's overflow answer. Both of these options require the need to build on Green Belt. This should not be done until every Brownfield site has been utilised. Wyre Forest has a population growth below the national average. Therefore housing requirements are below the national average. To cater for increased housing that is not actually required is against the Development Needs Assessment 2015.
	<a href="#">LPP02529</a>	Object	I wish to object to the inclusion of Green Belt arable land WFR/WC/16 within the Option A plan as it creates a link to the Lea Castle site which cumulatively would result in an unacceptable linear extension of Kidderminster towards the north-east and encourage urban sprawl towards Cookley creating a corridor of continuous development between the two settlements. It is a sloping site that is highly visible, particularly from the A449 Wolverhampton Road and from the Wolverley direction and as such any large-scale development would be highly visually intrusive, particularly rising towards the A451 Stourbridge Road. Loss of this Green Belt land, in combination with development of the Lea Castle hospital site, would create a significant and unacceptable narrowing of the designated Green Belt between Kidderminster and Stourbridge and the wider West Midlands conurbation. The Green Belt study identifies this parcel of land as NE1 as having no nature conservation or cultural heritage interests. However, when left fallow, this arable field becomes one of the distinctive poppy fields in this area of Worcestershire and one of the few on the east side of Kidderminster. Inclusion of these parcels of Greenfield, Green Belt land for development combined with the Lea Castle site will actively encourage urban sprawl to the north-east and thus should be removed from the Plan.
	<a href="#">LPP02547</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well known local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village Inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02567</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, doctor's surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this (not in plans). The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. Currently lack of planned infrastructure would mean all new residents crossing the A449 into Cookley using the "secondary access?", for pedestrians and motorists this will present dangers due to the volume of high speed traffic. The current bus service is under review, this is not mentioned and needs to be considered as vital for residents both incoming and established. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. There is, also an identified need for housing suitable for elderly people. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt, known to WFDC as part of Wyre Forest Rural. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than the established village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. Most local people wish to</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			see sensible, balanced development of the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. Finally, Cookley is identified as self sustaining for it's housing needs, such a large development does not consider this or any harmonisation required with the established Community. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2574</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively and proportionately-with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 600-1200 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. The unique character and community of Cookley will become lost in urbanisation. Green Belt once lost, is lost forever. I fail to see why developing houses on Green Belt land is needed when there are multiple Brownfield sites that could be developed. Population numbers in Wyre Forest have barely risen in the last 7 years. These plans are disproportionate. Affordable housing- I see there is allowance for 18% affordable or social housing- this is low- please explain why? If houses are to be built- build homes people can afford to buy.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council, WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village- forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			destruction of the woodland, which includes affordable housing. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brown field sites to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2608</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. As a parent of a child who has just completed her schooling at Cookley Sebright Primary School there is no room for expansion and they are full. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. There is also the danger of children crossing the A449 to get to school. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02623</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development takes over Green Belt land and is not just limited to the Lea Castle development.</li> <li>2. There are no submitted plans to describe where proposed facilities like doctors, shops, schools for us to consider.</li> <li>3. I believe that the redevelopment of Kidderminster is needed prior to the development of either site A&amp;B to support jobs and infrastructure.</li> <li>4. No clear explanation on the plans to identify the link roads and what impact this will have on local routes and villages.</li> </ol> <p>Under no circumstances should Green Belt land ever be surrendered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02660</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Option A on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional traffic lights; roundabouts will not do anything to help. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor’s surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan for Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village &amp; not an extension of Kidderminster. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states, "The current approach to wash over status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes. We as a society should be looking into local employment to minimise the travelling distances to our employment in light of the energy crisis that is looming on this world of ours. We need to be making these provisions of long-term employment in this area for our future generations &amp; not just thinking about the here &amp; now. This is especially prominent in light of the lack of employment in this area &amp; the up &amp; coming redundancies from local employers.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02661</a>	Object	There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with



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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			the additional traffic. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. It would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPP02761</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. The proposed development of the Lea Castle site with 600 houses would require a surgery and school as Cookley is already at capacity for both with no room for expansion at the school. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs."The proposed development in no way supports this. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. On a personal note, I moved the West Midlands from Wiltshire having grown up in a small village with a strong sense of social cohesion where neighbours supported one another. I have found this again for the first time in Cookley/ Caunsall since moving here 2 years ago. I work as a health visitor in Kidderminster I am acutely</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>aware of the housing and social problems there, however, I believe overall the population of Wyre forest has not increased substantially and amalgamating Kidderminster with the outlying villages will not solve either the housing or social problems of the town, but may destroy the positive community relationships that already exist in these villages. In Kidderminster what is needed is an investment in the existing housing stock with more local amenities which could be incorporated into the development of the Brownfield sites, the town centre in particular needs careful consideration. Housing schemes need good infrastructure support to prevent isolation and a strong emphasis on social and affordable housing incorporated into small mixed communities. The proposed development fails to deliver this.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying Green Belt. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other Brownfield sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2786</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and unable to take more children.. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Breen Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. We should build on Brownfield sites first before any Green Belt land is used. I want to keep Cookley as a village and not lose it’s identify and become part of Kidderminster. Kidderminster gets gridlocked at the best of times so how can building this amount of homes at Lea Castle and other areas around the town centre cope with the extra traffic not to mention accommodating additional children at schools in the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2817</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option A as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses would need additional school and Doctors surgery. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not help this. A development of Lea Castle is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. Object to Option A as it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is not an extension of Kidderminster. It is a village and should expand in line with its own needs. Asking it to take 600</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			houses is expanding Kidderminster's needs and expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPP02848</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>• Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Develop Brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>• A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> <li>• Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02849</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>• Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>• Develop Brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>• A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> <li>• Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02867</a>	Object	We would like to strongly object to Options A/B of the housing development at Lea Castle and surrounding areas. After looking at the plans online and at Cookley Village Hall our objection is that neither option A or B has been thought out or presented properly by the Council to our people. There are no proper plans for our local or Kidderminster's infrastructure. Unknown to us and neighbours who have lived in Cookley for over 40 years the Village is being referred to on the plans as an extension of Kidderminster to our knowledge it has

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>always been Cookley Village like its neighbour Wolverley Village which doesn't seem to be included in this re-titling on the plans. This presumably has been changed so as to decrease the needs of Kidderminster. Cookley Village infrastructure can hardly cope at the moment with its own needs. You are unable to get an appointment at the local Doctors surgery as it is very busy. The Primary school is full to capacity and now that Sion Hill and Sladen middle school have been closed there will be a knock on effect to Kidderminster schools and services. The Village bus service and few small shops won't cope with the extra load. Many residents are young parents or pensioners who do not drive and rely on these services, any new people will surely impact on their quality of life? The problems of an extra 600 houses at Lea Castle linking us to Kidderminster along the Green Belt up the Wolverhampton A449 &amp; along the Stourbridge Road A451 would be a nightmare. The Park Gate public house on the Stourbridge Road has always been an accident black spot along with the Cookley Village Castle Road entrance. This has been the scene of many accidents for over 40 years, The extra problems of traffic at both sites would be appalling. Children and parents walking to school in Cookley would need to cross the A449 safely. We think that Lea Castle site should be developed, but sympathetically in its own right and as a separate entity to Cookley and Kidderminster with its own infrastructure and surrounded by the woodland already established not surrounded by houses. Worcestershire is a beautiful county the envy of a lot of our neighbours, with beautiful nature reserves and countryside, walks, rivers, views etc, when this has all been built on and spoilt we will never get it back. Animal life, their habitats and way of life will all be gone. Like our friends in other parts of Kidderminster Offmore, Comberton, Hurcott and Spennells to name but a few, not one of us want to see our neighbourhood spoilt, the Green Belt gone and relief roads zigzagging all over our land. We need to go back to the drawing board and work together with the Council as a community to talk and find an agreeable solution together sharing the load and coming up with a proper workable plan for the future of our home, Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02875</a>	Object	<p>Option A Lea Castle. Object as lack of local infrastructure to support this - Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport already at capacity. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not help this. The pollution is yet another matter that needs to be addressed. Object to Option A as would link Cookley to Kidderminster. Cookley is not an extension of Kidderminster, it is a village. As a village it should expand in line with its own needs not expanding to</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Kidderminster's needs and I do agree that development of Lea Castle site is needed but done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. PROTECT COOKLEY as a village inset Green Belt. Relief road extended as far as the A449, would just lead to more congestion and pollution further on affecting both of the villages COOKLEY and CAUNSALL. No objection to the building of homes on the Lea Castle site , on the Brownfield part of this site without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPP02882</a>	Object	<p>Whilst the initial planned housing for Lea Castle was proposed at 600 it is now clear there are proposals to increase this to over 1000. I am not opposed to building houses and light business units on the site but I am are very concerned with the impact over 600+ houses will have <b>added</b> to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites nearby and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, doctors and people. It seems there is no definitive number of houses proposed for Sion Hill, but I have heard this could be between 45 and 150.</p> <p><b>Transport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted onto the A449 from Lea Castle.</b> The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities. Road safety, traffic flow and congestion are a serious concern. Concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow and</li> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted from Lea Castle via The Crescent.</b> Concerned with proposed exits off Lea Castle site and the volume of traffic which will impact on the traffic lights and A449. Exiting via The Crescent will make it very difficult for people exiting Castle Road safely onto main A449. The bend leading up to the Cookley turn is a bad bend where there are frequently accidents/near misses. At peak times it is very difficult to exit onto the A449 towards Kidderminster. I was told at one of the drop-in sessions that exiting via The Crescent would be discouraged, but in reality if the main exit off Lea Castle (Park Gate end) is busy, people will opt to exit via The Crescent — so no access via The Crescent would stop this.</li> <li>• <b>Axborough Lane-</b> although it is only proposed that a small amount of houses access this road, it will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the Stourbridge Road if people exit via The Crescent.</li> </ul>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>access and the necessity of further primary school(s) being <b>built and how/where these children will move on to</b> High School and how practical (travelling to/from) this will be. It should be made possible for Children/families to be able to walk to school safely for all the obvious reasons.</p> <p><b>Health:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Doctors surgeries:</b> Cookley is a very small practice with no parking and difficult road access. Wolverley, although slightly bigger, I would assume would not be able to take an influx of patients. This would mean that residents would have to commute into town — impacting on traffic load. Again this requires serious thought and if necessary further doctors surgery(s) should be incorporated into the developments.</li> <li>• With the planned expansion of Kidderminster I feel very strongly that hospital services needs to be at the forefront in terms of a hospital with A&amp;E and more services. Re-instating a proper hospital will relieve the current pressure on Worcester and Russell's Hall hospitals especially given these areas are also massively expanding. Could part of Lea Castle be ring fenced and considered for a hospital should the current hospital site not be considered big enough?</li> </ul> <p><b>Shops on Lea Castle:</b> Were Lea Castle to be developed then I feel it is very important it is self-sufficient with good shops/takeaways/public transport links so residents are not reliant on travelling to amenities in Cookley/Wolverley or Broadwaters - to limit traffic flow. The site must also ensure there are safe play areas to suit all ages.</p> <p><b>Sympathetic Building and Wildlife Lea Castle:</b> Any building on the Lea Castle site needs to be sympathetic to the area, I would be totally against removing/destroying the forest area as this creates a natural 'wall' and in effect hides the fact that a housing estate may exist there. I hope that existing wildlife would be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02976</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do</p>



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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p>600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctors surgery busy.</p> <p>I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 — 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end to Broadwaters at the southern meeting the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, doctors, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2977</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p>600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctors surgery busy.</p> <p>I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 — 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end to Broadwaters at the southern meeting the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, doctors, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3014</a>	Object	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opinion on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport are already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot, it is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. I cannot comprehend the volume of traffic and neither it seems can the planning developers that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term (again something that appears there is a gross lack of) I wonder how long it would be with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is incomprehensible. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment, oh and did I mention that it's impossible to park outside it also? In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. Also in being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. I would at this point like to draw your attention to this article please to this article, which yes I appreciate dates back to 2012 - <a href="http://www.kidderminstershuttle.co.uk/news/9825320.Wyre_Forest_s_population_growth_lowest_in_Worcestershire_over_10_years/">http://www.kidderminstershuttle.co.uk/news/9825320.Wyre_Forest_s_population_growth_lowest_in_Worcestershire_over_10_years/</a> I am of course not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing ? 30% or 18 % ? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated leading to only consequence. It strikes me that it won't be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging ? I'm let's be honest....where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase ? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3015</a>	Object	<p>I would like to voice my opinion regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport are already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot, it is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Crescent, Cookley. I cannot comprehend the volume of traffic that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term, how long with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing? 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctor's surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is incomprehensible. Additionally the Doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment - and impossible to park outside it also. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. Also in being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. I would at this point like to draw your attention to the Shuttle article (2012) stating the 10yr (2001-2011) population growth for Wyre Forest was 1.1%. I am not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing? 30% or 18 %? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. It won't be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging? Where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3113</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPP03126</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO3137</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to both plans A&amp;B of the local plan review for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley is, as you know, a small rural village which is part and parcel of our unique heritage and characteristic of the "British countryside" which in my opinion is worth fighting to preserve.</li> <li>• I also do not agree with Green Belt land being swallowed up into urban development unless, as a very last resort!</li> <li>• I myself face a huge change living here in The Crescent, as we are more than likely to have 600++?houses built upon the former Lea Castle site and my road which has been a cul-de-sac for at least 15 years is apparently, to be re-opened to accommodate this development. The A449 road is already a nightmare for both drivers\walkers alike. I recently did a random survey of traffic passing The Crescent during a week day 9am-9pm in which I calculated approx 16,000 vehicles per day(12hrs) passed the entrance to The Crescent.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3175</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A&amp;B on numerous grounds set out below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cookley is a Green Belt village, the council has a responsibility to ensure this continues. This proposed build goes against this. Just because Green Belt land is adjacent to Brownfield sites does not give a right or justification to build on that Green Belt. This goes against all ruling and requirements to protect the environment, agriculture and farming in the area.</li> <li>2. The proposed site is Cookley plus another 50% in a condensed area and there is no capacity to cope. No parking in the village, no Doctor's appointments, no extra school places. The A449 is already a very busy fast road well known as an accident black spot with many serious accidents in the recent past leading to serious injury and death. Extra housing across the road from the village, Dr's and school will lead to a vast increase in traffic driving into the village as it will be unsafe for children and</li> </ol>



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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			should be looking to do the same and not just provide a quick fix to housing problems which is not environmentally friendly, not conducive to society long term and is putting the community both in Cookley and the new site at risk in its location, lack of amenities and destruction of wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO3202</a>	Object	It is Green Belt land currently being farmed. It supports populations of Skylarks amongst it's wildlife and such Green Belt land should be preserved where ever possible.
	<a href="#">LPPO3204</a>	Object	It is Green Belt land currently being farmed. It supports populations of Skylarks amongst it's wildlife and such Green Belt land should be preserved where ever possible. It also will be the only countryside buffer separating Kidderminster from Cookley village.
	<a href="#">LPPO3257</a>	Object	I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a doctor's surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the doctor's surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3379</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a doctor’s surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the doctor’s surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states “The</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</p> <p>To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03403</a>	Object	<p>The area affected is home to wildlife including birds of prey and sometimes deer. I am shocked that our Council would build on land that has been preserved as Green Belt. Once Green Belt land is gone, it is gone forever. I fear and strongly suspect that your plans will result in Cookley losing this sense of identity, history and community. If your proposals go ahead, there seem to be no plans for the people who will live in them! It seems that local schools must already have capacity for increased numbers of pupils. Local shops and current facilities will be able to absorb increased demand; and there is available employment in the local area. Not to mention the adverse impact on local roads and volume of traffic potentially resulting in an increase in accidents and injury.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03459</a>	Object	<p>This local plan does not promote sustainable development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> </ol>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> <li>6. Promoting healthy communities</li> <li>7. Protecting Green Belt Land.</li> <li>8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</li> <li>9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</li> </ol> <p>Kidderminster is a market town, not an urban sprawl. Cookley is a village, not an extension of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3504</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety. As all people from the new build area will need to come to the existing Cookley area for school, the Doctors or small local shops, they will need to cross a busy road which is already an accident blackspot.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure. if they drive into the main village this will cause further congestion around the school and Doctors. There is not sufficient parking in this area for people at present. The local school is already at capacity.</li> <li>3. Green Belt. We should be doing all we can to protect and preserve these areas. They should be used only when all Brownfield options have been exhausted.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3526</a>	Object	<p>I am not opposed to building houses and light business units on the site but I am are very concerned with the impact over 600+ houses will have <b>added</b> to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites (bold above) and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, doctors and people.</p> <p><b><u>Roads around the Lea Castle site</u></b> – The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities and does not need increased pressure. I am very concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and safety.</p> <p><b>Castle Road Cookley and The Crescent</b> – Exiting via The Crescent will make it very difficult for people exiting Castle Road safely onto main A449. The bend leading up to the Cookley turn is a bad bend where there are frequently accidents/near misses. At peak times it is very difficult to exit onto the A449 towards Kidderminster.</p> <p>Axborough Lane will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the Stourbridge Road if people exit via The Crescent. This road is narrow with a blind summit and very poor visibility for exiting at both ends.</p> <p><b>Lea Lane</b> – I am concerned that Cookley will become a ‘rat run’ to and from Kidderminster via Lea Lane. Increased traffic on this road would be dangerous, the road is very unsafe, very narrow and runs past a Primary School and doctors with a tight turning T-junction at the village end and busy T junction at the Lock Pub end. Perhaps it should be considered <u>that Lea Lane be made one way only?</u></p> <p><b>Schools:</b> Local schools being Cookley Primary, Wolverley Sebright Primary, St Oswald’s Primary, Wolverley Secondary. Cookley has recently had a new build and would suggest cannot be expanded further and is already an oversubscribed school. Similarly, with Wolverley Primary. I would suggest St Oswald’s alone will not be able to cater for the potential extra intake from Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Stourbridge Road. Also there is a danger element as the Wolverley Road is a very busy road with heavy vehicle traffic and pollution.</p> <p><b>Doctors surgeries:</b> Cookley is a very small practice with no parking and difficult road access. Wolverley, although slightly bigger, I would assume would not be able to take an influx of patients</p> <p><b>Shops on Lea Castle:</b> Were Lea Castle to be developed then I feel it is very important it is self-sufficient with good shops/takeaways/public transport links so residents are not reliant on travelling to amenities in Cookley/Wolverley or Broadwaters - to limit traffic flow.</p> <p><b>Sympathetic Building and Wildlife Lea Castle:</b> I would be <u>totally against</u> removing/destroying the forest area as this creates a natural ‘wall’. I hope that existing wildlife would be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife.</p> <p><b>Retirement/low level housing:</b> What I would like to see on ANY development particularly on Lea Castle, given its beauty and location would be housing and a community for the elderly. A safe and secure complex with services for the elderly, shops, community centre, hair salon, doctors etc. A site of this nature would not necessarily have commuters at peak times, not impact on schools and local shops would mean no heavy impact on current supermarkets in the town. It will also create jobs and business opportunities.</p> <p><b>Public Transport:</b> Needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest,</p>

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			development on Lea Castle on the blue print only. Our infrastructure is already stretched to full capacity, with the A449 already an accident hot spot with no provisions in place from yourselves to solve this, so adding more onto this would mean catastrophic consequences. I see no reason for development to remove trees, woodlands or wild life habitats in the name of progress.
	<a href="#">LPP04311</a>	Object	I object to use of Green Belt land as proposed by your Option A. Thus is both unnecessary and morally wrong. Green Belt is not to be used in this fashion it is for agricultural and recreational use only.
	<a href="#">LPP04401</a>	Object	I strongly disagree with the proposal plans (both options) and feel that the lack of facilities within Kidderminster such as local shops and poor transport links, will not be able to cope with the volume of new homes you are proposing to build. Not to mention the beautiful Green Belt that will disappear if these plans are granted. My other strong concern is for the local wildlife, they will have nowhere to go if their natural habitat is destroyed, this includes the local bat population which are protected species. The rural feel of the outskirts of Kidderminster will be no more. The beautiful view from Kendlewood Road and nearby will be ruined and the view is the reason my family moved to Kendlewood Road. This will also devalue the house if the plans go ahead. I also feel that Kidderminster will suddenly no longer feel rural, but completely overcrowded with no amount of local amenities to cope with the volume of people proposed to live here. I question why developments are proposed on beautiful Green Belt and not derelict industrial sites.
	<a href="#">LPP04453</a>	Object	I object to options A on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, doctors surgery, shops and transport, Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well known local accident spot. It is also less than 50 meters from the proposed entrance to the core site via the Crescent, Cookley. To summarise: Cookley is a village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not be destroying our Green Belt and putting development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site in the Brownfield part of the site and without destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other Brownfield sites such



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

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

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

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

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope would be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. This is totally unacceptable. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a ‘village Inset Green Belt’. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2,800+ people that will move into the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. On page 178, Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal is described as <b>(for 600+plus homes) this is very disturbing and is not giving a final build intention, which in terms of planning, it clearly should.</b> Most disturbing is additional numbers of houses, (above 600 properties) involves the removal of woodland which would be devastating to wildlife, and the environment of this part of the county, this is unacceptable. <b>To summarise:</b> Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. There is strong feeling about this issue in the village. We have met as a community and will stand together for what is right. But it is vital that the message comes across to Local Plan Review, that I like many local people believe in the development of the Brownfield site areas of Lea Castle Hospital site, for housing and services. However I do not approve of the plan as it is set out in the Local Plan Review document.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04696</a>	Object	<p>In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.</p>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04703</a>	Object	In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPP04744</a>	Object	<b>Policy 6D</b> page 32 which gives the first mention of the proposed site of the Lea Castle Hospital. I, along with many in the area, would consider this the perfect site for development. The mature trees around the site would shield much of the housing from view of the general public and the access into the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads would be acceptable. However, there does not seem to be any logic at this stage to extend the housing along Hurcott Lane out onto the A456.
	<a href="#">LPP04952</a>	Object	I would like to object strongly to the proposed development of Lea Castle site and surrounding areas. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is no local infrastructure to support this scale of development. In terms of doctors, schools, shops and transport Cookley is already up to capacity. 600+ houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and doctors surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion having recently been modernized at great cost. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is unbelievable. Additionally the Doctors surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments at the moment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. The population of our village has hardly changed over the last 5 years. In being asked to accommodate 600+ houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. Also this new development would be larger than the whole of Cookley. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current suggested plan does not do this. Where is the proposed development in nearby Wolverley which has 2 primary schools and a high school. Other local action groups are recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04966</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of the Lea Castle site and adjacent areas. For Cookley it will wipe out its status as a village, inns, GP surgery, school and church plus its playing fields and village hall. These will all be overstrained by the huge population growth implied. The value of Cookley's properties will undoubtedly suffer a loss. The proposal will blight the villages attractiveness – e.g. p.178, justification 31.2 will involve the destruction of Talbot Wood through which runs a beautiful public footpath. Cookley amenity natural surroundings accessed by such paths must not be blocked or turned into sub-urban alleyways benefit of the natural richness that enhances our well-being. The Anglo-Saxon castle contains a definitive description of the parishes bounds under King Aethelbald Lea Castle land is in this anciently established parish and not a district of Kidderminster. The Lea Castle land in question was designated to function as a sanatorium. Any future development should continue with a role of the same nature or a senior person's village.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04979</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04981</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the doctor's surgery.</p> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04983</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the doctor's surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04995</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is a need for more housing, there are plenty of Brownfield sites around the area.</li> <li>• School is full to capacity, as is the medical centre.</li> <li>• The Lea Castle site is home to a lot of wildlife.</li> <li>• The Crescent cannot support the amount of extra traffic for the development and I fear that it will be unsafe for the residents.</li> <li>• Cookley is a lovely village in its own right, it is not an extension of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04999</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans at Lea Castle on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Community</li> </ul>

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

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			I believe the road network, schools, doctors and local amenities of Cookley and surrounding areas are hugely inadequate. The more Green Belt that is taken away and replaced with concrete will impact on the amount of water that goes into the drains.
	<a href="#">LPP05132</a>	Object	I object to 600 plus houses being built on the Lea Castle area with no schools/doctors/activities for children. Cookley school and doctors are both full already. I agree that building does need to be done on the Lea Castle area brown sites only. Save our Green Belt. There are plenty of brown sites that could be used prior to damaging our green. This plan has not been thought out as to how these new housing areas will be used and lived in. This is being rushed through due to invested interest by the council.
	<a href="#">LPP05138</a>	Object	The Lea Castle site does need developing, the red area on the plan is in my opinion enough taking into account the closeness of the village and the impact it will have. The options of blue and sandy area are not necessary at this time. I do feel that the Brownfield sites have not been given enough consideration.
	<a href="#">LPP01767</a>	Support	Support Option A- Lea Castle
	<a href="#">LPP01769</a>	Support	Option A Lea Castle is better suited as the roads are capable to cope with a larger population.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO497</a>	Object	Object to WFR/WC/32.
	<a href="#">LPPO1933</a>	Comment	<p>If 1000 dwellings were built on Lea Castle we understand that this would constitute sufficient additional increased demand for primary school places to warrant/justify the creation of a new Primary School.</p> <p>Prefer the larger Option B to be developed to achieve the required number of dwellings for an additional primary school.</p> <p>Concern with Lea Castle is that the Cookley village primary school should remain a village primary school serving the needs of the immediate local village.</p> <p>If Cookley village primary school is developed and expanded to increase number of class rooms/class sizes/attendance from outside the village (increasing traffic into the village with parents from outside the village leaving/collecting children by car) this would cause significant adverse impact on the village infrastructure (vast majority of village parents walk children to school) and the overall performance/results of the school.</p>
Health and Safety Executive	<a href="#">LPPO4165</a>	Comment	<p>We have concluded that there is the potential for land allocated in your plan to encroach on consultations zones. The land allocations that could be effected are as follows:</p> <p><b>LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION (EAST) – WFR/WC/32</b> – HSE Ref: 6867 National Grid Gas Pipeline – Blakedown/Swindon (see additional comment LPPO018)</p>
Homes England	<a href="#">LPPO4402</a>	Comment	<p>The HCA also supports the inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital Extension site, which is proposed as an allocation under Option B for a residential development of 360 dwellings, and removal from the Green Belt. It is considered that this is a sustainable location for further development to support the 600 dwellings at the former Lea Castle Hospital. It is evident that some sites will need to be removed from the Green Belt to deliver the overall housing needs of the District. The site has clear robust boundaries, being bounded by the A451 to the west, and Axborough Lane to the north, as well as proposed development to the west.</p> <p>The inclusion of the Lea Castle Hospital Extension (east) site for 360 dwellings as part of Option B is supported, and considered an appropriate location to deliver additional housing at Kidderminster. High level technical assessments in relation to landscape, ecology and transport, have been</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>undertaken for the Lea Castle Hospital Extension (east) site to demonstrate how the site could be developed. This assessment should be read in parallel with these representations. A Concept Masterplan is also included which demonstrates that the site could provide around 360 dwellings (at a density of around 27 dph). The HCA also owns the land to the west of the Lea Castle Hospital site which could also support the the delivery of housing should the Council consider the site to be appropriate for development.</p> <p>This representation should be read in parallel with the accompanying supporting document, which includes high-level technical work in relation that has been undertaken for the Lea Castle Hospital Extension site to support its proposed allocation and emphasise its suitability for development. The HCA requests that the wording under Option B is changed to state that the indicative number of dwellings <b>(subject to detailed masterplanning is 360)</b>.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4904</a>	Comment	<p><u>Proposal.</u> Having studied the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review we propose and support a plan to develop the Lea Castle site (WFR/WC/15) and adjacent sites (WFR/WC/32) and (WFR/WC/16) bounded by Wolverhampton Road, Stourbridge Road and Axeborough Lane being the only real option. This area would provide a good number of dwellings (2000+) with local amenities to compliment this size of development such as a primary school a good bus service etc., all served by existing good roads with a minimum of major infrastructure provisions. If the town council adopts this proposal it would be vital to improve/widen Hurcott Lane to improve traffic flow from the Lea Castle site to the Birmingham Road. This would also provide a very useful relief road for those travelling from the Northeast of Kidderminster wishing to connect with the A456 Birmingham Road to then travel in the direction of Birmingham.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4932</a>	Comment	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the Brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4968</a>	Comment	Object to option A and B and the loss of 'Green Belt' local to Cookley. Lea Castle brown field

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			areas should be developed and retain the perimeter trees. A smaller scheme could be adopted without major impact upon Wolverley and Cookley current services. Eastern relief road will join the A449 at some point before the County boundary with Staffs, this would mean a major junction local to or near the Caunsall tee junction and the Island Pool pub, this already is a dangerous road and currently is classed as an accident blackspot.
	<a href="#">LPPO4990</a>	Comment	One of the positives put forward for the major housing development to the north and east is a potential eastern bypass. Without this, such development will be catastrophic in terms of travel in this area for local people and people wanting to visit the area. I have to object to options A & B including the Lea Castle site without proper provision for schools, medical services and other community services including open spaces and consideration of the impact on road infrastructure. I have to object to options A & B or any developments that effectively join the village of Cookley to Kidderminster. I have no objection to the development of the Lea Castle site without the intrusion onto Green Belt, and removal of wooded areas, however this needs to be done in a far more considered and sensitive way. Without an eastern bypass the impact of major housing development will impact significantly on the quality of life. An eastern bypass creates a possibility that I could support development on the Lea Castle site.
	<a href="#">LPPO410</a>	Object	The current infrastructure will not support this development. Cookley school has already been extended and is at capacity. Medical facilities are stretched. The A449 is a very busy road, at certain times of day it is already very difficult coming out of Cookley. For this proposal to be successful extra schooling and medical facilities and great improvements in road safety would be needed.
	<a href="#">LPPO493</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. The Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. Hence, my suggestion that this site is more suited to the 540 unit elderly persons site.
	<a href="#">LPPO658</a>	Object	I object to the blue and sandy coloured areas being developed. The red area which is the original Lea Castle site is sustainable in size and amount of dwellings originally proposed which I believe to be 600. The options A&B in addition to the red area are too much for surrounding villages/areas to sustain. More definition needs to be revealed as to infrastructure going in place, schools, GP's shops etc.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1007</a>	Object	<u>Land east of Lea Castle Hospital</u> From a map site appears as a natural extension to Hospital site but it is very different. Hospital is hidden behind tree belt but this site is very open. Development would mean urbanisation of open countryside. If more land is needed in this area then WFR/WC/16 would be preferable.
	<a href="#">LPPO1888</a>	Object	The Lea Castle site does need developing, the red area on the plan is in my opinion enough taking into account the closeness of the village and the impact it will have. The options of blue and sandy area are not necessary at this time. I do feel that the Brownfield sites have not been given enough consideration.
	<a href="#">LPPO2202</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of local infrastructure i.e. schools, Doctors' etc. in Cookley.</li> <li>• Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic.</li> <li>• Junction of A449 and Castle Road is busy and a well known accident spot.</li> <li>• Also less than 50m from the proposed entrance of the core site.</li> <li>• Cookley is a village inset in Green Belt.</li> <li>• Cookley has its own identity and provides key local services.</li> <li>• Should be meeting local needs in a sustainable way and not destroying Green Belt by putting a development larger than Cookley village next to us.</li> <li>• Will join Cookley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Happy to see residential development in Lea Castle Hospital site as long as only the</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Brownfield part is used - without the destruction of woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider other brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2246</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>:  Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2272</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my comments on the proposed development of the Lea Castle site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current road infrastructure would not support the development of 600 houses on the proposed option Core housing site. Indeed any building on the site would severely impact upon the lives of people living in Cookley, Broadwaters and Wolverley with increased traffic on already busy roads that already have traffic hotspots. (A449 traffic lights, Broadwaters mini roundabouts, the junctions of Cookley onto the A449 and the appalling turning from the Stourbridge Road by the Park Gate Inn).</li> <li>There is no mention of building a school or availability of Drs Surgeries. Local primaries are currently full/oversubscribed, Drs Surgeries are already stretched. The village amenities of Cookley could not cope with the influx of people from 600 homes.</li> <li>Cookley is 'Inset Green Belt' pg29 LPR. This will no longer be the case if the proposed development option A is carried out. Indeed it would join up with Broadwaters and the rest of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village and should remain so.</li> </ul> <p>Summary: Whilst I have no objection to building on Lea Castle with additional supporting social infrastructure I do <b>object</b> to building on the land WFR/wc/16 and WFR/wc/32 and also building on</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			established woodland (to the West and South of The Crescent) within the Core A site. (Which is not shown on the plan from the consultation evenings).
	<a href="#">LPPO2332</a>	Object	I object to Option B due to lack of local infrastructure, schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport. Access/highways infrastructure would not cope. As a brownfield site some development necessary on Lea Castle but 600 homes too much; Option B would compound this. Need affordable housing/sheltered facilities for the elderly; development should be proportionate throughout area. I object to Option A as it would link Cookley to Kidderminster, it doesn't suit the needs of Cookley as a village; Green Belt will be lost. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when southern Green Belt is removed? If Option A is large enough will extra infrastructure, roads, Doctors', schools be provided? No evidence of any extra employment provision so will it just become a commuter belt. There are brown field sites not on plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park/site of the old quarry on the B4189. Why is Wolverley washed over?
	<a href="#">LPPO2335</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 178 relating to Options A and B (appendix a) regarding the Kidderminster Urban Development, and the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Option B on the grounds that together with the development of the core site at Lea Castle, there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley, is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. It is also less than 50 metres from one of the proposed entrances to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. Lea Castle, even though it has a Wolverley post code, has always been regarded as part of Cookley. Indeed many people from the village worked there and it has always been a nightmare crossing the A449 to the Lea Castle centre. It is inevitable that as a Brownfield site some development will have to go ahead and it is right and proper that it should. However, 600 homes can never be supported by the facilities in the village which are near capacity already. The additional proposal of Option B would only compound the problem. We need growth as everywhere in Kidderminster and we should take our share but not disproportionately. We were led to believe there would be some affordable housing for our young and sheltered care facilities for the elderly as a very high proportion of the residents are indeed 65 plus. The village needs to

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			expand according to its own needs and the development of this site should reflect this. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to the whole of Kidderminster's needs and is being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. It states in the local plan that development should be proportionate. This would not be the case. As an aside, I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2000+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". There seems to be very limited employment in the Wyre Forest and very small population growth, so are we just trying to creating a commuter belt for Birmingham and Worcester as opposed to meeting our own need? On page 178 Justification 31.1 it states "there is insufficient sustainably located readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land to accommodate the necessary housing and employment growth required in the plan period." WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and proposing a development larger than our village, and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site. As long as it is sensitive to our needs, on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2458</a>	Object	I object to both Options A & B at Lea Castle on a number of grounds: There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic. Some additional visibility displays and traffic lights will do little to alleviate this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. Please do not use Green Belt land. There are a number of brownfield sites that are not being considered and I would like to know why not How sympathetic will the new build be to the fairly abundant wildlife on the Lea Castle site some of which are protected species - dormice, bats (including pipistrelle), polecats etc. all of which have been found on the site. 600 plus houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It has no usable playing field as it is. The Doctors'

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>surgery is very busy and it is hard to get an appointment within a reasonable time scale. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster; it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to meet the requirements of Wyre Forest rather than its and local needs. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. Furthermore the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2466</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B at Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors’ surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. As previous posted, other local action groups are</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs. I have a 4 bedroom house that I wish to downsize from but am unable to find a suitable bungalow or house in the Cookley area. With an aging, but young mentally and physically, population growing, more suitable accommodation is needed in order to release the much-needed family homes. If the Lea Castle site is developed it should include much more of homes suitable for retired people.
	<a href="#">LPPO2626</a>	Object	<p>object to both A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land not just at Lea Castle.</li> <li>• What plans are there for more facilities e.g. Doctors', shops, schools</li> <li>• Redevelop Kidderminster first to support local jobs/infrastructure/transport</li> <li>• Where are link roads and what is their impact?</li> </ul> <p>Do not surrender Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2696</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors', shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>2) The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. It is also approx. only 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p><b>600 houses</b> in the Lea Castle Hospital site area as a number in itself will mean at least <b>1200 people</b> needing services, with children in the families to swell these numbers, they will need an additional school and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and has undergone classroom expansion last year to accommodate the children who already attend it. There is no room for further expansion. Who has considered the additional impact on Wolverley High school or King Charles High school? Additionally the Doctors' surgery is small, and a spur to Aylmer lodge in Kidderminster already these days. Likewise there is no room for expansion. What does the Practice Management and GP's/Nursing services attached to this busy Cookley surgery think of these proposals? What meaningful discussion has taken place or research done regarding medical service provision? The Lea Castle Hospital housing estate Core building area covering the existing brownfield site, should have its own services, which should include, community centre, services for the increasing older population, play areas for children, pharmacy, sensible sized shops in a safe accessible location. Not on a junction of a busy road (Park Gate entrance). I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate the social and infrastructural needs of 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope would be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. This is totally unacceptable. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a 'village Inset Green Belt'. I see no evidence in the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2,800+ people that will move into the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. On page 178, Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal is described as <b>(for 600+plus homes) this is very disturbing and is not giving a final build intention, which in terms of planning, it clearly should.</b> Most disturbing is additional numbers of houses, (above 600 properties) involves the removal of woodland which would be devastating to wildlife, and the environment of this part of the county, this is unacceptable. <b>To summarise:</b> Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. There is strong feeling about this issue in the village. We have met as a community and will stand together for what is right. But it is vital that the message comes across to Local Plan Review, that I like many local people believe in the development of the brownfield site areas of Lea Castle Hospital site, for housing and services. However I do not approve of the plan as it is set out in the Local Plan Review document.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2751</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors’ surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well known local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2753</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors’ surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well known local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>school and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02787</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and unable to take more children. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Breen Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			without the destruction of the woodland. We should build on brownfield sites first before any Green Belt land is used. I want to keep Cookley as a village and not lose it's identity and become part of Kidderminster. Kidderminster gets gridlocked at the best of times so how can building this amount of homes at Lea Castle and other areas around the town centre cope with the extra traffic not to mention accommodating additional children at schools in the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2819</a>	Object	Object to Option B as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses would need additional school and Doctors' surgery. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not help this. A development of Lea Castle is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO2878</a>	Object	Option B Object as lack of infrastructure - Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. 600 houses would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, visibility splays and traffic lights will not help, also pollution. Agree that a development of Lea Castle site is needed but done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. If relief road built will cause congestion and pollution for Cookley and Caunsall. Do not destroy our Green Belt. No objection to building homes on the brownfield Lea Castle site without destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO2883</a>	Object	Whilst the initial planned housing for Lea Castle was proposed at 600 it is now clear there are proposals to increase this to over 1000. I am not opposed to building houses and light business units on the site but I am are very concerned with the impact over 600+ houses will have <b>added</b> to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites nearby and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, Doctors' and people. It seems there is no definitive number of houses proposed for Sion Hill, but I have heard this could be between 45 and 150.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Transport:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted onto the A449 from Lea Castle.</b> The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities. Road safety, traffic flow and congestion is a serious concern. Concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow and</li> <li>• <b>No access should be permitted from Lea Castle via The Crescent.</b> Concerned with proposed exits off Lea Castle site and the volume of traffic which will impact on the traffic lights and A449. Exiting via The Crescent will make it very difficult for people exiting Castle Road safely onto main A449. The bend leading up to the Cookley turn is a bad bend where there are frequently accidents/near misses. At peak times it is very difficult to exit onto the A449 towards Kidderminster. I was told at one of the drop-in sessions that exiting via The Crescent would be discouraged, but in reality if the main exit off Lea Castle (Park Gate end) is busy, people will opt to exit via The Crescent — so no access via The Crescent would stop this.</li> <li>• <b>Axborough Lane-</b> although it is only proposed that a small amount of houses access this road, it will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the Stourbridge Road if people exit via The Crescent. This road is narrow with a blind summit and very poor visibility for exiting at both ends.</li> <li>• Concerned that Cookley will become a 'rat run' to and from Kidderminster via Lea Lane. Increased traffic on this road would be dangerous, the road is very unsafe, very narrow and runs past a Primary School and Doctors' with a tight turning T-junction at the Village end and busy T junction at the Lock Pub end. Predictably, if roads used to commute are congested, you find the next available 'cut through' and for those who wish to avoid congestion elsewhere in order to get to Kidderminster, Stourport Bewdley, Bridgenorth, Cookley and Lea Lane will be their option. This should be discouraged I Perhaps it should be considered that Lea Lane be made one way only?</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No access from Lea Castle into The Crescent.</li> <li><b>Possible solution:</b> Consider that the main road in and out of Lea Castle should run directly onto the Stourbridge Road A451 (between Axborough Lane and the Park Gate pub). A roundabout at this point or slip roads (which may also reduce the speed on this road). Perhaps even another roundabout at the Park Gate T-Junction. Re-directing traffic in this direction will mean traffic does not exit onto the A449, may reduce traffic at the Park Gate Junction and prevent Axborough lane being a cut through to the A451. Maybe in the future the A451 could link into the Eastern Relief Road so traffic here can also circumvent the town.</li> <li><b>Public transport</b> needs reviewing to ensure services are more reliable, accessible right across Wyre Forest, run frequently and economic to use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Schools:</b> Cookley Primary cannot be expanded further and is already an oversubscribed school. Similarly, with Wolverley Primary. St Oswalds alone will not be able to cater for the potential extra intake from Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Stourbridge Road. Therefore any injection of funds would be futile to create extra places if buildings cannot be expanded to cope. Wolverley High School, although on a larger site is situated inside a small village, across two, one vehicle access bridges. Increased traffic in this area would be a major issue. There are already problems with parents having to collect children from surrounding areas such as The Lock car park. In an ideal world the children would walk to school but there is a danger element as the Wolverley Road is a very busy road with heavy vehicle traffic and pollution. As a priority <b>any proposed development must give serious thought to school access</b> and the necessity of further primary school(s) being <b>built and how/where these children will move on to</b> High School and how practical (travelling to/from) this will be. It should be made possible for Children/families to be able to walk to school safely for all the obvious reasons.</p> <p><b>Health:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Doctors' surgeries:</b> Cookley is a very small practice with no parking and difficult road</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>access. Wolverley, although slightly bigger, I would assume would not be able to take an influx of patients. This would mean that residents would have to commute into town — impacting on traffic load. Again this requires serious thought and if necessary further Doctors’ surgery(s) should be incorporated into the developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the planned expansion of Kidderminster I feel very strongly that hospital services needs to be at the forefront in terms of a hospital with A&amp;E and more services. Re-instating a proper hospital will relieve the current pressure on Worcester and Russell’s Hall hospitals especially given these areas are also massively expanding. Could part of Lea Castle be ring fenced and considered for a hospital should the current hospital site not be considered big enough?</li> </ul> <p><b>Shops on Lea Castle:</b> Were Lea Castle to be developed then I feel it is very important it is self-sufficient with good shops/takeaways/public transport links so residents are not reliant on travelling to amenities in Cookley/Wolverley or Broadwaters - to limit traffic flow. The site must also ensure there are safe play areas to suit all ages.</p> <p><b>Sympathetic Building and Wildlife Lea Castle:</b> Any building on the Lea Castle site needs to be sympathetic to the area, I would be totally against removing/destroying the forest area as this creates a natural ‘wall’ and in effect hides the fact that a housing estate may exist there. I hope that existing wildlife would be considered as we are aware of bats on this location and other precious wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3461</a>	Object	<p>This local plan does not promote sustainable development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>6. Promoting healthy communities  7. Protecting Green Belt Land.  8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</p> <p>Kidderminster is a market town, not an urban sprawl. Cookley is a village, not an extension of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3642</a>	Object	<p>This is a development plan on a massive scale for such a rural area, and I oppose all of the options. I agree to development on Lea Castle on the blue print only. Our infrastructure is already stretched to full capacity, with the A449 already an accident hot spot with no provisions in place from yourselves to solve this, so adding more onto this would mean catastrophic consequences. I see no reason for development to remove trees, woodlands or wild life habitats in the name of progress.</p>
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO4090</a>	Object	<p>Number of concerns with some of the proposed Kidderminster Urban Extensions, as detailed below: WFR/WC/32 – Lea Castle Hospital Extensions – Site identified as making a ‘contribution’ and ‘significant contribution’ to the Green Belt by the Green Belt assessment. The site should not be allocated for development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4256</a>	Object	<p>I object to all of the Core Sites and Option B in the Green Belt to the north and east of Kidderminster on the basis of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impairing the quality of the rural environment visible and immediately accessible from Greenhill;</li> <li>• noise and air pollution due to increased traffic on the roads around Greenhill and Broadwaters;</li> <li>• pressure on local amenities (play areas, schools, shops, etc);</li> <li>• 4) Pressure on public transport, since the proposed sites are too far from the town centre</li> </ul>

# **LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST**

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			and secondary schools to access by walking.
	<a href="#">LPP04397</a>	Object	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposal plans (both options) and feel that the lack of facilities within Kidderminster such as local shops and poor transport links, will not be able to cope with the volume of new homes you are proposing to build. Not to mention the beautiful Green Belt that will disappear if these plans are granted. My other strong concern is for the local wildlife, they will have no where to go if their natural habitat is destroyed, this includes the local bat population which are protected species. The rural feel of the outskirts of Kidderminster will be no more. I also feel that Kidderminster will suddenly no longer feel rural, but completely over-crowded with no amount of local amenities to cope with the volume of people proposed to live here. I question why developments are proposed on beautiful Green Belt and not derelict industrial sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04420</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to both plans A&amp;B of the local plan review for the following reasons...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley is, as you know, a small rural village which is part and parcel of our unique heritage and characteristic of the "British countryside" which in my opinion is worth fighting to preserve.</li> <li>• I also do not agree with Green Belt land being swallowed up into urban development unless, as a very last resort!</li> <li>• 3) I myself face a huge change living here in The Crescent, as we are more than likely to have 600++?houses built upon the former Lea Castle site and my road which has been a cul-de-sac for at least 15 years is apparently, to be re-opened to accommodate this development. The A449 road is already a nightmare for both drivers\walkers alike. I recently did a random survey of traffic passing The Crescent during a week day 9am-9pm in which I calculated approx 16,000 vehicles per day (12hrs) passed the entrance to The Crescent.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4425</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A&amp;B on numerous grounds set out below...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cookley is a Green Belt village, the council has a responsibility to ensure this continues. This proposed build goes against this. Just because Green Belt land is adjacent to brown field sites does not give a right or justification to build on that Green Belt. This goes against all ruling and requirements to protect the environment, agriculture and farming in the area.</li> <li>2. The proposed site is Cookley plus another 50% in a condensed area and there is no capacity to cope. No parking in the village, no Doctors' appointments, no extra school places. The A449 is already a very busy fast road well known as an accident black spot with many serious accidents in the recent past leading to serious injury and death. Extra housing across the road from the village, Dr's and school will lead to a vast increase in traffic driving into the village as it will be unsafe for children and adults to cross this busy, dangerous road on foot. Parking will be a nightmare with increased congestion due to people driving into cookley as opposed to walking across A449. Poor parking = accidents. There is no room for extension of any local services in cookley.</li> <li>3. Removal of Green Belt including established woodland will affect wild life in the area, Buzzards and Bats along with other species. Living just across the road from the proposed site we have restrictions on what type of lighting we are allowed because of the established wildlife. Surely these restrictions show the green credentials of Councils past. Why is this council proposing at least 600 houses requiring numerous street lights that will render these past green ideals null and void? Properties away from the site have these restrictions so it is more imperative for properties closer to have stricter lighting regulations to protect the bats and other species.</li> <li>4. Cookley is referred to as "village Inset Green Belt" how can this be if our Green Belt is removed? Cookley is NOT an urban extension of Kidderminster! Cookley deserves and needs to be retained as a village. I know that the old hospital site will need to be redeveloped but it surely should be on a much smaller scale than proposed. It should stay within the established footprint of buildings already on the site. Access should be via the B4189 and the A451 in order not to over burden the already busy A449.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>5. A smaller development should concentrate on environmentally sound, eco-friendly housing to compliment the local area not to decimate it! The community should be encouraged to maintain the wildlife and established animal community for future generations to enjoy and maintain a healthy human existence.</p> <p>6. Before established Green Belt is destroyed for new housing all existing brown field sites within the councils jurisdiction should be fully developed. These may not be as financially appealing to developers but should be a priority to our council. Profit should not come before the environment and the devastation of existing communities and wildlife. Animal life some of which are protected will be lost, the bees will be reduced due to removal of plant life and the Removal of hundreds of established tress will negatively effect the environments and will have detrimental long term effects to the area and sustaining of human beings in the future (we should be thinking long term!).</p> <p>7. As a society we are all aware of the damage we have done and are doing to our environment. The government is actively looking to rectify damage for the future re cars, pollution and the council should be looking to do the same and not just provide a quick fix to housing problems which is not environmentally friendly, not conducive to society long term and is putting the community both in Cookley and the new site at risk in its location, lack of amenities and destruction of wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4443</a>	Object	I agree that the Lea Castle site is in need of development as it has been standing empty for many years and has been subject to vandalism and criminal activity. The locals put this forward as an option several years ago, when the Council proposed turning it into a Traveller's site as they stated there was no need for housing in the town. Were the Planners wrong then or now? This site on its own I believe has scope for 600+ houses. I do not agree that the neighbouring fields bordering the A451 should be added on. This would be an eyesore for those approaching Kidderminster, as well as wanton destruction of productive farmland.
	<a href="#">LPPO4448</a>	Object	I agree that the Lea Castle site is in need of development as it has been standing empty for many years and has been subject to vandalism and criminal activity. The locals put this forward as an

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			option several years ago when the Council proposed turning it into a Traveller's site as they stated there was no need for housing in the town. Were the Planners wrong then or now? This site on its own I believe has scope for 600+ houses. I do not agree that the neighbouring fields bordering the A451 should be added on. This would be an eyesore for those approaching Kidderminster, as well as wanton destruction of productive farmland.
	<a href="#">LPP04539</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. The proposed development of the Lea Castle site with 600 houses would require a surgery and school as Cookley is already at capacity for both with no room for expansion at the school. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs."The proposed development in no way supports this. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. On a personal note, I moved the West Midlands from Wiltshire having grown up in a small village with a strong sense of social cohesion where neighbours supported one</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>another. I have found this again for the first time in Cookley/ Caunsall since moving here 2 years ago. I work as a health visitor in Kidderminster I am acutely aware of the housing and social problems there, however, I believe overall the population of Wyre forest has not increased substantially and amalgamating Kidderminster with the outlying villages will not solve either the housing or social problems of the town, but may destroy the positive community relationships that already exist in these villages. In Kidderminster what is needed is an investment in the existing housing stock with more local amenities which could be incorporated into the development of the brownfield sites, the town centre in particular needs careful consideration. Housing schemes need good infrastructure support to prevent isolation and a strong emphasis on social and affordable housing incorporated into small mixed communities. The proposed development fails to deliver this. To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying Green Belt. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brownfield sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04557</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>: Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04564</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b>: Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.
	<a href="#">LPPO4565</a>	Object	I object to Options <b>A &amp; B</b> : Cookley is already at capacity and there is no local infrastructure to support this; i.e. schools, Doctors', shops and transport. The highways infrastructure would also not cope with the more traffic; the junction of the A449/Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School/Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is already full with no room for expansion and the Doctors' surgery v. busy.
	<a href="#">LPPO4612</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B at Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Please do not destroy the village for the children of the future.
	<a href="#">LPPO4662</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well known local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>school and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village Inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4671</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this (not in plans). The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. Currently lack of planned infrastructure would mean all new residents crossing the A449 into Cookley using the "secondary access?", for pedestrians and motorists this will present dangers due to the volume of high speed traffic. The current bus service is under review, this is not mentioned and needs to be considered as vital for residents both incoming and established. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. There is, also an identified need for housing suitable for elderly people. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p>In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt, known to WFDC as part of Wyre Forest Rural. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than the established village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. Most local people wish to see sensible, balanced development of the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland. Finally, Cookley is identified as self sustaining for it's housing needs, such a large development does not consider this or any harmonisation required with the established Community. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient.
	<a href="#">LPPO4743</a>	Object	<b>Policy 6D</b> page 32 which give the first mention of the proposed site of the Lea Castle Hospital. I, along with many in the area, would consider this the perfect site for development. The mature trees around the site would shield much of the housing from view of the general public and the access into the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads would be acceptable. However, there does not seem to be any logic at this stage to extend the housing along Hurcott Lane out onto the A456.
	<a href="#">LPPO4765</a>	Object	I would like to voice my opinion regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport are already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot, it is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. I cannot comprehend the

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>volume of traffic that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term, how long with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing? 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is incomprehensible. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment - and impossible to park outside it also. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. Also in being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. I would at this point like to draw your attention to the Shuttle article (2012) stating the 10yr (2001-2011) population growth for Wyre Forest was 1.1%. I am not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing? 30% or 18 %? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. It won't be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging? Where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham,</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Wolverhampton and others.
	<a href="#">LPPO4769</a>	Object	<p>I would like to voice my opinion regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. As a resident of Cookley I can confirm that the Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport are already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this and potentially hinder it as the traffic backs up down into the village. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot, it is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. I cannot comprehend the volume of traffic that would travel along this stretch of road between approximately 7.30am of a week day morning. If you also think long term, how long with the proposed increase in traffic before the road needs resurfacing? 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery, however I am led to believe that there is no legal obligation from either the local authority or the developers that this would be built. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is incomprehensible. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment - and impossible to park outside it also. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. Also in being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. I would at this point like to draw your attention to the Shuttle article (2012) stating the 10yr (2001-2011) population growth for Wyre Forest was 1.1%. I am not naïve in knowing that there is a housing shortage in the UK and would indeed be prepared to give more support to the plan if I felt that the majority of it would be affordable housing. I wonder if you could tell me please what percentage of Option A would be built as affordable housing? 30% or 18</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>%? Which is the more accurate figure? On page 47, in Policy 7 it states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. It won’t be long before generations of villagers will be harking back to the halcyon days when it was nice to see trees and fields as far as the eye can see and not row upon row of cold and sterile houses with a profound lack of community or belonging? Where is the economy in Kidderminster also to support such a population increase? These homes will simply act as a commuter belt for Birmingham, Wolverhampton and others.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4818</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p>600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery busy.</p> <p>I note that Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>development of 1200 — 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end to Broadwaters at the southern meeting the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p>Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, Doctors’, schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road. To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4822</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport in Cookley are already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley.</p> <p>600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery busy.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I note that Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure.</p> <p>Agree that development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively, supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 — 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end to Broadwaters at the southern meeting the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</p> <p>Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. In addition Cookley Village will not be able to cope with the additional cars coming into the village to park at the shops, Doctors', schools etc. If there are 600 houses that is an average of 1200 cars. Lea Lane already suffers with people constantly parking on the double yellow lines and blocking the road. To summarise: Cookley is a Village inset in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4888</a>	Object	I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO4892</a>	Object	<p>I would like to comment the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A &amp; B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO4901</a>	Object	I would like to comment on page 193 of the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. As a parent of a child who has just completed her schooling at Cookley Sebright Primary School there is no room for expansion and they are full. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. There is also the danger of children crossing the A449 to get to school. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPP04908</a>	Object	I would like to comment on the Local Plan Review of the local plan information, regarding the proposed development of Lea Castle. I object to Option B on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional traffic lights; roundabouts will not do anything to help. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident black spot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan for Cookley is referred to as an urban

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>extension of Kidderminster. Cookley is a village &amp; not an extension of Kidderminster. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. On page 47, in Policy 7 it states, "The current approach to wash over status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. In the table on page 29, Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when our southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes. We as a society should be looking into local employment to minimise the travelling distances to our employment in light of the energy crisis that is looming on this world of ours. We need to be making these provisions of long-term employment in this area for our future generations &amp; not just thinking about the here &amp; now. This is especially prominent in light of the lack of employment in this area &amp; the up &amp; coming redundancies from local employers. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4937</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO4941</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states "The current approach to "insetting" and "washed over" status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs." How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPP04945</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. Policy 7 states “The current approach to “insetting” and “washed over” status of specific villages will be retained although village envelopes will be revisited to allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of 1200 – 1400 homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern, in any way a development that meets the needs of Cookley as a

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			village? Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated. Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when <i>our</i> southern Green Belt is completely removed? I would infer from this that your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient. To summarise: Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it’s local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brownfield part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.
	<a href="#">LPPO4953</a>	Object	I would like to object strongly to the proposed development of Lea Castle site and surrounding areas. I object to Options A & B on the grounds that there is no local infrastructure to support this scale of development. In terms of Doctors’, schools, shops and transport Cookley is already up to capacity. 600+ houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Doctors’ surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion having recently been modernized at great cost. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is unbelievable. Additionally the Doctors’ surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments at the moment. In addition I would like to object to Option A in that it would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. The population of our village has hardly changed over the last 5 years. In being asked to accommodate 600+ houses it is expanding to Kidderminster’s needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. Also this new

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			development would be larger than the whole of Cookley. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current suggested plan does not do this. Where is the proposed development in nearby Wolverley which has 2 primary schools and a high school? Other local action groups are recommending development of Lea Castle to protect their own interests, which is understandable...but Cookley is a village. It is not an extension of Kidderminster and it should not be sacrificed to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO4957</a>	Object	Proposed development of Lea Castle - I object to options A&B for the following grounds; Lack of supporting infrastructure and lack of appropriate access. Option A would effectively join Cookley to Kidderminster. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster. It is not; it is a village. The document states that villages should be allowed to develop to expand in line with their own needs. This proposed development would expect Cookley to accommodate a minimum of 600 new homes with no provision made for additional demands on existing services such as schooling, GP surgery and shops. I also have concerns re increased traffic in the area and the exhaust emission and noise pollution associated with it.
	<a href="#">LPPO4959</a>	Object	I strongly object to the development of the orange, purple and blue zones in and around Lea Castle, as this will join Cookley Village a rural community to Kidderminster Town and therefore lose the village status It is not necessary to build on as there variety of brown belt land still to be redeveloped nearer to the town centre which would meet the school, doctor, roads needed for the extra people.
	<a href="#">LPPO4961</a>	Object	Object to development of this land is due to the fact that Cookley will lose its village identity and end up as a Kidderminster extension. This will not be feasible due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recent modernisation of school will not accommodate more than 600 houses in the area.</li> <li>- This area is Green Belt and priority should be redevelopment of brown belt of which there are several around Kidderminster.</li> <li>- Increase in traffic in and around our quiet village</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			- I do not have any objection to development of red Lea Castle site as this is brown field.
	<a href="#">LPPO4963</a>	Object	I object to option A&B as it is Green Belt land and not enough Brownfield sites have considered. No consideration given to infrastructure i.e. Schools, Doctors' etc. Kidderminster Hospital is inadequate and puts pressure on Worcester hospital, which is in special measures. Health care for the amount of people 6000 houses would bring puts peoples' health and lives at risk. Cookley is a village not an extension of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4964</a>	Object	I object to option A&B and wish to retain Cookley as a village – school and GP Surgery just coping with current numbers. Lea Castle site could be used for a badly needed care home complex. Yes to Brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4967</a>	Object	Objects to the proposed development of the Lea Castle site and adjacent areas. For Cookley it will wipe out its status as a village, inns, GP surgery, school and church plus its playing fields and village hall. These will all be overstrained by the huge population growth implied. The value of Cookley's properties will undoubtedly suffer a loss. The proposal will blight the villages attractiveness – e.g. p.178, justification 31.2 will involve the destruction of Talbot Wood through which runs a beautiful public footpath. Cookley amenity natural surroundings accessed by such paths must not be blocked or turned into sub-urban alleyways benefit of the natural richness that enhances our well-being. The Anglo-Saxon castle contains a definitive description of the parishes' bounds under King Aethelbald Lea Castle land is in this anciently established parish and not a district of Kidderminster. The Lea Castle land in question was designated to function as a sanatorium. Any future development should continue with a role of the same nature or a senior person's village.
	<a href="#">LPPO4969</a>	Object	Objects to development of the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lack of infrastructure (Doctors', schools, shops and transport - Cookley can't cater for any more)</li> <li>2. Objects to building on Green Belt when there is sufficient brownfield land</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. Cookley is a village not an extension of Kidderminster</p> <p>4. Concerned about housing development areas without any employment or entertainment for young people</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4970</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposed development at Lea Castle - Options A &amp; B on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors' Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity.</li> <li>• Access and highways infrastructure is insufficient to cope with proposed development. Additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent, Cookley.</li> <li>• 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment.</li> <li>• Development would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. The Local Plan Cookley refers to Cookley as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village and it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. Accommodating 600 houses would be for Kidderminster's needs.</li> <li>• Development of the Lea Castle site is needed, however this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.</li> </ul> <p>Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet its local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt with large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the brownfield part of Lea Castle,</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			without the destruction of the woodland. I also strongly suggest that you consider other brown field sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4971</a>	Object	I object to 600 plus houses being built on the Lea Castle area with no schools/Doctors'/activities for children. Cookley school and Doctors' are both full already. I agree that building does need to be done on the Lea Castle area brown sites only. Save our Green Belt. There are plenty of brown sites that could be used prior to damaging our green. This plan has not been thought out as to how these new housing areas will be used and lived in. This is being rushed through due to invested interest by the council.
	<a href="#">LPPO4972</a>	Object	<p>Objection to Options A &amp; B Lea Castle:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Uses Green Belt land not just Lea Castle.</li> <li>2. What are plans for infrastructure; schools, public transport, Doctors' and impact on Cookley village.</li> <li>3. Will houses be taken by commuters and what would impact be on roads, services and carbon footprint?</li> <li>4. Develop Kidderminster town centre prior first</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4973</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development at Hurcott ADR/BW4 and the development at Lea Castle WFR/WC/15/16.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lane going through Hurcott from the Stourbridge Road to the Birmingham Road will not handle the increased level of traffic and would become a fast, quick entry to the Birmingham Road. The junction at the Park Gate is already an accident spot.</li> <li>• With regard to the Miller Homes application there were proposals for a path/cycle route from this site running along the back of the houses on Kendlewood Road. This is private property and the owner will not give permission for such.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local schools will not handle the increase in numbers if you allow both proposals. Nor the hospitals which already are not able to cope as mentioned on national news. Worcester Royal is under considerable strain as is Russell Hall hospital.</li> <li>This area should be left alone for natural wildlife.</li> <li>The proposed extensions, in one area are unfair to local residents causing a new bottle neck to the entry of Kidderminster. This kind of development is unnecessary in a town with poor employment, hospital provision and over prescribed schools.</li> </ul> <p>There are empty buildings in the Kidderminster area that could be developed into homes/apartments so there should be no need to build news homes on these areas of natural beauty/wildlife.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4974</a>	Object	I object to proposed core housing and options A and B at Lea Castle. Development will contribute to urban sprawl and remove separation between Cookley and Kidderminster. Insufficient infrastructure, congestion and pollution will get worse in an already very busy area. 600 houses will completely change the local character for the independent village. Road and pedestrian access is congested and dangerous Local facilities' have no capacity to handle the extra load. Site is wildlife friendly, deer, bats, badgers, birds and other wildlife. Site could instead be developed for other purposes sympathetic to the environment and local community. A 600-house development would destroy wildlife and greenery. I object to using The Crescent as an access route to the development. It is a narrow road with difficult pedestrian and vehicular access to the busy Wolverhampton Road. Any development should be totally separate from the community on The Crescent.
	<a href="#">LPPO4975</a>	Object	Lack of local infrastructure available to support this. Village school that could not expand to cope with a further 600 houses and neither could Cookley Medical centre. Increased level of traffic this development would produce. Cookley is a village and is no way an extension of Kidderminster. Cookley should not suffer to support Kidderminster's needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO4976</a>	Object	Object to Options A & B as there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. 600 houses would

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. In Cookley Schools, Doctors', shops and transport already at capacity. Access and highways infrastructure would not cope with additional traffic, visibility splays and traffic lights will help this. Junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is an accident blackspot and close to the proposed entrance to the Core Site via the Crescent. Object to Option A it would link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster. In the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs. Development of the Lea Castle site is needed but needs to be done more sensitively supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. No evidence for employment or commercial provision around Lea Castle site. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient. 31.2 fails that the planning application for 600 homes involves removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site. The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended to A449 would lead to congestion further up the A449 affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt with a strong identity and provides key local services. WFDC should be support Wolverley and Cookley to meet its local needs in a sustainable way, not by destroying Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4977</a>	Object	<p>I object to Options A &amp; B in relation to Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional school and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field and to expect it to take more children is ludicrous. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's need and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to support local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this.
	<a href="#">LPPO4978</a>	Object	I object to Options A & B at Lea Castle on the grounds that there is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of schools, Doctors' surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic and some additional visibility splays and traffic lights will not do anything to help this. The junction of the A449 and Castle Road, Cookley is extremely busy and a well know local accident blackspot. It is also less than 50 metres from the proposed entrance to the Core Site via The Crescent, Cookley. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and a Doctors' surgery. Cookley Sebright Primary School is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Doctors' surgery is so busy it is hard to get an appointment. I note that in the local plan Cookley is referred to as an urban extension of Kidderminster, it is not, it is a village. As a separate village it should be allowed to expand in line with its own needs. In being asked to accommodate 600 houses it is expanding to Kidderminster's needs and being expected to carry this burden on its already stretched infrastructure. While I agree that a development of the Lea Castle site is needed this needs to be done more sensitively with a view to supporting local infrastructure and need. The current plans do not do this. I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt "based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley". By near the document should say joined to The Crescent, Cookley, of course. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn & a small office building is insufficient.
	<a href="#">LPPO4980</a>	Object	Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the Doctors' surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4982</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school in Cookley or at the Doctors' surgery.</li> </ul> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4984</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development of Lea Castle and the surrounding area and development on the Green Belt. The core development – is now far greater than originally proposed. This was just to be on the site of the Lea Castle hospital and it should not extend into neighbouring fields and woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cookley should not end up as part of Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure would not be able to sustain such a large development. The A449 outside Cookley is already dangerous to cross, and there is not enough space in the school</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>in Cookley or at the Doctors’ surgery.</p> <p>This is an ill-thought out proposal and I disagree with such an aggressive development on Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4985</a>	Object	<p>I must object to both options A &amp; B. There is not the infrastructure in place to accommodate either. Option B) The existing roads are not capable of taking the additional traffic. The A449 would not be able to cope with the number of cars resulting from a proposed 600 house development on Lea Castle. Not to mention the increase in emissions that would be caused. The Doctors’ surgery in the village is full to capacity and so is the school. Therefore a new school and Doctors’ surgery will be required to accommodate probably 2000 plus people for 600 homes. Both of these options require the need to build on Green Belt. This should not be done until every brownfield site has been utilised. Wyre Forest has a population growth below the national average. Therefore housing requirements are below the national average. To cater for increased housing that is not actually required is against the Development Needs Assessment 2015.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4986</a>	Object	<p>There is a lack of local infrastructure to support this. In terms of Schools, Doctors’ Surgery, shops and transport Cookley is already at capacity. The access and highways infrastructure would also not cope with the additional traffic. 600 houses in the Lea Castle area would need an additional School and Dr's surgery. Cookley Sebright is full and has no room for expansion. It already has no usable playing field. Additionally the Dr's surgery is so busy it is hard to get appointments. It would effectively link Cookley to Kidderminster making it an extension of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4987</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors’/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>- Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>- Develop brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>- A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>- Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4988</a>	Object	<p>Object to Options A and B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impact on Cookley, i.e. Doctors'/related parking/Cookley Primary School no room to expand.</li> <li>- Use Lea Castle site with necessary infrastructure</li> <li>- Develop brownfield sites before Green Belt land/regenerate empty shops in town centre.</li> <li>- A449 is a very busy road which increased traffic would make more dangerous</li> <li>- Outline planning permission involves removal of Green Belt land.</li> <li>- Cookley village would become part of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4989</a>	Object	<p>We would like to strongly object to Options A/B of the housing development at Lea Castle and surrounding areas. After looking at the plans online and at Cookley Village Hall our objection is that neither option A or B has been thought out or presented properly by the Council to our people. There are no proper plans for our local or Kidderminster's infrastructure. Unknown to us and neighbours who have lived in Cookley for over 40 years the Village is being referred to on the plans as an extension of Kidderminster to our knowledge it has always been Cookley Village like its neighbour Wolverley Village which doesn't seem to be included in this re-titling on the plans. This presumably has been changed so as to decrease the needs of Kidderminster. Cookley Village infrastructure can hardly cope at the moment with its own needs. You are unable to get an appointment at the local Doctors' surgery as it is very busy. The Primary school is full to capacity and now that Sion Hill and Sladen middle school have been closed there will be a knock on effect to Kidderminster schools and services. The Village bus service and few small shops won't cope with the extra load. Many residents are young parents or pensioners who do not drive and rely on these services, any new people will surely impact on their quality of life? The problems of an extra 600 houses at Lea Castle linking us to Kidderminster along the Green Belt up the Wolverhampton A449</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>&amp; along the Stourbridge Road A451 would be a nightmare. The Park Gate public house on the Stourbridge Road has always been an accident black spot along with the Cookley Village Castle Road entrance. This has been the scene of many accidents for over 40 years. The extra problems of traffic at both sites would be appalling. Children and parents walking to school in Cookley would need to cross the A449 safely. We think that Lea Castle site should be developed, but sympathetically in its own right and as a separate entity to Cookley and Kidderminster with its own infrastructure and surrounded by the woodland already established not surrounded by houses. Worcestershire is a beautiful county the envy of a lot of our neighbours, with beautiful nature reserves and countryside, walks, rivers, views etc, when this has all been built on and spoilt we will never get it back. Animal life, their habitats and way of life will all be gone. Like our friends in other parts of Kidderminster Offmore, Comberton, Hurcott and Spennells to name but a few, not one of us want to see our neighbourhood spoilt, the Green Belt gone and relief roads zigzagging all over our land. We need to go back to the drawing board and work together with the Council as a community to talk and find an agreeable solution together sharing the load and coming up with a proper workable plan for the future of our home, Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4991</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety. As all people from the new build area will need to come to the existing Cookley area for school, the Doctors' or small local shops, they will need to cross a busy road which is already an accident blackspot.</li> <li>2. Infrastructure. If they drive into the main village this will cause further congestion around the school and Doctors'. There is not sufficient parking in this area for people at present. The local school is already at capacity.</li> <li>3. Green Belt. We should be doing all we can to protect and preserve these areas. They should be used only when all brownfield options have been exhausted.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4992</a>	Object	<p>The entire plan goes against a number of planning policy clauses in addition to being wholly against the need to rejuvenate Kidderminster town centre, provide housing within areas accessible to local services, promote the use of public transport, reduce car use and in turn carbon emissions within</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the region.</p> <p><b>Achieving Sustainable Development</b></p> <p>This local plan does not promote sustainable development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Build a strong, competitive economy</li> <li>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</li> <li>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</li> <li>4. Promoting sustainable transport</li> <li>5. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.</li> <li>6. Promoting healthy communities</li> <li>7. Protecting Green Belt Land.</li> <li>8. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</li> <li>9. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</li> <li>10. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4993</a>	Object	<p>I am not opposed to building houses and light business units on the site but I am are very concerned with the impact over 600+ houses will have <b>added</b> to this the number of proposed houses on the other sites (bold above) and the effect all this will have on the surrounding road links, schools, Doctors' and people. The A449 is already a fast and busy road, notorious for accidents with a significant number of fatalities and does not need increased pressure. I am very concerned that too many houses in one area converging onto the same busy roads/areas of <b>Cookley, Wolverley, Broadwaters, Horsefair, Land Oak, Birmingham Road and on the town ring road</b> will have massive impact on traffic flow and safety. Exiting via The Crescent will make it very difficult for people exiting Castle Road safely onto main A449. The bend leading up to the Cookley turn is a bad bend where there are frequently accidents/near misses. At peak times it is very difficult to exit onto the A449 towards Kidderminster. Axborough Lane will inevitably be a choice road to cut through to the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Stourbridge Road if people exit via The Crescent. This road is narrow with a blind summit and very poor visibility for exiting at both ends. I am concerned that Cookley will become a 'rat run' to and from Kidderminster via Lea Lane. Increased traffic on this road would be dangerous, the road is very unsafe, very narrow and runs past a Primary School and Doctors' with a tight turning T-junction at the village end and busy T junction at the Lock Pub end. Perhaps it should be considered <u>that Lea Lane be made one way only?</u>
	<a href="#">LPPO4996</a>	Object	<p>If there is a need for more housing, there are plenty of brownfield sites around the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School is full to capacity, as is the medical centre.</li> <li>- The Lea Castle site is home to a lot of wildlife.</li> <li>- The Crescent cannot support the amount of extra traffic for the development and I fear that it will be unsafe for the residents.</li> <li>- Cookley is a lovely village in its own right, it is not an extension of Kidderminster.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4997</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the plan will see Cookley being joined to Kidderminster and it will cease to be a village and destroy /overwhelm our community</li> <li>• What is the main force driving this development, population growth? Population of Wyre Forest has not grown at all in the past five years and all indications are that UK population growth will retract over the next 10 years. Population growth cannot be used as a reason for this massive development.</li> <li>• Destruction of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• 1000 homes completely out of context with local environment inadequate infrastructure roads, schools, medical. No guarantee within plan.</li> <li>• Who is the development aimed at clearly not the local population with only 18% affordable housing.</li> <li>• This kind of development will attract people from outside the area not people who already</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>live and work here, increasing pollution and traffic density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are enough brownfield sites around the area to cope with any population growth.</li> <li>• This expansion is being driven by profit not social and enterprise needs.</li> <li>• Lea Castle site is an area of natural beauty this should be preserved and enhanced. It is an asset that could be used for the benefit of local people in perpetuity.</li> </ul> <p>This Development should not be allowed to go ahead.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4998</a>	Object	<p>The area affected is home to wildlife including birds of prey and sometimes deer. I am shocked that our Council would build on land that has been preserved as Green Belt. Once Green Belt land is gone, it is gone forever. I fear and strongly suspect that your plans will result in Cookley losing this sense of identity, history and community. If your proposals go ahead, there seem to be no plans for the people who will live in them! It seems that local schools must already have capacity for increased numbers of pupils. Local shops and current facilities will be able to absorb increased demand; and there is available employment in the local area. Not to mention the adverse impact on local roads and volume of traffic potentially resulting in an increase in accidents and injury.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5000</a>	Object	<p>I object to the plans at Lea Castle on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure</li> <li>• Green Belt</li> <li>• Employment</li> <li>• Community</li> </ul> <p>I believe the road network, schools, Doctors' and local amenities of Cookley and surrounding areas are hugely inadequate. The more Green Belt that is taken away and replaced with concrete will impact on the amount of water that goes into the drains.</p>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO5001</a>	Object	<p>Lea Castle Hospital extensions - we do not consider it possible for east of Kidderminster to sustain completion rates needed to deliver these allocations during Plan period. Green Belt assessment</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			states that sites make a contribution/significant contribution to Green Belt at this location. Non-Green Belt sites should be favoured instead.
	<a href="#">LPPO5002</a>	Object	<p><b>LEA CASTLE SITE</b> The roads, around this site already have many problems. The site which was Sion Hill School is planned for 100 – 150 houses both this road &amp; the Wolverley road converge on to the crossroads of the A449 which is a very fast road. You have the Cookley turning which goes into the village, another accident BLACKSPOT. From there you have the Crescent, then onto Axborough Lane &amp; the Island Pool &amp; crossroads. All of this area has experienced many accidents &amp; fatalities.</p> <p><b>THE PARK GATE PUBLIC HOUSE</b> A451 Stourbridge Road, both this junction &amp; the whole of the Stourbridge Road again is a fast road experiencing many accidents &amp; fatalities. When considering the large number of houses in this area consideration should be whether it is a safe environment for the increased traffic. &amp; the fact each household has a least 2 cars to each family.</p> <p><b>LEA CASTLE SITE footprint</b> The avenue of trees &amp; woodland &amp; wildlife, i.e. bats, owls etc. The fact is builders don't take this into consideration when building on these sites. If it is necessary to build on this site, serious consideration should be given to building low density housing i.e. one or two bedroom bungalows of which there is a serious shortage for the older generation in the Wyre Forest area. Providing a regular bus service from the site, alleviating the use of vehicles leaving the area.</p> <p><b>HOSPITALS</b> KIDDERMINSTER hospital has downgraded &amp; is still being considered for further reductions, as is REDDITCH Hospital and they can't help as they are over subscribed! WORCESTER cannot cope with the number of people attending the hospital, A FACT, yet still Worcester is experiencing extensive housing in its areas. Where are all the additional people to go when they need medical help! DOCTORS' surgeries are full in Wyre Forest putting further pressure on the medical profession. The</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>District Nurses are in the same position.</p> <p><b>SCHOOLS</b> are at full capacity.</p> <p>With all the redundancies that have taken place recently. Wyre Forest is no longer a hive of production.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO513</a>	Support	<p>I support building on the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large number of the dwellings would be on existing brown field ground and not reducing the amount of Green Belt land. The size of the area could be further increased by using the land up to Axborough Lane.</li> <li>- A large number of dwellings could support a 2 form entry primary school, thus reducing the impact on the local facilities.</li> <li>- It would be within the catchment of Wolverly CE High School and would positively impact the schools long term viability.</li> <li>- It would be capable of sustaining a bus service</li> <li>- It would support a village centre which would fall under Cookley parish, but would not put any burden on that community as it would be large enough to support its own park, village hall, school and shop.</li> <li>- It would potentially be able to provide live-work units</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2141</a>	Support	<p>Support as site is already part developed with services required. Access is available to all types of transportation. Impact on The Crescent would be small, road runs through existing site and has supported the services daily to a large population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3006</a>	Support	<p>I choose option B the lea Castle site.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3201</a>	Support	It is more of a brownfield site, being adjacent to the area that has previously been built on.
	<a href="#">LPPO3205</a>	Support	It is more of a brownfield site, being adjacent to the area that has previously been built on.
	<a href="#">LPPO3430</a>	Support	I believe the alternative proposal is the best option. The old Lea Castle site is large and will accommodate the housing required to be built. Without encroaching on surrounding areas of Green Belt land and Cookley. No major alterations to man roads. No bridge to be built. No by-pass required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3536</a>	Support	I was advised that if a combined total of approx 1000 dwellings were built on the Lea Castle Hospital site this would constitute sufficient additional increased demand for primary school places to warrant/justify the creation of a new Primary School. With this in mind we would prefer the larger Option B to be developed to achieve the required total number of dwellings to trigger the requirement for an additional primary school. Our main concern with the Lea Castle Hospital development is that the Cookley village primary school should remain a village primary school serving the needs of the immediate local village. If the existing Cookley village primary school is further developed and expanded to increase number of class rooms/class sizes/attendance from outside the village (increasing traffic into the village with parents from outside the village leaving/collecting children by car) this would cause significant adverse impact on the village infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPPO4088</a>	Support	Include WFR/WC/32 and reduce the size or density of development on the Spennells/Stanklyn Lane sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4297</a>	Support	<p>Following attending the Cookley consultation event I wish to submit my comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am in favour of the Lea Castle site and land next to Lea Castle being developed as long as it does not result in additional pressure being put onto Cookley School which already seems to be at capacity. Lea Lane which the school is situated on gets dangerously busy in term</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WFR/WC/32 - LEA CASTLE HOSPITAL EXTENSION EAST

Respondent	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>time when the school starts and ends each day, so with additional people having to drive their children to school would only put more pressure onto a lane which is already too busy. People also attend the Doctors' which is opposite the school this just adds extra pressure on the lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I can see the merit of developing road infrastructure around the Spennells area to provide relief to the centre of Kidderminster which is often bottle necked something needs to be done to make road travel easier to the area.</li> <li>• It makes sense to me to develop just a few areas of the district with large housing sites rather than lots of areas with smaller developments, therefore I would be in favour of option A.</li> </ul> <p>I have registered with your consultation website however did not find it easy to add any comments hence this email.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3073</a>	Object	Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic,  Local schools, doctors and dentists are already struggling to cope with existing numbers of occupants in these areas, and a significant increase in the number of houses would lead to an influx in students and patients  Loss of wildlife
	<a href="#">LPPO2056</a>	Object	With the Burlish Top Nature reserve having homes, right up to its border. Will these defeat the object of a nature reserve?  Currently during heavy rain falls, the Kingsway gutters are like fast flowing streams. Also the Junction of Elan Avenue to the Kingsway floods.
	<a href="#">LPPO2148</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposed plan due to the loss of Green Belt when there are areas that are empty buildings in Kidderminster than can be used to more effect.</li> <li>2. There isn't enough spaces in schools as there is</li> <li>3. It takes too long to get any GP, dentists</li> <li>4. The road network now struggles with the demand of vehicles let alone extra carbon footprint emissions.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2137</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic noise and pollution</li> <li>• Removal of agricultural land have an impact on the wildlife in the area</li> <li>• Building of houses behind property will reduce value of her home.</li> <li>• Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO168</a>	Object	I object to the inclusion of land adjoining Burlish Top nature reserve as being included within the plan for housing.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>We have enjoyed access to the land for the 18 years.</p> <p>The land has always been used by walkers and is a natural buffer to the nature reserve. It is home to badgers, sky larks and many other animals. Any development would be destructive and have a massive impact on the environment. There would be light and noise intrusion to the nature reserve and would remove a valuable public amenity.</p> <p>Inclusion of this land in the plan is wholly inappropriate</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1754</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that The Kingsway is already a 'rat-run' and residents struggle to exit their driveways safely due to congestion and speeding vehicles.</li> <li>Also concerned that Bewdley Rd won't cope with a new building site and more traffic. Public transport is not seen as viable as bus service is 'extremely poor.'</li> <li>Worried that increased congestion will delay the emergency services. Also concerned about increased traffic and impact of pollution on health.</li> <li>Highlights the fact that Stourport lacks a by-pass or ringroad. Concerned that doctors and dentists won't cope with growing population.</li> <li>Believes that there isn't any evidence of a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area that couldn't be met by utilising brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3289</a>	Comment	<p>This is an important and widely used public open space currently acts as a “buffer” between a large residential area and the local nature reserve and SSSI. Again concerns must exist about the suitability of The Kingsway for access to this site. This land in the past had been farmland, and its inclusion as part of the Golf Course was acceptable on the grounds that it would still provide a predominantly green area for local enjoyment and recreation. It is concerning too that the land has been contaminated by recent waste tipping, again detracting from its suitability.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO166</a>	Comment	<p>Site L1/2, the Kingsway road will require widening to a standard carriageway so that residents can access the A451 safely rather than use Burlish Crossing or Windermere Way. The Burlish Crossing lights will need to be reconfigured to avoid even worse traffic delays if all the developments closest to this junction are approved.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO741</a>	Comment	An area with no direct public transport into the nearest town, increasing car traffic and air pollution, leaving residents with no alternative means of transport
	<a href="#">LPPO2178</a>	Comment	Wyre Forest Golf Club land could be an option for development.
	<a href="#">LPPO2189</a>	Comment	Wyre forest golf club (Burlish Golf club), if the golf course cannot be reopened the 62 acres could be used for building more homes having good accessibility to both Kidderminster and Stourport,
	<a href="#">LPPO234</a>	Comment	The proposal to develop the golf course does not take in to consideration that for building of properties the site will be cut in to two by the Strategic Main and its service access zone. This will not only limit the number of dwellings but effectively create two separate sites. Both of which border an SSI.
Wyre Forest District Council	<a href="#">LPPO1254</a>	Comment	Concerns related to potential impacts on biodiversity at Wyre forest golf club. Due to the presence of acidic habitat.
	<a href="#">LPPO2651</a>	Comment	<p>I cannot comment on most of the proposed sites for development because I do not have a thorough knowledge of the environment and area for each of them. The same applies to those preparing the plans – flow chart trends and geographical pictures may well suggest “potentially” suitable areas but there may be local specific considerations that contradict this view.</p> <p>My comments are therefore restricted to proposed development sites in my immediate area.</p> <p>I have some serious concerns for any changes to the use of land in the areas on Burlish Top and the immediate surrounding land. With reference to the plans this is the area shown as a CORE SITE immediately behind Torridon Close and Elan Avenue that the council have owned and I believe has been previously referred to as “the potential golf academy” land. It is shown on the plan as a core site.</p> <p><b><u>HISTORIC FLOODING</u></b></p> <p>The lie of this land has previously been the cause of severe flooding to properties in Elan Avenue, my own property</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>included. We suffered this issue numerous times from the mid-seventies. Although local residents had grave concerns about the land fill matter that was being dumped in this site it has resulted in a situation where we have not had any flooding for the past few years. I was fortunate that only my garden was affected (the flood water was lapping my rear doorstep about an inch below entering the house) – but that resulted in me having to remove many inches of mud from my land and losing equipment from my shed that was ruined. Other properties were more unfortunate, they had huge amounts of water entering their houses as much as 18 inches deep – one house in particular that I went to had raw sewerage in their house because the force of flood water had blown the manhole cover.</p> <p>This was not just a one-off occurrence.</p> <p>The current lie of the land has been created by a company, authorised by the council, dumping excessive land fill which I believe deems the current land unsafe for building on. There has been talk of asbestos and all sorts of stuff being dumped there. This would require the height of the land being reduced significantly prior to development and this would take us back to the same as it was when the flooding occurred.</p> <p>At the moment the lie of the land allows the grassed open area to absorb heavy rainfall. Flattening out the area it is believed will cause the water to start running off again – standard drainage channels are unlikely to prevent the problem because, as stated above, the force of water was able to blow off manhole covers.</p> <p><b><u>PROTECTION</u></b></p> <p>There is a spring at the bottom of this land which I believe is a protected area because it has been identified there are newts there. I believe in the past that the council said this area would be fenced off but that has not happened.</p> <p><b><u>EXISTING PROPERTY PRIVACY</u></b></p> <p>I have no objection on this basis, the new properties would not interfere visually with my home at all so this is not part of my concern. Neighbours in the Elan Avenue cul-de-sac might have a different opinion because the new</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>houses being on higher land would make them fully overlook their properties.</p> <p><b><u>CHANGE OF USE</u></b></p> <p>We have previously been advised by the council that land owners cannot be held responsible for water escapement if they have not changed the use of the land because the land was there before our properties.</p> <p>In this instance there would be a change of use so the land owner (the council) would be held responsible for any subsequent issues, damages and losses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4221</a>	Comment	If you are going to build why do you have to build on Green Belt when you have land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf Course L1/2 and the land that runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where the children and parents are in walking distance surely this makes more sense?
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1301</a>	Comment	This currently acts as a “buffer” between a large residential area and the local nature reserve and SSI. It is used by many walkers (ref. obesity figures for Wyre Forest District). We question the suitability of The Kingsway access to this site. There are also suggestions that the land has been contaminated by past activities.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1444</a>	Comment	Wyre Forest Golf Club - only part of site has been assessed in Green Belt assessment so entire site cannot be released. Should be subject to requirements of para.74 of NPPF. No evidence to show the requirements have been met. Allocation should be removed,
	<a href="#">LPPO3435</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public rights of way. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat, skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nest in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also have significant impact upon the vast variety of pant and wildlife</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.
	<a href="#">LPPO3440</a>	Object	<p>The roads on Burlish/Lickhill and Bewdley Road are already being used as rat runs and can't cope with any more traffic never mind the population with the inevitable building of houses.</p> <p>Houses mean requirements for schools and doctors and dentists and we are already at overflow point.</p> <p>Let's keep the bit of beauty we have left.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4182</a>	Object	I am also concerned that a number of the sites proposed for housing are so close to special areas of countryside that may be damaged by the development – L1/2 Wyre Forest Golf Club.
	<a href="#">LPPO4217</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urbanisation, threatening the existing public Rights of Way. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. We think that building would have impact on the vast variety of plant and wildlife.</li> <li>• Significant increased traffic on all roads on Bewdley Road North, Burlish Estate and Lickhill Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs which will effect times for emergency services to reach destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emission of exhaust fumes with results of higher risk to local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a By-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing despite promises of a "By-pass.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to another area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities i.e. GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3632</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to Wyre Forest Golf Club. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will destroy wildlife.</li> <li>○ Will put more pressure on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>○ This will undermine the work WFDC Rangers have done to create more biodiversity.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The route to local schools is limited adding to more traffic congestion.</li> <li>○ Risk of class sizes increasing if schools take on more pupils.</li> <li>○ County Council receives received one of the lowest payments per pupil in the country.</li> </ul> <p>To summarise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increase in hosing will bring more traffic, noise and air pollution.</li> <li>• Poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion need to be addressed in Stourport.</li> <li>• Doctors will not be able to cope with more patients.</li> <li>• Plans need to be put in place to alleviate these problems before any developments go ahead.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4019</a>	Object	<p>I am aware that it has been extensively tipped on and understand that the nature of the materials tipped there may not be fully known. There is still evidence of settlement with area's not draining &amp; pooling with water. The new Birmingham relief water pipe which is still undergoing installation passes through the middle of the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a pond which has a population of protected Great Crested Newts.</li> <li>• There's a spring on the site which is utilised.</li> <li>• The site provides a natural barrier between the existing houses &amp; the Birchen Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• The site is regularly &amp; extensively used for recreational purposes by the local population.</li> <li>• The building of housing would spoil the open aspect &amp; greatly effect my enjoyment.</li> <li>• Access to the site is very limited via the Kingsway this is not a main road and was not designed to take a substantial increase to traffic flow.</li> <li>• I am concerned that any development will increase the risk of flooding properties.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5097</a>	Object	<p>Object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extra Traffic.</li> <li>• More children to local schools.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of wildlife.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO451</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to development of the Kingsway/ Golf Club site and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Development of this land will be detrimental to the natural environment on this site and to the adjoining nature reserve. The site is essential for the many insects, small wildlife and nesting birds that make their homes there.</p> <p>The development is another step towards joining the towns of Kidderminster and Stourport via Birchen Coppice. Development towards the joining of the two towns must not be allowed to take place.</p> <p>The infrastructure to support such a large development on Lickhill and on Burlish is not in place. The roads, schools and doctors are not coping now and when planning such a large scale development in the Stourport and Burlish area plans are included to improve these also in order to make it a self contained community rather than an add on to an already not coping system.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO523</a>	Object	<p>The area is poorly serviced by the current road infrastructure. At peak traffic times there are often traffic queues from the sharp bend in Kingsway to the traffic lights at Burlish crossroads. The road is used as a shortcut by heavy goods vehicles in both directions, despite the signage pointing out its unsuitability. Little evidence of the need for additional recreational facilities to address the "pressure on the adjoining Burlish Top Nature Reserve" the suggested need for additional housing in this area can be addressed through the use of existing brownfield sites. Severn Trent Water should be consulted over the wisdom of building anything at all over its new water pipeline once it is finished.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO748</a>	Object	<p>Need to protect Green Belt; loss of habitat, increased traffic, pollution, schools full, doctors would not be able to cope, no evidence to justify building on Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1644</a>	Object	<p>Object loss of Green Belt and good quality agricultural land.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1201</a>	Object	<p>Concerns with the Stourport-on-Severn site allocations :</p> <p>LI/2 – Wyre Forest Golf Club – Part of site assessed through Green Belt assessment. No evidence base to support the release of the entire site shown from the Green Belt Site last used as a golf course and therefore, a form of open space subject to the requirements of paragraph 74 of the Framework. Areas of open space should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space to be surplus to requirements, or the loss resulting from the proposed development will be replaced by equivalent or better provision. No evidence to support this. This allocation should be removed in its entirety.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1673</a>	Object	<p>I object to LI/2 as it impacts on wildlife and a loss of open green space. The natural beauty of the area would be blighted, the Kingsway and Buggy Lane are not suitable for the increase in traffic generated from new houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1761</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to building houses on the fields at the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road North and on the garden centre and horse paddocks on the Lickhill Road.</p> <p>There will be a loss of Green Belt areas, a lot more traffic with increased noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes. Stourport lacks a bypass.</p> <p>There will be loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife habitat and impact on a variety of plants.</p> <p>More people needing facilities such as school, doctors, dentists etc.</p> <p>Asks if there are brownfield sites that could be used as an alternative.</p> <p>Objects to building on Green Belt areas.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1801</a>	Object	<p>It would add extra traffic and more children to the local schools.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1815</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 and LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stourport does not have the infrastructure to support sufficient increase in traffic.</li> <li>2. Burlish Crossing is already overwhelmed by traffic at peak times causing tailbacks,</li> <li>3. Loss of valuable Green Belt will lead to loss of wildlife.</li> <li>4. Impact on habitat - there are nesting skylarks and tawny owl</li> <li>5. Increase in traffic pollution</li> <li>6. Need to consider schools and Doctor's surgeries as they are already under pressure.</li> </ol> <p>Please re consider your plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2365</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTIONS TO Policy 32- Core Sites/Wyre Forest Golf Club as development would almost join Stourport and Kidderminster at Kinver Avenue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO657</a>	Object	<p>This site is on landfill, next to a narrow lane at national speed limit and next to an SSI site and beauty spot. If developed site is right next to Kidderminster Gun Club which operates all through the summer months clay shooting. I have complained twice now to environmental health as the noise level is unacceptable. New houses would be even closer to this site. Severn Trent has put a major pipeline through the site surely this cannot be compromised.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1856</a>	Object	<p>Stourport has enough new housing sites, building more would be disastrous. Our roads are too busy now. Kingsway is like a main road, and with new houses built at the field adjacent to Burlish Park, can only make it worse.</p> <p>Getting in and out of Stourport. is very difficult because of so much traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1896</a>	Object	<p>Map L1/2 - This area of land was used as landfill for a considerable time. Was this waste there toxic and even if not</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is it advisable to build on this type of land?</p> <p>It is adjacent to Burlish Top Nature Reserve and surely households and traffic will adversely affect this important facility and the flora and fauna of the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1993</a>	Object	Object
	<a href="#">LPPO2032</a>	Object	L1/6/7: Kingsway traffic is already busy and noisy. More houses would add to this. The schools could not cope with more pupils doctors/local hospitals are already stretched; we do not need more housing in the area due to lack of infrastructure ad should protect wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO2067</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal</p> <p>Kingsway is already a very road between Kidderminster to Bewdley with speeding issues</p> <p>The proposal will impact on schools, doctors/dentists and wildlife</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4203</a>	Object	Traffic at the Burlish traffic lights is already unacceptable. Extra housing on Kingsway, golf course or on Lickhill sites will make this severe issue even worse for everyone. The extra volume of cars will cause even more pollution and will impact on the environment. Building on Green Belt sites is unacceptable. Many brown field sites are not being developed, many parts of Stourport are derelict and run down, why can't these be utilised before destroying the parts of the town that are still attractive, unpolluted and well kept.
	<a href="#">LPPO1807</a>	Object	Object to LI/2.
	<a href="#">LPPO1636</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The field at the top of Kingsway is contaminated and unsuitable for housing development.</li> <li>• Roads are already congested w/o more traffic/pollution; when will improved infrastructure be provided?</li> <li>• GP's/Schools will be unable to cope and wildlife will be affected</li> <li>• This will not bring wealth to Stourport it will only attract commuters; Stourport town centre requires growth.</li> <li>• Why has riverside development not happened and Lloyds Garage site used as car park?</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use brownfield sites - old vinegar works/“Cheapside” area of Stourport is ripe for development not Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1631</a>	Object	<p>Can’t see justification for building at Burlish crossing:</p> <p>Lack of roads/schools and doctors/dentists already busy</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3261</a>	Object	<p>The extra traffic - it is already difficult to get out of the immediate area at rush hour times and holidays/sunny days.</p> <p>The safety caused by the extra traffic, Kingsway is already a speedy and busy lane. We are regular walkers to Burlish Top along with a lot of locals with dogs, children, and cycles.</p> <p>The area has a Newt community which I thought were protected. There is also a Badger family living quietly and happily as well as other animals/birds/ reptiles. These would no doubt be disturbed and possibly evicted. A lot of council money has been spent on Burlish Top Nature Reserve bringing it back to its natural heathland habitat, for a home to wildlife, birds, reptiles and flora. I can only think that developing the land so close to this will undo all of that hard work.</p> <p>There is already a problem with illegal use of motorcycles and at night with youths drinking/drugs. Any major development will probably exacerbate these problems.</p> <p>There may be problems with the nature of materials in/on the land. There is still evidence of settlement; area’s not draining and pooling with water and subsidence/holes appearing. We have previously suffered flooding to our property due to changes in the lie of the said land which resulted in substantial claims against our insurances.</p> <p>We are being asked to lodge our concerns before we actually know exactly what is being planned i.e. the type of houses, the spacing/road layout and the entrance from the Kingsway.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3307</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top of ‘Kingsway’ (L1/2) restricted number of houses with no infringement towards the ‘Golf Club’ / Nature Reserve.</li> </ol>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing next to 'New Tesco'!?</li> <li>Utilising 'Brownfield Sites' or existing housing stock.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2631</a>	Object	This site should not be developed as it is essential to maintain green space between the three towns. WFDC should pursue other avenues to gain important revenue from this site, whilst still maintaining a green attractive appearance perhaps a wildflower meadow. Keeping this as a green site would not only be attractive to anyone wishing to move into the area, but would also benefit the current residents of Kidderminster and Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO3013</a>	Object	<p>Object to Burlish Golf Course which was used as an unauthorised a tip despite being SSI/health risk. Better sites - Stourport/ Kidderminster town centres &amp; former Chichester Caravans site being centrally located/on a bus route.</p> <p>Impact of extra traffic on Kingsway, distance from doctors surgeries/limited public transport/possible damage to property (already have pipe line close by)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3041</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I received NO communication from the council. .</li> <li>Strongly object to loss of Green Belt status.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations.</li> <li>Object to the increase in road noise and extra pollution from exhaust fumes.</li> <li>Stourport does not have ring road or by pass like Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>Will more schools, GP and dental surgeries be built?</li> <li>Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land.</li> <li>Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1996</a>	Object	<p>Objects due to the increase of traffic on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road.</p> <p>Traffic is already bad. Stourport is already a congested town and is not able to cope with increased traffic from increasing housing estates.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2017</a>	Object	<p>Site LI/2 was previously a landfill site and I would be concerned about residential properties being built here. Firstly considerable excavation will be needed potentially leading to environmental problems for existing residents and users of Burlish Top Nature Reserve and secondly I'm not sure how attractive such a site would be to would be house buyers of the new builds.</p> <p>There has recently been much disruption due to the laying of the Severn Trent Water Pipeline. The prospect of yet more noise, mess and danger is not attractive.</p> <p>If LI/2 goes ahead the traffic situation will become even more horrendous leading to public safety and environmental impacts of untenable proportion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2062</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way.</li> <li>• Burlish Top Nature Reserve under threat/decrease in wildlife</li> <li>• Lack of road infrastructure in Stourport/increase in traffic noise/pollution in area/total upgrade of roads in Wyre Forest would be necessary</li> <li>• New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers</li> <li>• Lead to extreme pressure on – schools, doctors, dentists, gas/electricity and water/sewage suppliers</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2084</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of brown belt not Green Belt land</li> <li>• Proposed plans would increase of traffic, pollution, medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Don't let profit be the major factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2154</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status. The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected.</li> <li>• Traffic at ALL times of the day is extremely busy. An extra 300+ properties centred around this area without additional major roads included in your plans will be very foolhardy</li> <li>• The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GP's, Dentists and all local schools will not be able to cope!</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2363</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Badger Set and Protected acid grassland and newts on the site</li> <li>The New Birmingham relief pipe line goes through the site.</li> <li>Considerable depth of contaminated material on site.</li> <li>There is a spring feeding an Aquifer for Blackwell Abstraction point on the site</li> <li>Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>Drainage issues if built on;</li> <li>There is no storm drain system in Elan Avenue</li> <li>Former Golf Course would be a better option having space, being easier to develop, with good access to roads/schools/transport/sports facilities and Stourport.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1990</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Kingsway, Burlish and Lickhill Road due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from large tailbacks.</li> <li>Significant impact on facilities e.g. GP surgeries, dentists, hospitals already over burdened.</li> <li>Impact on schools – larger class sizes or unable to take in local children requiring then to travel to outside area to school.</li> <li>Impact on wildlife habitat and Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>Lack of bypass to alleviate traffic in Stourport</li> <li>Loss of Green Belt status which should protect countryside and protect rights of way.</li> <li>No evidence of shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by brownfield sites e.g. Power Station site.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4206</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic/pollution</li> <li>• Stourport is already a bottleneck</li> <li>• Local amenities – schools/GP Surgeries full.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1795</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any plans that involve building on Green Belt land for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are sufficient brownfield sites to exploit before needing to consider Green Belt</li> <li>2. Concerned about development around Burlish as the crossing is very busy.</li> <li>3. Concerned about access road to Bewdley for emergency services- at peak times Burlish crossing can be gridlocked.</li> <li>4. Infrastructure in and around Stourport - questions if it will be able to cope with the additional demand on services and roads</li> <li>5. Green Belt needs to be retained to protect wildlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1904</a>	Object	<p>Concerned about:-the loss of Green Belt,          -Significant increase of traffic on all roads in Burlish Park, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (peak times tailbacks).          -Increase in time it will take emergency services to reach residents.          - The bus service is already poor.          - The erosion of what makes Wyre Forest special, the three towns keeping their separate identities.          - Increased pressure on GP surgeries, dentists and schools.          -The wonderful addition we have of Burlish Nature Reserve will be affected by loss of wildlife. There are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields and rare plant species too.          - Surely there are many brownfield sites that can be utilised within Wyre Forest. Once again Stourport-on-Severn comes out worst affected.          Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster a ring road but Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic.          My objections are not of the 'in my backyard' syndrome but a plea for an already over crowded little town not to grow anymore. We do not have the infrastructure to grow further and let us keep the cherished parts of put town</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			that make it a place we want to live.
	<a href="#">LPP01664</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</li> <li>• Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</li> <li>• Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01778</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any loss of Green Belt that protects the countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</li> <li>• Concerned about increased noise and pollution due to traffic and the impact on the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Suggests not building on the Green Belt but alternatively utilising land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf course L1/2 and the land that runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where children and parents are within walking distance. Suggests prioritising these sites before developing on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Concerned about lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries dentists and public transport in this area.</li> <li>• Also concerned that Stourport lacks a good public transport infrastructure including a decent safe cycle path. This all needs to be done before any houses should be considered.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03176</a>	Object	<p>The field which is part of the golf course is heavily contaminated with industrial waste including chemical waste.</p> <p>The Kingsway already suffers heavy traffic congestion in the morning and evening rush hour. Any further traffic would be entirely unacceptable, would increase pollution and add to the traffic queues.</p> <p>It was stated in your report that building houses on this site "would take pressure off the Burlish Top Nature Reserve" That is completely the opposite of what would happen. People would be attracted to and buy houses on this site because of the location.</p> <p>No new roads, no bridge or by pass.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3325</a>	Object	<p>Site L1/2 Wyre Forest Golf Club, represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. The volume of traffic has increased substantially in the past 7 years, to the point where it can be difficult to leave our property. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements.</p> <p>The increased traffic Burlish Top to the main Kidderminster - Stourport road represents a real safety hazard particularly to children at Stourport High School and users of the sports facilities. The road is very narrow and would not support increased traffic.</p> <p>Other core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will also increase the traffic at Burlish lights, I don't see how development at L1/2 can be integrated into the area with adequate transport facilities for both existing and new residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2908</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to this site being used.</li> <li>• Will encroach in The Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• The tranquillity of 'The Top' will be jeopardised with more people living in the area and cause damage to wildlife.</li> <li>• Nothing will be left for future generations except bricks, concrete and tarmac.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2543</a>	Object	<p>I strongly contest the Core development areas in the Burlish/ Lickhill areas, I do understand, just from the basic maths, that there is a need for additional housing within the district. However, I have raised my main concerns above to highlight the obvious issues that I assume someone within the Planning Policy Team has already considered.</p> <p>Following the drop-in and after having reviewed the documents again online I have a few points/queries to make, in particular in respect of the Core housing sites in the Burlish/Kingsway and Lickhill areas of Stourport and also the Option B sites, in particular the one at Burlish Crossing:</p> <p>In respect of the land agreed as a Core housing development at Kingsway (LI/2) I have seen and heard comments that this site has already been 'agreed' for development - is this the case? If so, this would suggest that Wyre Forest DC have already been in negotiations with a developer to sell the land to? Also, it has been brought to my attention, that part of this land (the south section) is immediately developable, again is this the case? If so, does this mean that the north part of the land isn't suitable to be developed and would mean less than 80 dwellings would be built there?</p> <p>Within the initial development plan (prior to the June 2017 options) I read that the site at LI/2 had been highlighted as a possible site for recreational development as well as housing development, which was a strategy to 'reduce the burden on the nearby Burlish Top Nature Reserve'. Given that the plan now only suggests housing on this site, am I right to assume that the 'recreational' plans for this land have been quashed? Wouldn't this land be better used for recreational purposes giving its proximity to the nature reserve, taking into account National obesity levels rising, the lack of local leisure facilities in both Bewdley and Stourport (and an under-equipped Leisure Centre for the Wyre Forest as a whole) and also the fact that the land is currently utilised by dog walkers and children for leisure? Similarly, there are hectares of land here that is now inhabited by wildlife and which houses a vast number of trees, all of which would presumably be destroyed if this land was developed.</p> <p>- Road networks and traffic - Both of the core housing sites at Lickhill and the Kingsway along with the Option B site at LI/5 would have a detrimental effect on the congestion within the local area. These three sites would potentially mean 331 new homes could be built within a 1/4 of a mile of each other, thus raising the concern that there could be potentially 331 more vehicles using the 3 main roads in this area being Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road and The</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Kingsway. Currently, even without these additional houses, the traffic at Burlish Crossings is already a complete nightmare and inconvenience for all commuters going to/from work and/or school. With these additional (potential) developments I can only assume that this congestion will continue to become a more difficult problem to solve.</p> <p>- Roads networks and safety - Similarly these additional vehicles will be using roads which are direct links to the High School and several primary schools within the area, which surely raises a safety concern? Should we be encouraging increased use of The Kingsway, Windermere Way and Lickhill Road given the number of children who use those routes to school every day? Also, if these sites in particular were to be developed where would the access to those 'estates' be? I would assume accessing a large housing development from any of these roads would mean that traffic systems would need to be put in place to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike - would this mean more traffic due to signalling on top of the expected increased in vehicle numbers?</p> <p>- Road networks/ The Bridge - it probably goes without saying that the traffic issues on the Stourport Bridge are already a major problem for the town. The Option B sites, in their vastness, backing onto the Areley Kings area of Stourport would only add to this problem. I have been informed that if a developer were to buy this land then a second bridge and supporting roads would be built - what would the impact of this buildings works be on the town's road infrastructure in the meantime? Also, where would that bridge be located and what would the environmental impacts of that development be?</p> <p>- Schools - The schools within the Burlish and Lickhill vicinity are already over-subscribed each year with many children being rejected from their first choice (and quite often most local) primary school. From the Plan document I can see that there are several options available to deal with the potential increase in children within the area, however 0.5FE proposals are almost a complete waste of time as sustaining a structure within a primary school with an additional 0.5FE is almost impossible with the current funding cuts being made by central government. What 0.5FE increase would do, would be to unnecessarily force joint year group teaching in order to deliver efficient and break-even budgets. Your education team will well know that this is not the most effective way of delivering the curriculum and could also have negative effects on future OFSTED ratings, particularly if pressure is going to be put on to teaching staff to deliver to larger group of pupils. This is one of the easiest ways to make Stourport a less attractive town of choice as parents currently have the knowledge that primary schools within these areas are</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>OFSTED good or outstanding! Similarly, 1FE primary schools are as difficult to sustain, especially within such areas where the majority of students receive only basic funding but the normal costs of running a school still have to be met. Have governors of all local primary schools been informed of the suggestions within the plan so that they can think about succession planning if any of these sites were to be developed? Would their budgets be able to handle any potential changes? Where would a new development for a 1FE school be situated if this were the route that was taken in Stourport, I would assume it would be in the over-subscribed areas? If so, Green Belt?</p> <p>- Medical centres - As above for schools. Local medical centres, surgeries and hospitals are already working to capacity - would residents then be expected to travel longer distances into Kidderminster to seek medical attention? Would Kidderminster Hospital A&amp;E department be re-instated by the time all of the development is complete and these 5,400 dwelling have been built?</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly object to the sites that have been included in the Core housing plans and Option B which would so strongly affect the Burlish and Lickhill areas of Stourport for all of the above mentioned reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2434</a>	Object	<p>My objection centres around the building of houses under Option B, specifically relating to Burlish Crossing. The provision of 157 houses on the site when coupled to the core sites of Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2) and Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7) would mean an additional 331 houses, perhaps 600 extra cars, in an area that struggles at times to cope with the volume of traffic currently. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The resultant reduction in air quality, additional noise pollution and increased damage to road surfaces would lead to further strain on local medical and other community services, protracted response times from emergency services and increased dangers to pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>Without adequate provision for additional schools, medical facilities and other community services I believe this option to be ill conceived.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2367</a>	Object	Object Kingsway/Burlish crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road because:

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Increased traffic congestion, noise pollution/fumes</li> <li>○ Burlish top nature reserve would be ruined/wildlife lost</li> <li>○ Capacity of NHS services/Drs/dentists/schools and access by emergency services.</li> <li>○ Stourport has nothing to cope with extra traffic e.g. a bypass</li> <li>○ Don't build on the agricultural land instead do something for the community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2324</a>	Object	<p>Without more houses being built there are traffic jams every weekday early morning, mid afternoon and early evening in Kingsway, Windermere Way, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. There are also traffic problems outside the schools in Kingsway/Windermere Way with the school run vehicles and Kingsway is also used as a shortcut for lorries (Talbot largest culprit) and at times when the A451 Kidderminster Road is blocked because the town roads are blocked with traffic.</p> <p>More cars means more pollution, will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles and poor public transport adding to number of cars on the road.</p> <p>The compulsory purchase of a Care Home in Lickhill Road (another kick in the teeth for the elderly of the area), loss of a business and peoples horse riding hobby.</p> <p>Nearest doctors are based in Stourport. They will not cope with the extra numbers of patients. Are there enough places available at the schools?</p> <p>Until the council can come up with a plan and the funds to improve the roads and facilities in the Burlish, Lickhill and Kingsway area of Stourport, the idea of building houses as should be scrapped.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2009</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill and Bewdley Road</li> <li>• Health risks from traffic.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in school places and classes getting bigger.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries, emergency services.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests utilising sites old brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2111</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt land must be protected at all costs.</li> <li>• Doctors and Dentists will find it difficult to cope with extra people.</li> <li>• More schools will be needed and that will mean more transport on our roads. Traffic is very noisy already on our roads so the increase will make it worse.</li> <li>• Emergency services will find it difficult at busy times on our roads.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2115</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools.</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2120</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all local roads = more noise/fumes</li> <li>3. Kingsway already subject to speeding</li> <li>4. Impact on capacity of schools, GPs, dentists</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			5. Loss of wildlife and productive agricultural land
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPPO3560</a>	Object	Use of green/brownfield sites. All areas outstanding Bewdley particularly in Bewdley Road North area/Kingsway. Loss of floral and fauna, already eroded during last 25years.
	<a href="#">LPPO1653</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no bus routes, more cars will be needed to take children to already overcrowded schools</li> <li>2. Existing traffic issues esp. at school times in Lickhill Road/Windermere Way</li> <li>3. If there is no play area on the estate children will play in streets which could result in an accident</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1752</a>	Object	<p>Asking if there is evidence to prove that more housing is really needed. Is the population really increasing and are there really not enough Brownfield sites?</p> <p>Asking if there will be any increase in bus services, doctor's surgeries, schools and policing because they do not believe current support services will cope with a growing population.</p> <p>Questioning the rationale behind building more houses and if it's simply to make more money for the Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1781</a>	Object	Object to the collective three sites L1/2, L1/6/7 and M1/6 being the subject of new developments. When there are a number of Brownfield sites that should take priority over Green Belt sites. We all heartily support the 10 points of objections put forward by the Burlish & Lickhill Green friends against these proposals.
	<a href="#">LPPO1802</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/2, LI/5, L1/6/7, M1/6 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Est., Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1811</a>	Object	<p>My objection is that the road and infrastructure cannot cope with anymore traffic on the Bewdley Road and crossroads at lights between 7:00-9:30am and 3:00pm-7:00pm it is gridlock most of the time which will also effect on the L/1/2 site proposed. The Kingsway will not be big enough to cope another reason is the Nature Reserve just coming back to how is should be.</p> <p>The boundaries between Kidderminster and Stourport are just yards apart known so let's just keep it as it is.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4209</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I object to the destruction of Green Belt and resultant increase in already congested traffic/assoc pollution, where is promised bypass?</li> <li>Poor bus service</li> <li>Schools/Doctors already oversubscribed.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4211</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The field at the top of Kingsway – object strongly mainly on traffic grounds as this is extremely heavy on working and school days.</li> <li>Also the proximity to the nature reserve.</li> <li>Garden Centre and Paddocks.</li> <li>Also traffic concerns and proximity to Ravenhurst Nursing home.</li> <li>Surely there should be a review of need for housing in the area and also the provision of schools, health centres and local hospitals before detailed plans for housing.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4218</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt natural habitat.</li> <li>Lack of health care to support a higher population.</li> <li>Increase in traffic/pollution.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1634</a>	Object	<p>I object to these new developments as collectively the 3 sites would mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also initially affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alienate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes or unable to take in local children them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat: there are sky larks, linnets, and other red-listed birds resting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also have a significant impact in the vast variety of plants and wildlife on Burlish Top nature reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. There is no evidence that there is a short fall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO990</a>	Object	Strongly object to this site being developed. Was part of Burlish Common enclosed in 1820s? Golf course is sporting uses and must be regarded as greenfield. Beyond the Old Worcester Road is Burlish Top Nature Reserve. It is desirable to have a buffer between this and any developed area. Lowland heath is a scarce natural resource and should be protected. Development here would also narrow gap between Stourport and Kidderminster significantly.
	<a href="#">LPPO3323</a>	Object	Many issues if further development along any part of the Kingsway;
	<a href="#">LPPO2961</a>	Object	The Green Belt needs to be protected for the good of the environment and country as a whole. No Green Belt

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>status areas should be up for consideration for housing.</p> <p>LI/2 is too close to Burlish Top Nature Reserve to be used for housing. Housing would pose a significant threat to wildlife.</p> <p>All three proposed sites already have more than enough houses situated in a relatively small area. There is no evidence that this amount of new housing is required in the area, where the population growth is below the national average.</p> <p>I would hope that plans for housing in this area will be restricted to Brownfield sites only, and kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>More housing would inevitably increase the volume of traffic, traffic noise, and pollution to an unacceptable level.</p> <p>The Green Belt is vital to the health and well-being of all of us. The former Wyre Forest Golf Club site was a much appreciated area of peace and quiet. More effort should be made to find a similar use for this land. We do not want to lose any more of our precious, green, open views. The three new school/college buildings have already encroached enough on our open landscape in this area of Stourport</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2980</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and sugar beet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2982</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and sugar beet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3177</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land along The Kingsway and at the back of some of the houses in Torridon Close is not suitable for housing.</li> <li>This field is contaminated with industrial waste which was illegally dumped when the land was used for landfill. Contamination was confirmed when Severn Trent recently surveyed the land with a view to burying the pipeline. They found high levels of contamination and the course of the pipe had to be re-routed.</li> <li>Traffic congestion in the Kingsway leading down to Burlish Crossing is already a problem and with even more cars resulting from a housing development along Kingsway, the congestion would be greatly increased.</li> <li>The amount of traffic in Stourport has increased greatly in recent years due to additional housing and yet the infrastructure has not improved. There have been no additional schools, medical centres, hospitals in the Wyre Forest area and no improvement with the roads to help alleviate traffic, apart from a set of traffic lights at Burlish Crossing. What a difference that made! Over the years promises have been made by MPs to improve traffic problems by introducing a new relief road and bridge, but these promises have never materialised.</li> <li>Stourport is already heavily congested and these traffic problems are increased in the summer months as it is popular with tourists.</li> <li>Rather than improvements to the infrastructure of Stourport, we have witnessed a decrease in our facilities, i.e. Police, Fire Station, Leisure Centre and swimming pool, children's paddling pool in the Memorial Park. These facilities have all been moved to Kidderminster.</li> <li>Although I object to the large housing estates and social housing on Green Belt land in theory I accept that with increased population and immigration there is a need for additional housing. But with increased population in an area, surely the facilities and infrastructure for that area should also be increased to cater for the increased needs of the populace.</li> </ul> <p>I would add that although I am against these concrete jungles taking over Green Belt land, it would appear that Kidderminster would be better placed to accommodate the additional housing, as its infrastructure and facilities are far superior to those in Stourport. In addition, the proposed new road joining the A456 to the A449 would also help alleviate the additional traffic; whereas I believe there are no such new roads proposed for Stourport.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2372</a>	Object	<p>We had not received any notification of these plans which we think is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of Green Belt Land makes a mockery of Green Belt Status, and is a precedent that will affect existing farmland, public access / rights-of-way.</p> <p>Stourport-on-Severn is expected to support the local allocation of houses but while Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring-road and a proposed new road to cope with both housing and extra traffic, Stourport-on-Severn does not have the existing or planned infrastructure to cope and the significant amounts of proposed traffic. This will have knock on environmental effects, and the traffic affecting existing local traffic and emergency service access at peak times.</p> <p>Local schools and NHS services are already stretched; there is no proposal for how this will be dealt with, and will lead to increased class sizes, longer waiting lists or people having to travel outside of the area which will further add traffic to areas where overspill fills the requirements.</p> <p>The plans will lead to a loss of both good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Skylarks, Linnets and other red-listed birds nest in these proposed sites. The use of the Kingsway field will also, we believe, have a significant impact on the diversity of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no evidence that in the Wyre Forest area the shortfall cannot be met by the use of brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport-on-Severn) and sugar beet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2728</a>	Object	<p>LI/2 - Wyre Forest Golf Club - The site is situated next to Burlish Top Nature Reserve, which needs to be protected. There is a strong likely hood that if the area is built upon, the nature reserve would be damaged with increased levels of rubbish. The site being proposed should be used as a buffer zone between development and the natural environment to ensure the protection of designated natural sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2435</a>	Object	<p>I should like to object to the building of houses at Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2). They would mean an additional 331 houses together with the extra cars, in an area that cannot cope now at certain times of the day. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The extra traffic would result in a reduction in air quality and additional noise, plus the unnecessary use of Green Belt land with no provision it seems for medical and educational services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2463</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing development will be likely to increase littering/dumping of household waste.</li> <li>• There are already concerns over anti-social behaviour that takes place on a daily basis and this is likely to worsen. There will also be affects on the local wildlife and damage to their habitat.</li> <li>• Traffic at Burlish crossing during peak times is already the cause of much annoyance to residents.</li> <li>• Increasing the housing population will only make this situation worse and will also increase pollution in the area as well as noise pollution.</li> <li>• The land next to Tesco should be a priority for the council in view of the best interests of the town as it looks bad to people visiting. So why ruin the country side on the edge of town when the centre of town is in clear need of re-development?</li> <li>• The new houses on the old Sugar Beet site are yet to be completed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2109</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the building of houses on Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These roads already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• The noise, emissions of exhaust fumes, getting on and off out drives, when there's no hold ups we have to put up with speeding cars along Kingsway.</li> <li>• Lack of facilities as such GP surgeries, dentists and schools.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing. Only hold ups with woo much traffic, road works or accidents. How ill emergency services cope?</li> <li>• The impact of building houses in Kingsway field would have significant impact on plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Council.
	<a href="#">LPPO449</a>	Object	Object to development on greenfield sites Wyre Forest Golf Club, corner of Kingsway LI/2.
	<a href="#">LPPO681</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Traffic noise.</li> <li>• Crowded doctors and schools.</li> <li>• Nature.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2007</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Further development between Stourport and Kidderminster in the open area should not be permitted to prevent link-up of these two towns.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. Kingsway is already a dangerous road caused by speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will also affect time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. The impact of building houses would have significant impact on vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2035</a>	Object	I object to the development in Kingsway/Lickhill Road areas.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The roads here are not coping with the current amount of traffic esp. at peak times adding more traffic would increase this problem and be dangerous for pedestrians</li> <li>Schools/Doctors surgeries are currently stretched</li> <li>Wildlife/residents will suffer if green spaces lost</li> <li>Other areas/empty properties could be used</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2048</a>	Object	<p>I was unaware of these proposals/deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt/prime agricultural land for food production</li> <li>Preferred option must be brownfield sites.</li> <li>More traffic = more noise/pollution. Plan will compound area's existing traffic problems.</li> <li>GP/dental surgeries/local schools already oversubscribed</li> <li>Negative impact on businesses at top of Lickhill Rd and wild/plant life</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1853</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Belt Status</li> <li>Loss of Rights of ways/walking.</li> <li>Poor Road access down Kingsway to Stourport High School</li> <li>Loss of habitat/plants/wildlife on Burlish Top.</li> </ol> <p>No infrastructure in place around Stourport for increased population/ traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1678</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the plans for building on Wyre Forest Golf club map ref. LI/2.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A loss of Green Belt and precious open land which will affect wildlife populations.</li> <li>The introduction of more traffic on already congested roads (peak periods) i.e. Kingsway, Bewdley Road, Windermere Way.</li> <li>More junctions causing even more traffic chaos.</li> <li>Stourport has already catered for more people. I.e. Tan Lane, Manor Road, Vale Road, which will impact on local</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>facilities such as GPs, dentists, schools etc.</p> <p>5. Stourport is notorious for peak time traffic jams which include Bewdley Road, Kidderminster Road, Hartlebury Road, Worcester Road and Dunley Road often causing gridlock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0682</a>	Object	Proposals for Burlish/Lickhill areas - traffic already at standstill at peak times. Greenfields are all there is to separate 3 different towns. Doctors/dentists - hard to get appointment. Schools - not enough places. Must use existing brownfield sites in Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPP0683</a>	Object	<p>Very concerned about developing sites in the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and Steatite Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing,</li> <li>• Pressure on local schools already at capacity with waiting lists,</li> <li>• Pressure on GP's and NHS dentist,</li> <li>• Retaining Stourport's character and identity,</li> <li>• Threat to wildlife,</li> <li>• Pollution,</li> <li>• Additional traffic and places pressure on road network.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0717</a>	Object	Object to proposals around Burlish
	<a href="#">LPP0723</a>	Object	Development would have significant impact on plants and wildlife habitat. Industrial/brownfield sites should be developed.
	<a href="#">LPP0747</a>	Object	Concerned at loss of Green Belt land so close to Burlish Top. Roads already very busy. Increased pollution from extra traffic will affect nature and young families. Stourport lacks road infrastructure of Kidderminster. Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth.
Barratt Homes West	<a href="#">LPP0796</a>	Object	Wyre Forest Golf Club - only part of site has been assessed in Green Belt assessment so entire site cannot be released. Should be subject to requirements of para.74 of NPPF. No evidence to show the requirements have been

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Midlands			met. Allocation should be removed,
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPP01575</a>	Object	We don't need any more buildings going up in this area. We have enough problems with traffic now coming in and out of Stourport. We don't want our Green Belt spoiled.
	<a href="#">LPP0185</a>	Object	Further to my previous objection comment it must be noted that the field now has a major STW pipeline dissecting it which is not engineered to be built on. The site is also still settling from the many years of infill, up to 15m in the central section. There are several seasonal ponds caused by settlement, these will grow over time as further settlement takes place. Key facts regarding this proposed site have been over looked, when these are taking into consideration it is clear that the site should not be included within the Local Plan
	<a href="#">LPP01668</a>	Object	Stourport has a very poor road network and more houses will worsen, esp. The Kingsway as a country lane
	<a href="#">LPP03807</a>	Support	<p>I support the release of land at site LI/2, subject to significant landscape considerations.</p> <p>The whole of the western edge of Stourport lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. It is appropriate that all settlements make a contribution to the current housing shortages. Even though the LPR commissioned research defines Wyre Forest as a self- sustaining housing market, it does not mean that, in the plan period, this might not change in different economic or transport circumstances. House prices in Wyre Forest compared to other districts in Worcestershire and nearby metropolitan boroughs are significantly lower and the reasons for this might change. The plan makes little provision for this area becoming more attractive because it is so cheap and commuting becomes easier with improved transport- such as new train station and services, as well as an impact because of low carbon technologies- electric cars for example.</p> <p>In relation to site LI /2, a large part of the site is in a visually prominent location and would be only too apparent for a wide local area. A policy of the plan should set out at this stage that only the lower-Lying areas of the site, say to the south of where the pipeline has been laid, should be considered for housing purposes. The visually prominent northern half of the site should be set aside for landscaping and habitat restoration, so as to enhance Burlish Top.</p> <p>Burlish Top is a very well used resource for recreation- cycling and dog walking - and its car park is very cramped- rightly so in order to protect a beautiful and large oak tree. Part of the northern most land could be used to provide</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/2 – WYRE FOREST GOLF CLUB

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a car park for the Wildlife reserve at Burlish Top.</p> <p>However the above aspects need to be set out in the Local Plan at this stage so as to secure appropriate development.</p> <p>In relation to the housing market, site LI/2 could also be designated for use by self-build applicants. Green technologies, design codes, landscaping and materials guidance should also be set out at this stage so prospective developers are aware of the significance/importance of the site, It is an opportunity for the Council to set standards for the future as well as contribute to the housing market in an innovative way.</p> <p>Overall, the plan does not require enough of prospective developers. Some of the sites are significant areas and masterplans, guiding principles and 'green infrastructures' should be required at this stage in the Local Plan and at Outline. Specifying the need for future-proofing designs, layout principles so as to drive uniqueness in landscape, access, housing and open space, as well as providing for housing designs adaptability for future purposes, with regard to new technologies as well as existing green ones, should be made explicit in the Local Plan. It would set a standard that reassures local communities that new areas will add to their betterment in living near to it- it will have direct benefits for them- by green routes connected open spaces and clear identities by block designs and legibility. Such broad principles have to be set out in the Local Plan now so as to be sustainable for the future and deliver excellence where there is already a presumption of approval by NPPG guidance.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1749</a>	Support	<p>Avoid building on Green Belt when you have land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf course L1/2 and the land the runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where the children and parents are in walking distance. Worried about travellers moving on site.</p> <p>Re. Stourport - There is a lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries Dentists and Public Transport in this area. Stourport needs a good public transport infrastructure in place first and a decent and safe cycle path if you are going to increase the amount of houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO727</a>	Support	use land at top of Kingsway for mixed housing and green space



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO4030</a>	Comment	The proposal for development at Lickhill Road North does compromise open land and will, without doubt, add extra pressure to a very busy junction (Burlish Crossing traffic lights) which currently sees regular traffic queues outside residential properties.
	<a href="#">LPPO1895</a>	Comment	LI/6/7 Obviously I am concerned about its effect on the value of my home, and on the Green Belt.  Will the dwellings will be private or council homes. Will their access be from Lickhill Road North? When will construction begin?
	<a href="#">LPPO3389</a>	Comment	An area with no direct public transport into the nearest town, increasing car traffic and air pollution, leaving residents with no alternative means of transport.
	<a href="#">LPPO384</a>	Comment	Re: Lickhill Road North LI/6/7 - Roads around Burlish Crossing are already heavily congested and additional traffic would cause further congestion at the Swan Hotel/High street junction.
	<a href="#">LPPO3511</a>	Object	<p>We strongly object to building houses on the fields at the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road North and on the garden centre and horse paddocks on the Lickhill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be a loss of Green Belt areas, a lot more traffic with higher noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes Stourport has no by-pass and no ring road.</li> <li>• There will be loss of wildlife habitat and impact on a variety of plants.</li> <li>• Loss of productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• More people needing facilities such as school, doctors, dentists etc.</li> </ul> <p>Surely there are a number of brown sites that can be used for a limited number of houses. We certainly object to building on Green Belt areas.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3568</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available.</li> <li>• Inadequate facilities.</li> <li>• We need to safeguard what we have for future generations.</li> <li>• Only doing it for extra council tax and to provide for Birmingham overspill.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO L1/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planners have allowed developments go ahead before without listening to objections.</li> <li>Building companies are to large and have too much money for objections to be noted.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3600</a>	Object	L1/6/7: Kingsway traffic is already busy and noisy. More houses would add to this. The schools could not cope with more pupils doctors/local hospitals are already stretched; we do not need more housing in the area due to lack of infrastructure
	<a href="#">LPPO4207</a>	Object	<p>I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</p> <p>Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3974</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urbanisation, threatening the existing public Rights of Way. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. We think that building would have impact on the vast variety of plant and wildlife.</p> <p>Significant increased traffic on all roads on Bewdley Road North, Burlish Estate and Lickhill Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs which will effect times for emergency services to reach destinations.</p> <p>Traffic noise and higher emission of exhaust fumes with results of higher risk to local residents.</p> <p>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing despite promises of a "by-pass.</p> <p>Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to another area to attend school.</p> <p>Lack of other facilities i.e. GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4043</a>	Object	Garden Centre/Horse Paddocks (L16/7) very small development, give the 'garden centre' the opportunity to move

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			to the already used ground on the Bewdley Road, leaving 'The Paddocks' in situ.
	<a href="#">LPPO662</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even more traffic noise.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• Erosion of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Possibly even more development even nearer to house.</li> <li>• Was never informed of this development – I can not express how strongly we object.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO437</a>	Object	<p>I object to loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</p> <p>The development will significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</p> <p>This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time take for emergency services to reach their destinations.</p> <p>Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</p> <p>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</p> <p>Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</p> <p>Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife habitat there are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</p> <p>There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugar Beet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1988</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Kingsway, Burlish and Lickhill Road due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from large tailbacks.</li> <li>2. Significant impact on facilities e.g. GP surgeries, dentists, hospitals already over burdened.</li> <li>3. Impact on schools – larger class sizes or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to outside area to school.</li> <li>4. Impact on wildlife habitat and Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>5. Lack of bypass to alleviate traffic in Stourport</li> <li>6. Loss of Green Belt status which should protect countryside and protect rights of way.</li> <li>7. No evidence of shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by brownfield sites e.g. Power Station site.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2059</a>	Object	<p>Land Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the traffic increase in already congested area.</li> <li>• Need land for food production post Brexit.</li> <li>• Use brownfield site e.g. near Tesco first.</li> <li>• Build affordable housing near shops/services for people w/o own transport.</li> <li>• Do not take the Green Belt as an easy option</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2064</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way.</li> <li>• Burlish Top Nature Reserve under threat/decrease in wildlife</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of road infrastructure in Stourport/increase in traffic noise/pollution in area/total upgrade of roads in Wyre Forest would be necessary</li> <li>• New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers</li> <li>• Lead to extreme pressure on – schools, doctors, dentists, gas/electricity and water/sewage suppliers</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4038</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic,</li> <li>• Local schools, doctors and dentists are already struggling to cope with existing numbers of occupants in these areas, and a significant increase in the number of houses would lead to an influx in students and patients</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4045</a>	Object	<p>Re; Kingsway/Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road housing plans.</p> <p>I wish to state my objection to any of these housing plans. The roads on Burlish/Lickhill and Bewdley Road are already being used as rat runs when Stourport is at gridlock, which is now a daily occurrence and can't cope with any more traffic never mind the population with the inevitable building of houses. Stourport has no other roads in order to alleviate or divert traffic. If there is a requirement for housing needs there can be met in the area of the dual carriageway, where there is unused land or land being used to put yet more industrial units on, which either lie un-let or are not necessity or added value to the area.</p> <p>Green Belt is Green Belt and we have so little of it, or peaceful areas to walk and ride horses and feel safe and the wildlife will be destroyed, particularly at Burlish Top.</p> <p>Houses mean requirements for schools and doctors and dentists and we are already at overflow point with all of there. If you want to encourage tourism and welcome visitors to Stourport, let's keep the bit of beauty we have left. Thank you.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4053</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increase in housing will bring more traffic, noise and air pollution.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion need to be addressed in Stourport.</li> <li>Doctors will not be able to cope with more patients.</li> <li>Plans need to be put in place to alleviate these problems before any developments go ahead.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4069</a>	Object	I object to LI/5 because of already heavy traffic in area and already busy facilities e.g. Drs would not cope
	<a href="#">LPPO3570</a>	Object	Object. This area in the proposal is obviously Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3586</a>	Object	<p>I wish to make my comments and raise objections to the plans affecting all age groups living in the vicinity of these three areas.</p> <p>My list as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl and threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>Significantly increase of traffic on all roads in Burlish Park, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times suffers significantly from long tailbacks at present.</li> <li>This increase will inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach the residents. Not to forget, for us, non car drivers, the appalling bus service that already exists and will certainly not improve the situation (already difficult getting to appointments).</li> <li>The erosion of what makes Wyre Forest special, the three towns keeping their separate identities.</li> <li>GP surgeries and dentists will struggle to cope with such an influx of patients.</li> <li>As an ex teacher, schools will definitely suffer – they are not big enough to cope – class sizes will increase and it will be back to mobile classrooms and lack of parking for parents picking up their children – adding to the traffic chaos.</li> <li>The wonderful addition we have of Burlish Nature Reserve will be affected by loss of wildlife. There are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields and rare plant species too. These spaces are all too rare and must be cherished.</li> <li>Surely there are many brownfield sites that can be utilised within Wyre Forest. Once again Stourport-on-Severn comes out worst affected.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster a ring road but Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic.</li> <li>My objections are not of the 'in my backyard' syndrome but a plea for an already over crowded little town not to grow anymore. We do not have the infrastructure to grow further and let us keep the cherished parts of put town that make it a place we want to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3596</a>	Object	Object
	<a href="#">LPPO3604</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I object to the proposal</li> <li>Kingsway is already a very road between Kidderminster to Bewdley with speeding issues</li> <li>The proposal will impact on schools, doctors/dentists and wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3661</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status. The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected.</p> <p>Traffic at ALL times of the day is extremely busy. An extra 300+ properties centred around this area without additional major roads included in your plans will be very foolhardy</p> <p>The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity. GP's, Dentists and all local schools will not be able to cope!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3399</a>	Object	Need to protect Green Belt; loss of habitat, increased traffic, pollution, schools full, doctors would not be able to cope, no evidence to justify building on Green Belt
	<a href="#">LPPO1656</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>Increase in traffic/pollution</li> <li>Stourport is already a bottleneck</li> <li>Local amenities – schools/GP Surgeries full.</li> <li>Use brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO3414</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can't see justification for building at Burlish crossing:</li> <li>• Lack of roads/schools and doctors/dentists already busy</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3047</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly object to loss of Green Belt status.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Object to the increase in road noise and extra pollution from exhaust fumes.</li> <li>• Stourport does not have ring road or by pass like Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Will more schools, GP and dental surgeries be built?</li> <li>• Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO663</a>	Object	Object to proposed allocations
	<a href="#">LPPO2622</a>	Object	Building houses here would increase commuter traffic through the known congestion points in Kidderminster or Stourport in order to access the main arterial route. The sites are too far away from town centres.
	<a href="#">LPPO2704</a>	Object	If LI/6/7 goes ahead the traffic situation will become even more horrendous leading to public safety and environmental impacts of untenable proportion.
	<a href="#">LPPO2021</a>	Object	We don't want any building on Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2070</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the sewers be able to cope with the extra quantity generated by 80 homes?</li> <li>• Will the water supply be sufficient to cope with these extra 80 homes or will the current houses suffer from pressure supply drop.</li> <li>• Current the traffic builds up, pass the junction of the Kingsway and Elan Avenue with an extra 80 homes, say 120 cars. This will get worse and take longer to clear up, down passed Windermere Way onto Burlish</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Crossing traffic lights.
	<a href="#">LPPO2083</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of brownfield not Green Belt land</li> <li>• Proposed plans would increase of traffic, pollution, medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Don't let profit be the major factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4204</a>	Object	Object to LI/6/7.
	<a href="#">LPPO1836</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects.</li> <li>• Local facilities inadequate.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4205</a>	Object	<p>My objection is that the road and infrastructure cannot cope with anymore traffic on the Bewdley Road and crossroads at lights between 7:00-9:30am and 3:00pm-7:00pm it is gridlock most of the time which will also effect on the L/1/2 site proposed. The Kingsway will not be big enough to cope another reason is the Nature Reserve just coming back to how is should be.</p> <p>The boundaries between Kidderminster and Stourport are just yards apart known so let's just keep it as it is.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3995</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>area to attend school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugar Beet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4015</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugar Beet Factory</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			(Kidderminster).
	<a href="#">LPPO4071</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt/wildlife.</li> <li>2. more traffic/junctions on roads already congested at peak times</li> <li>3. Stourport has already increased population</li> <li>4. Impact on GPs, dentists, schools etc.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3074</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road is very busy not only with cars belonging to the residents between Burlish crossroads and Stourport town but also it is used as a bypass to avoid the one way system for areas over the bridge.</li> <li>• I really don't think that the space between the Scout Hut and Ravenhurst Rest Home is big enough for 90 houses, there are only 16 or so on this side of the road opposite to the field so it must be a very dense development with small houses and close together.</li> <li>• There is also a pipeline running across the middle of the field that was put in 30 years or more ago</li> <li>• Public transport can be difficult.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3324</a>	Object	<p>Sites L1/6/7 Lickhill Road North represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. The volume of traffic has increased substantially in the past 7 years, to the point where it can be difficult to leave our property. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements.</p> <p>The increased traffic Burlish Top to the main Kidderminster - Stourport road represents a real safety hazard particularly to children at Stourport High School and users of the sports facilities. The road is very narrow and would not support increased traffic.</p> <p>Other core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will also increase the traffic at Burlish</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			lights, I don't see how development at L1/6/7 can be integrated into the area with adequate transport facilities for both existing and new residents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3341</a>	Object	Proposals for Burlish/Lickhill areas - traffic already at standstill at peak times. Greenfields are all there is to separate 3 different towns. Doctors/dentists - hard to get appointment. Schools - not enough places.
	<a href="#">LPPO3344</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very concerned about developing sites in the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and Steatite Way.</li> <li>• Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing,</li> <li>• Pressure on local schools already at capacity with waiting lists,</li> <li>• Pressure on GP's and NHS dentist,</li> <li>• Retaining Stourport's character and identity,</li> <li>• Threat to wildlife,</li> <li>• Pollution,</li> <li>• Additional traffic and places pressure on road network</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3384</a>	Object	Object to proposals around Burlish
	<a href="#">LPPO3395</a>	Object	Concerned at loss of Green Belt land so close to Burlish Top. Roads already very busy. Increased pollution from extra traffic will affect nature and young families. Stourport lacks road infrastructure of Kidderminster. Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth.
	<a href="#">LPPO3422</a>	Object	<p>I object to these new developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt /existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Increase in already bad traffic</li> <li>• Affect on emergency services</li> <li>• Increase in traffic noise/ fumes health risk</li> <li>• No Stourport by pass</li> <li>• Lack of facilities e.g. GP surgeries, schools and dentists</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat and productive agricultural land.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use brownfield first</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3490</a>	Object	<p>Asking if there is evidence to prove that more housing is really needed. Is the population really increasing and are there really not enough Brownfield sites?</p> <p>Asking if there will be any increase in bus services, doctor's surgeries, schools and policing because they do not believe current support services will cope with a growing population.</p> <p>Questioning the rationale behind building more houses and if it's simply to make more money for the Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3518</a>	Object	<p>We object to the collective three sites (referred to figures stated above) being the subject of new developments. When there are a number of Brownfield sites that should take priority over Green Belt sites. We all heartily support the 10 points of objections put forward by the Burlish &amp; Lickhill Green friends against these proposals.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3520</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/6/7 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Est., Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> <li>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3603</a>	Object	<p>I was unaware of these proposals/deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt/prime agricultural land for food production</li> <li>Preferred option must be brownfield sites.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More traffic = more noise/pollution. Plan will compound area's existing traffic problems.</li> <li>• GP/dental surgeries/local schools already oversubscribed</li> <li>• Negative impact on businesses at top of Lickhill Rd and wild/plant life</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3651</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools.</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3653</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on local roads = more noise/fumes</li> <li>3. Kingsway already subject to speeding</li> <li>4. Impact on capacity of schools, GPs, dentists</li> <li>5. Loss of wildlife and agricultural land</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3660</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposed plan due to the loss of Green Belt when there are areas that are empty buildings in Kidderminster than can be used to more effect.</li> <li>2. There isn't enough spaces in schools as there is</li> <li>3. It takes too long to get any GP, dentists</li> <li>4. The road network now struggles with the demand of vehicles let alone extra carbon footprint emissions.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO3708</a>	Object	<p>Without more houses being built there are traffic jams every weekday early morning, mid afternoon and early evening in Kingsway, Windermere Way, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. There are also traffic problems outside the schools in Kingsway/Windermere Way with the school run vehicles and Kingsway is also used as a shortcut for lorries (Talbot largest culprit) and at times when the A451 Kidderminster Road is blocked because the town roads are blocked with traffic.</p> <p>More cars means more pollution, will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles and poor public transport adding to number of cars on the road.</p> <p>The compulsory purchase of a Care Home in Lickhill Road (another kick in the teeth for the elderly of the area), loss of a business and peoples horse riding hobby.</p> <p>Nearest doctors are based in Stourport. They will not cope with the extra numbers of patients. Are there enough places available at the schools?</p> <p>Until the council can come up with a plan and the funds to improve the roads and facilities in the Burlish, Lickhill and Kingsway area of Stourport, the idea of building houses as should be scrapped.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3714</a>	Object	<p>We had not received any notification of these plans which we think is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of Green Belt Land makes a mockery of Green Belt Status, and is a precedent that will affect existing farmland, public access / rights-of-way.</p> <p>Stourport-on-Severn is expected to support the local allocation of houses but while Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring-road and a proposed new road to cope with both housing and extra traffic, Stourport-on-Severn does not have the existing or planned infrastructure to cope and the significant amounts of proposed traffic. This will have knock on environmental effects, and the traffic affecting existing local traffic and emergency service access at peak times.</p> <p>Local schools and NHS services are already stretched; there is no proposal for how this will be dealt with, and will</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>lead to increased class sizes, longer waiting lists or people having to travel outside of the area which will further add traffic to areas where overspill fills the requirements.</p> <p>The plans will lead to a loss of both good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Skylarks, Linnets and other red-listed birds nest in these proposed sites. The use of the Kingsway field will also, we believe, have a significant impact on the diversity of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no evidence that in the Wyre Forest area the shortfall cannot be met by the use of brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport-on-Severn) and Sugar Beet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3727</a>	Object	<p>I should like to object to the building of houses at Lickhill Road North (LI/6/7). They would mean an additional 331 houses together with the extra cars, in an area that cannot cope now at certain times of the day. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The extra traffic would result in a reduction in air quality and additional noise, plus the unnecessary use of Green Belt land with no provision it seems for medical and educational services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2270</a>	Object	<p>Our wonderful view has already been ruined by a thick hedge which darkens our lounge. If houses are then put along there which we were assured was Green Belt land and would never be built on, we will also lose the remaining view from our bedroom window.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4220</a>	Object	<p>Stourport has a very poor road network at present and more houses will only add to the problems. The Kingsway in particular is a country lane and the plans for LI/2 will create more traffic on an already dangerous road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2907</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to this site being used.</li> <li>• It is a greenfield site.</li> <li>• Greenfield sites are subject to Green Belt status - should not be concreted or tarmacked over.</li> <li>• Traffic from site will create more congestion on an already busy road.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1881</a>	Object	Object LI/6/7
	<a href="#">LPPO2024</a>	Object	<p>The two reasons for my objection are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More houses mean more people and more cars which mean more fumes which is bad for health.</li> <li>Bewdley Road can't cope with more cars at peak times morning/evening. There are already queues from the lights at Burlish traffic light, some very long.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2112</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Belt land must be protected at all costs.</li> <li>Doctors and Dentists will find it difficult to cope with extra people.</li> <li>More schools will be needed and that will mean more transport on our roads. Traffic is very noisy already on our roads so the increase will make it worse.</li> <li>Emergency services will find it difficult at busy times on our roads.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3559</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More houses=more cars – already busy crossroads/increased traffic.</li> <li>No infrastructure is in place around Stourport for increased population/traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3598</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing public rights of way.</li> <li>Further development between Stourport and Kidderminster in the open area should not be permitted to</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>prevent link-up of these two towns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. Kingsway is already a dangerous road caused by speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will also affect time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. The impact of building houses would have significant impact on vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3599</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt areas.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill and Bewdley Road, (this has a massive impact on us all).</li> <li>• Health risks from traffic.</li> <li>• Increase in school places and classes getting bigger.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries, emergency services.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Use sites such as old brownfield sites</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3602</a>	Object	<p>I object to the development in Kingsway/Lickhill Road areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads here are not coping with the current amount of traffic esp. at peak times adding more traffic would increase this problem and be dangerous for pedestrians</li> <li>• Schools/Doctors surgeries are currently stretched</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife/residents will suffer if green spaces lost</li> <li>• Other areas/empty properties could be used</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3650</a>	Object	<p>The noise, emissions of exhaust fumes, getting on and off out drives, when there's no hold ups we have to put up with speeding cars along Kingsway.</p> <p>Lack of facilities as such GP surgeries, dentists and schools.</p> <p>Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing. Only hold ups with too much traffic, road works or accidents. How ill emergency services cope?</p> <p>The impact of building houses in Kingsway field would have significant impact on plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3713</a>	Object	<p>Object Kingsway/Burlish crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic congestion, noise pollution/fumes</li> <li>• Burlish top nature reserve would be ruined/wildlife lost</li> <li>• Capacity of NHS services/Drs/dentists/schools and access by emergency services.</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to cope with extra traffic e.g. a bypass</li> <li>• Don't build on the agricultural land instead do something for the community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3725</a>	Object	<p>My objection centres around the building of houses under Option B, specifically relating to Burlish Crossing. The provision of 157 houses on the site when coupled to the core sites of Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2) and Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7) would mean an additional 331 houses, perhaps 600 extra cars, in an area that struggles at</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>times to cope with the volume of traffic currently. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The resultant reduction in air quality, additional noise pollution and increased damage to road surfaces would lead to further strain on local medical and other community services, protracted response times from emergency services and increased dangers to pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>Without adequate provision for additional schools, medical facilities and other community services I believe this option to be ill conceived.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3733</a>	Object	<p>Although I don't strongly agree with any of the options available but do strongly contest the Core development areas in the Burlish/ Lickhill areas, I do understand, just from the basic maths, that there is a need for additional housing within the district. However, I have raised my main concerns above to highlight the obvious issues that I assume someone within the Planning Policy Team has already considered.</p> <p>Following the drop-in and after having reviewed the documents again online I have a few points/queries to make, in particular in respect of the Core housing sites in the Burlish/Kingsway and Lickhill areas of Stourport and also the Option B sites, in particular the one at Burlish Crossing:</p> <p>In respect of the sites highlighted for Option B (especially within the Burlish/Lickhill area) I have a few concerns which I'd like to raise:</p> <p>- Road networks and traffic - Both of the core housing sites at Lickhill and the Kingsway along with the Option B site at LI/5 would have a detrimental effect on the congestion within the local area. These three sites would potentially mean 331 new homes could be built within a 1/4 of a mile of each other, thus raising the concern that there could be potentially 331 more vehicles using the 3 main roads in this area being Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road and The Kingsway. Currently, even without these additional houses, the traffic at Burlish Crossings is already a complete nightmare and inconvenience for all commuters going to/from work and/or school. With these additional (potential) developments I can only assume that this congestion will continue to become a more</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>difficult problem to solve.</p> <p>- Roads networks and safety - Similarly these additional vehicles will be using roads which are direct links to the High School and several primary schools within the area, which surely raises a safety concern? Should we be encouraging increased use of The Kingsway, Windermere Way and Lickhill Road given the number of children who use those routes to school every day? Also, if these sites in particular were to be developed where would the access to those 'estates' be? I would assume accessing a large housing development from any of these roads would mean that traffic systems would need to be put in place to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike - would this mean more traffic due to signalling on top of the expected increased in vehicle numbers?</p> <p>- Road networks/ The Bridge - it probably goes without saying that the traffic issues on the Stourport Bridge are already a major problem for the town. The Option B sites, in their vastness, backing onto the Areley Kings area of Stourport would only add to this problem. I have been informed that if a developer were to buy this land then a second bridge and supporting roads would be built - what would the impact of this buildings works be on the town's road infrastructure in the meantime? Also, where would that bridge be located and what would the environmental impacts of that development be?</p> <p>- Schools - The schools within the Burlish and Lickhill vicinity are already over-subscribed each year with many children being rejected from their first choice (and quite often most local) primary school. From the Plan document I can see that there are several options available to deal with the potential increase in children within the area, however 0.5FE proposals are almost a complete waste of time as sustaining a structure within a primary school with an additional 0.5FE is almost impossible with the current funding cuts being made by central government. What 0.5FE increase would do, would be to unnecessarily force joint year group teaching in order to deliver efficient and break-even budgets. Your education team will well know that this is not the most effective way of delivering the curriculum and could also have negative effects on future OFSTED ratings, particularly if pressure is going to be put on to teaching staff to deliver to larger group of pupils. This is one of the easiest ways to make Stourport a less attractive town of choice as parents currently have the knowledge that primary schools within these areas are OFSTED good or outstanding! Similarly, 1FE primary schools are as difficult to sustain, especially within such areas where the majority of students receive only basic funding but the normal costs of running a school still have to be met. Have governors of all local primary schools been informed of the suggestions</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>within the plan so that they can think about succession planning if any of these sites were to be developed? Would their budgets be able to handle any potential changes? Where would a new development for a 1FE school be situated if this were the route that was taken in Stourport, I would assume it would be in the over-subscribed areas? If so, Green Belt?</p> <p>- Medical centres - As above for schools. Local medical centres, surgeries and hospitals are already working to capacity - would residents then be expected to travel longer distances into Kidderminster to seek medical attention? Would Kidderminster Hospital A&amp;E department be re-instated by the time all of the development is complete and these 5,400 dwelling have been built?</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly object to the sites that have been included in the Core housing plans and Option B which would so strongly affect the Burlish and Lickhill areas of Stourport for all of the above mentioned reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3986</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed use for the area LI/6/7 Stourport-on-Severn, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status. Our Green areas need to be protected at all costs, for existing &amp; future residents, and for the good of the environment and country as a whole. No Green Belt status areas should be up for consideration for housing.</p> <p>Overcrowding. All three of these proposed sites already have more than enough houses situated within a relatively small area. From what I have read, it would seem there is no evidence that this amount of new housing is required in the Wyre Forest area, where the population growth is below the national average.</p> <p>I would hope that plans for housing in this area will be restricted to Brownfield sites only, and kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution. The Burlish Estate/Kingsway/Lickhill roads are more than busy enough as things are. More housing would inevitably increase the volume of traffic, traffic noise, and pollution to an unacceptable level for these areas.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Quality of life. Green, unspoilt areas are vital to the health and well-being of all of us. We do not want to lose any more of our precious, green, open views. The three new school/college buildings have already encroached enough on our open landscape in this area of Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO1649</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt natural habitat.</li> <li>2. Lack of health care to support a higher population.</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic/pollution.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1759</a>	Object	<p>Opposes development sites L1/6/7, L1/5/ AKR/14, AKR/15.</p> <p>Believes that development will have a negative impact on people living in these areas as the values of their properties will drop because it will affect their outlook.</p> <p>Also concerned about traffic increase on Lickhill Lower, Lickhill and Lickhill North roads. Very busy during school run and speeding during weekends already an issue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1814</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to any more development around Lickhill Road North due to the number of road accidents and speeding.</li> <li>• Concerned about noise and air pollution as a result of increased traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1846</a>	Object	<p>We have recently moved from a busy urban to a rural environment. Why build on Green Belt Land when there is brown belt land available.</p> <p>There isn't the infrastructure to cope with extra traffic or sufficient capacity in local schools and already stretched GP Surgeries.</p> <p>Any housing shortfall in Wyre Forest can be taken up in other areas with existing infrastructure.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4219</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no bus routes, more cars will be needed to take children to already overcrowded schools</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing traffic issues esp. at school times in Lickhill Road/Windermere Way</li> <li>If there is no play area on the estate children will play in streets which could result in an accident</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3338</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>Increase in traffic.</li> <li>Traffic noise.</li> <li>Crowded doctors and schools.</li> <li>Nature.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3332</a>	Object	I object to development on greenfield sites Lickhill Road North LI/6/7.
	<a href="#">LPPO2698</a>	Object	<p>Houses being built in Lickhill Road North (LI/6/7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic will lead to more road noise, pollution &amp; congestion. Where will the entrance and exits be? Causing potential risk of accidents.</li> <li>Schools already full with lack of places for children. Where will the new house residents' children go?</li> <li>The land is already owned and being used for its intended purpose, where horses are kept and grazing. Why take this away?</li> <li>Road surface not suitable for extra traffic and also already as a lack deterrent for speeding, something that would need to be tackled if it was to go ahead.</li> <li>If it wasn't for local groups making residents aware of this, very few people would be aware.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2107</a>	Object	<p>Objections to Lickhill Road North.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very busy road, traffic would be worse</li> <li>Traffic noise/exhaust fumes health risk</li> <li>Loss of Green Belt status</li> </ol>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO2138</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic noise and pollution</li> <li>• Removal of agricultural land have an impact on the wildlife in the area</li> <li>• Building of houses behind property will reduce value of her home.</li> <li>• Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1983</a>	Object	<p>Objects to Burlish and Lickhill development:</p> <p>We object to any development on the Green Belt land and Greenfield sites.</p> <p>There is more than sufficient despoiled land and brownfield sites to accommodate having development – it is vital that Green Belt land is not developed in anyway.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2065</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will add to traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites by Tesco store first.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1909</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley Road North is already a very busy road so more building would cause mayhem.</li> <li>• Local government said there would be more building on brownfield sites not on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1850</a>	Object	<p>I object, on the grounds of loss of Green Belt areas/agricultural land, the increase in traffic/(noise) and the loss/impact any development would have on wildlife, to plans to develop the field at the top of Kingsway that runs parallel with Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North and the area currently a garden centre/horse paddocks on Lickhill Road.</p> <p>Development here would also increase class sizes (which are already high) and impact on the quality of education in local schools. Why can't these developments be built on brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1804</a>	Object	Green Belt

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO1675</a>	Object	<p>The field at the top of Kingsway – object strongly mainly on traffic grounds as this is extremely heavy on working and school days. Also the proximity to the nature reserve.</p> <p>Garden Centre and Paddocks.</p> <p>Also traffic concerns and proximity to Ravenhurst Nursing home.</p> <p>Surely there should be a review of need for housing in the area and also the provision of schools, health centres and local hospitals before detailed plans for housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO608</a>	Object	<p>Enough congestion along Bewdley Road North around the traffic lights as it is. Schools and doctors in the town cannot cope with extra families that are proposed.</p>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO799</a>	Object	<p>Lickhill Road North - lies outside settlement boundary in Green Belt. Has been allocated ahead of suitable/sustainable non-Green Belt sites adjacent to settlement edge. No exceptional circumstances.</p>
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO1576</a>	Object	<p>We don't need any more buildings going up in this area. We have enough problems with traffic now coming in and out of Stourport. We don't want our Green Belt spoiled.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1666</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the increase in already congested traffic/assoc pollution, where is promised bypass?</li> <li>2. Poor bus service</li> <li>3. Schools/Doctors already oversubscribed.</li> </ol>
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">LPPO1960</a>	Support	<p>To the North of the site there is a well established line of trees which will assist in controlling development in this direction but also assist to mitigate the visual impact of the development from public places such as traffic approaching Stourport via Bewdley Road North / Blackstone. Appropriate landscaping can be secured, in the planning process to assist in mitigating the impact of the proposal when viewed from the River Severn to the West. Such planting would enhance the biodiversity of the proposals and assist in creating habitat as a result of the development. The site as it currently stands is highly trafficked and of low ecological value. The remainder of</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>the site is grassland which is grazed which again will be of low ecological value.</p> <p>The site at Lickhill Road North would be preferable to Option B (LI/5) as it restricts development moving towards Blackstone. We have had approaches from developers, and promoters, and in that regard (subject to the relevant planning consents) the site is deliverable within the required time-scales for the local plan.</p> <p>Objectors may comment on the inability of the road network to cope with the increase in housing numbers on the area and out into Lickhill Road North. This is clearly a concern with all developments, however, realistically none of the road networks in the district were ever designed to take the increase in housing which we have seen over the last few decades. It is for this reason, amongst others, that there is an emphasis <i>on</i> reduction on the use of the private car and a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF.</p> <p>The site has a choice of routes out to Kidderminster, Bewdley and two routes to Stourport Town assisting and there are bus links within a few hundred meters walking distance from the site. Overall the site has good highway access and visibility in both directions. There are also water, electricity and sewage pipes in close proximity which, subject to approval from the relevant suppliers. There are footpath and pavement links to a number of nature reserves. Within the local area there are schools, community centres, a sports ground and a park as well as local services within walking and cycling distance.</p> <p>Overall this site is one which represents a sustainable location for development, on a site which has been partially developed previously which can be removed from the Green Belt with minimal impact or impacts which could successfully be mitigated.</p> <p>This site would create a good boost to local housing supply as well as a viable scheme for a developer assisting its delivery.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3804</a>	Support	<p>I support the release of land at site LI/6/7, subject to significant landscape considerations.</p> <p>The whole of the western edge of Stourport, lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. It is appropriate that all settlements make a contribution to the current housing shortages. Even though the LPR</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO LI/6/7 – LICKHILL ROAD NORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>commissioned research defines Wyre Forest as a self-sustaining housing market, it does not mean that, in the plan period, this might not change in different economic or transport circumstances. House prices in Wyre Forest compared to other districts in Worcestershire and nearby metropolitan boroughs are significantly lower and the reasons for this might change. The plan makes little provision for this area becoming more attractive because it is so cheap and commuting becomes easier with improved transport- such as new train station and services, as well as an impact because of low carbon technologies- electric cars for example.</p> <p>Site LI/6 seems under-used agricultural land with a marginally viable garden centre as an unattractive interface between urban and rural landscapes. Again, requiring a significant contribution to green infrastructure and technologies at this slightly elevated would help the development blend into the landscape context.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO726</a>	Support	Use garden centre site for mixed housing with green space

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/1 – BRIDGE STREET BASINS

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPO3701</a>	Comment	It is surprising to note the proposal to build 17 houses at the old Lloyd's garage site in Bridge St, Stourport. When council tax payers' money was used to compulsory purchase this site it was for the intention of transforming it into an attractive entrance to the Basins, thus enhancing Stourport as a tourist destination. There was no mention of housing at the time. Once again this would seem to contradict the Council's stated aim to increase developments in Stourport "which focus on tourism, particularly capitalising on the historic canal basins ..." (LPR; section 6 p34)
	<a href="#">LPO2102</a>	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AKR/1 – site set aside to access to the canal basins - claw back cost if not?</li> <li>• Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</li> <li>• Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food &amp; entertainment.</li> </ul>
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPO1299</a>	Comment	Following agreement with Advantage West Midlands this site was set aside to provide improved access to the basins' area. Any attempt to develop it for housing will result in a demand for "claw back" from the successor body to Advantage West Midlands.
	<a href="#">LPO2620</a>	Support	Should be developed for mixed use - residential with retail. The retail units would complement and enhance the existing retail units within the town.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/2 - CHEAPSIDE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO3409</a>	Comment	Some sites are not being brought forward for development by allegedly unrealistic assumptions of development value by the landowners. The Council might wish to consider Planning or Regeneration CPO powers to bring such landowners to a realistic expectation of land value. Cost and risk of promoting a CPO would need to be considered as part of a scheme being brought forward.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO3404</a>	Object	AKR/2 – Cheapside – Part of site is subject to flood risk. Framework makes it clear that development should be directed to sites within Flood Zone 1 before sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Site should be removed and an alternative site with a lower risk of flooding allocated for development. Site not currently available. Needs evidence that the site should not be protected for employment purposes before a mixed use allocation is pursued.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO800</a>	Object	Cheapside - part of site at risk of flooding. Development should be directed to sites of lower flood risk first. Site should be removed. Part of site also occupied and thus not currently available. There needs to be clear evidence that the site should not be protected for employment purposes before a mixed use allocation is pursued.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1445</a>	Object	Cheapside - part of site at risk of flooding. Development should be directed to sites of lower flood risk first. Site should be removed. Part of site also occupied and thus not currently available. There needs to be clear evidence that the site should not be protected for employment purposes before a mixed use allocation is pursued.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/7 – SWAN HOTEL

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPO236</a>	Comment	The whole of the Swan/Workmen's Club site is indicated, I was told that this represents land ownership and the whole site is not affected. As indicated two successful enterprises are to be removed including a property locally listed. This needs significant clarification to indicate the areas involved. Whilst applauding the use of brownfield rather than greenfield sites this particular proposal removes an edge of town employment opportunity in Parsons Chain site. The town has little employment with the exception of retail outlets.
Sport England	<a href="#">LPO3312</a>	Comment	Swan Hotel/Workmen's Club: this site appears to include a bowling green
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPO1300</a>	Comment	<p>The partial loss of Vale Road car park has put pressure on parking in the town centre. This affects both shopping provision, viability of local businesses and the night-time economy.</p> <p>The Workmen's Club and adjacent Bowling Club are important social centres for the town and host a range of activities which require provision of adequate car parking. Some local business people have contract parking on this site.</p> <p>We are curious as to how development of this site would improve the frontage on Lickhill Road which is narrow and has a number of difficult junctions.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO3612</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AKR/7 – Swan/workmen's club/bowling green are important social centres with car parking which should be maintained.</li> <li>• Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</li> <li>• Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food &amp; entertainment.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPO3711</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AKR/7 Swan Hotel/Workmens' Club - Regeneration of The Swan Hotel has been a success and should remain</li> <li>• Housing would worsen already congested traffic in town centre</li> <li>• No walking access to rail links or reliable bus service at present</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/7 – SWAN HOTEL

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02643</a>	Object	We would like to comment on the proposed compulsory purchase of the workmen's club in Stourport. This club has been well established for several decades, and has a thriving membership. To pursue a compulsory purchase on this site would not only deprive the people of Stourport with an important place of relaxation, but would also put several people out of work and should therefore be removed by WFDC from any compulsory purchase or future residential development plans
	<a href="#">LPP02616</a>	Object	I do not agree with compulsory purchase of the Swan Hotel as Robert Plant and Worley's Strings have invested a lot of money doing it up and it is an asset to the town in its current state.
Stourport Workmen's Club	<a href="#">LPP01547</a>	Object	<p>Stourport Workmen's Club Management Committee wish to register our protest in the strongest terms against the stated intention of Wyre Forest District Council to compulsory purchase our club and to replace it with twenty dwellings.</p> <p>Stourport Workmen's Club is one of the oldest established private clubs in Worcestershire with over 700 members and a dominant social hub of Stourport. It is used by Stourport Civic Society, RAOB and as an Election Polling Station.</p> <p>Presently, there is a rising tide of resentment and anger amongst Stourport residents about their perception of many of WFDC's actions disposing in favour of Kidderminster, with Stourport being ignored or treated as a poor relative.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0674</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of the "Stourport Workmans Club"</p> <p>Used as venue for wide variety of social occasions.</p> <p>Why consider this site when the site at the "Bond Worth" former factory has been lying idle for so many years?</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3550</a>	Comment	AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth site to be used for housing before AKR/14 Pearl Lane or AKR/15 Rectory Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO3221</a>	Comment	On the site of the large Tesco stores in Stourport there was supposed to be houses allocated, this is an area that would be worth reviewing again.
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO1259</a>	Comment	Some sites are not being brought forward for development by allegedly unrealistic assumptions of development value by the landowners. The Council might wish to consider Planning or Regeneration CPO powers to bring such landowners to a realistic expectation of land value. Cost and risk of promoting a CPO would need to be considered as part of a scheme being brought forward.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO3405</a>	Object	AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth –site had planning permission for 159 units which lapsed. Is site suitable and deliverable? The allocation should be removed from the plan
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1446</a>	Object	Carpets of Worth - planning permission has lapsed which calls into question suitability and deliverability of site. Allocation should be removed.
	<a href="#">LPPO2228</a>	Object	<p>Objects to AKR/20 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The access road, off Severn Road/Discovery Road is only very narrow and struggles to cope with traffic at the present time. Will this be widened for the redevelopment?</li> <li>2. There will be a large increase in footfall of people wanting to get from Cheapside into the High Street area of town. At the moment, a large number of walking groups, motorbikes, quad bikes, push bikes and even horses come through Waters Edge, which is a private development, even though there is a public Right of Way, running parallel only a couple of metres away.</li> <li>3. A number of residents of Waters Edge are very unhappy about the “traffic” coming through Waters Edge a moment, as, because it is a private development, we as owners are responsible for the cost of repairing the roadway, pavements, etc. It is NOT a Public Right of Way!!! The Public Right of Way should be highlighted by signs and the Water’s Edge development should have a gate erected on its entrance off</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Mart Lane, to stop the “traffic”. Our concerns are that this “traffic” will increase hugely with the Cheapside redevelopment. How can we get a gate erected?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The development of the land by Tesco, again for housing. The roadway that comes from Tesco on to Severn Road gets very congested. I have seen the Tesco car park at total grid-lock on many weekends. The traffic lights at the Severn Road and Mitton junction cause a back up of traffic along Severn Road, right past Tesco and round the bend towards the new River Stour crossing. This means no one can get out of Tesco!! More houses will exacerbate these issues. The road from Tesco should have been built with a filter lane to the left, so that traffic wanting to go left could get out. What will be done about this?</li> <li>5. The junction of Discovery Road with the Worcester Road. Again, more thought should have gone into this. Traffic lights or a mini roundabout need to be erected to keep the traffic flowing. You can wait up to 5 minutes trying to get out of Discovery Road to turn right onto the Worcester Road at peak times and weekends.</li> <li>6. What provisions are there going to be made for the occupants of the new housing all over Stourport for schools and Doctors Surgeries?</li> <li>7. There is reference to building an Eastern By-pass for Kidderminster, but what about a by-pass for Stourport? The whole town grinds to a standstill on good weekends, holiday times and peak times.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2229</a>	Object	<p>Objects to AKR/20 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The access road, off Severn Road/Discovery Road is only very narrow and struggles to cope with traffic at the present time. Will this be widened for the redevelopment?</li> <li>2. There will be a large increase in footfall of people wanting to get from Cheapside into the High Street area of town. At the moment, a large number of walking groups, motorbikes, quad bikes, push bikes and even horses come through Waters Edge, which is a private development, even though there is a public Right of</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Way, running parallel only a couple of metres away.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. A number of residents of Waters Edge are very unhappy about the “traffic” coming through Waters Edge a moment, as, because it is a private development, we as owners are responsible for the cost of repairing the roadway, pavements, etc. It is NOT a Public Right of Way!!! The Public Right of Way should be highlighted by signs and the Water’s Edge development should have a gate erected on its entrance off Mart Lane, to stop the “traffic”. Our concerns are that this “traffic” will increase hugely with the Cheapside redevelopment. How can we get a gate erected?</li> <li>4. The development of the land by Tesco, again for housing. The roadway that comes from Tesco on to Severn Road gets very congested. I have seen the Tesco car park at total grid-lock on many weekends. The traffic lights at the Severn Road and Mitton junction cause a back up of traffic along Severn Road, right past Tesco and round the bend towards the new River Stour crossing. This means no one can get out of Tesco!! More houses will exacerbate these issues. The road from Tesco should have been built with a filter lane to the left, so that traffic wanting to go left could get out. What will be done about this?</li> <li>5. The junction of Discovery Road with the Worcester Road. Again, more thought should have gone into this. Traffic lights or a mini roundabout need to be erected to keep the traffic flowing. You can wait up to 5 minutes trying to get out of Discovery Road to turn right onto the Worcester Road at peak times and weekends.</li> <li>6. What provisions are there going to be made for the occupants of the new housing all over Stourport for schools and Doctors Surgeries?</li> <li>7. There is reference to building an Eastern By-pass for Kidderminster, but what about a by-pass for Stourport? The whole town grinds to a standstill on good weekends, holiday times and peak times.</li> </ol>
Barratt Homes West	<a href="#">LPPO802</a>	Object	Carpets of Worth - planning permission has lapsed which calls into question suitability and deliverability of site. Allocation should be removed.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/20 – CARPETS OF WORTH

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Midlands			
	<a href="#">LPP02615</a>	Support	Should be developed with houses to attract people who choose to live in the Wyre Forest but their employment is within the surrounding towns and cities as they offer easy access to the main arterial roads without going through the known congestion points.
	<a href="#">LPP04512</a>	Support	I do feel these offer sufficient provision for new homes within the Stourport area. These utilise suitable land around the Carpets of Worth and Parsons Chain area without encroaching on Green Belt or 'open land'.
	<a href="#">LPP03329</a>	Support	Re: Carpets of Worth AKR/20  There is a large area of land, adjacent to the Tesco store, already allocated for housing but has lain unused for a considerable time. This site should be used before other proposed sites are utilised. Can pressure be put upon the developers to either proceed with building or relinquish the land to another developer?
	<a href="#">LPP0728</a>	Support	Use site for mixed housing

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/1 – COUNTY BUILDINGS, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPP0730</a>	Comment	Rebuild health centre with better facilities on site.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPP03406</a>	Object	MI/1 – County Buildings – Ongoing review to relocate to emergency hub, no certainty site will available for development. The allocation should be removed
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0803</a>	Object	County Buildings - range of uses on site - looking to relocate. Until this is complete there is no certainty that site will be available and allocation should be removed.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01447</a>	Object	County Buildings - range of uses on site - looking to relocate. Until this is complete there is no certainty that site will be available and allocation should be removed.
Place Partnership Ltd	<a href="#">LPP01094</a>	Support	<p>WP, WMP and HWFRS support the allocation of the County Buildings site for 40 dwellings.</p> <p>The delivery of the new Wyre Forest Emergency Service Hub means there is certainty that the HWFRS element of the site will come forward for development. Similarly, the Place Review being undertaken jointly by the Council and PPL means that there is confidence that the site as a whole will be available for redevelopment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02619</a>	Support	Should be developed for mixed use - residential with retail. The retail units would complement and enhance the existing retail units within the town.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/3 – PARSONS CHAIN, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPP03407</a>	Object	MI/3 – Parsons Chain – The deliverability of the site is questionable. If ‘no requirement for the embankment to be removed as part of the Stourport Relief Road in the future, then a viable scheme may come forward’. Uncertainty regarding the delivery of this site, should be removed from the Plan.
	<a href="#">LPP02818</a>	Object	<p>I am wishing to raise my concerns about the proposed development of Parsons Chain site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic – Worcester and Hartlebury roads are already heavily congested. I would like assurances that thought has been given to access points for these homes.</li> <li>• Woodland - concerned about any suggested removal of the woodland on the old Railway Line behind The Birches.</li> <li>• Schools – What provision is there for school places?</li> </ul> <p>Although I fully understand the need for houses in the Wyre Forest area the proposals made in the consultation lacked thought and foresight for the infrastructure of Stourport and I would like more robust details released to the public.</p>
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01448</a>	Object	Parsons Chain - deliverability is questionable. Depends on need to remove former railway embankment as part of Stourport Relief Road. Site should be removed.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0806</a>	Object	Parsons Chain - deliverability is questionable. Depends on need to remove former railway embankment as part of Stourport Relief Road. Site should be removed.
	<a href="#">LPP03186</a>	Support	I do feel these offer sufficient provision for new homes within the Stourport area. These utilise suitable land around the Carpets of Worth and Parsons Chain area without encroaching on green belt or 'open land'.
	<a href="#">LPP02617</a>	Support	Should be developed with houses to attract people who choose to live in the Wyre Forest but their employment is within the surrounding towns and cities as they offer easy access to the main arterial roads without going through the known congestion points.
	<a href="#">LPP0729</a>	Support	use Parsons Chain for mixed housing and green space

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO M1/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3393</a>	Comment	An area with no direct public transport into the nearest town, increasing car traffic and air pollution, leaving residents with no alternative means of transport.
	<a href="#">LPPO743</a>	Comment	Agree that MIP site should be developed for housing but not high density and keep well within boundary line. Access - should give way to traffic on Steatite Way. Bus service - none at present. Provision should be considered.
	<a href="#">LPPO3326</a>	Comment	Core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will increase the traffic at Burlish lights.
	<a href="#">LPPO2904</a>	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield site - post-factory.</li> <li>• Can support the use of this area being used for housing development.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4208</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</li> <li>• Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</li> <li>• Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1797</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of brown belt not Green Belt land</li> <li>• Proposed plans would increase of traffic, pollution, medical facilities and schools</li> <li>• Don't let profit be the major factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3566</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate facilities.</li> <li>• We need to safeguard what we have for future generations.</li> <li>• Only doing it for extra council tax and to provide for Birmingham overspill.</li> <li>• Planners have allowed developments go ahead before without listening to objections.</li> <li>• Building companies are too large and have too much money for objections to be</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3601</a>	Object	L1/6/7: Kingsway traffic is already busy and noisy. More houses would add to this. The schools could not cope with more pupils doctors/local hospitals are already stretched; we do not need more housing in the area due to lack of infrastructure and should protect wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO5143</a>	Object	<p>Objects to MI/6 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Bulrush Est, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> <li>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3519</a>	Object	We object to the collective three sites (referred to figures stated above) being the subject of new developments. When there are a number of Brownfield sites that should take priority over Green Belt sites. We all heartily support the 10 points of objections put forward by the Burlish & Lickhill Green friends against these proposals.
	<a href="#">LPPO3562</a>	Object	Object MI/6
	<a href="#">LPPO3626</a>	Support	Supports Steatite Way proposals with the provision that the exit onto Bewdley Road is improved due to several traffic accidents.



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3308</a>	Support	Other 'Brown Sites' - old Plastic Co area - untouched! Off 'Steatite Way' (M1/6).
	<a href="#">LPPO725</a>	Support	Use MIP site for mixed housing plus green space
Willsgrove Developments	<a href="#">LPPO1001</a>	Support	<p>Support the allocation of Site Ref MI/6 (Steatite Way) for housing use.</p> <p>Insufficient sites within Stourport on Severn's settlement boundary to accommodate the housing needs of the town.</p> <p>Site is located within a sustainable location, within walking distance of a number of bus stops and approximately 10 minutes' walk from the town centre of Stourport. There are well lit footpaths from the site to the town centre. A designated cycle path is also present along the length of Bewdley Road on both sides of the road.</p> <p>Site is within walking distance of town centre, two primary schools and Stourport High School. A convenience store is located to the south east of the site on Bewdley Road, some 120 metres from the site entrance. The main facilities within the local area are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dentist</li> <li>• Doctor's surgery</li> <li>• Primary school</li> <li>• Middle school</li> <li>• Secondary school</li> <li>• Community facilities</li> <li>• Convenience store</li> <li>• Bus stops</li> <li>• Supermarket</li> <li>• Post office</li> </ul> <p>Site has excellent access to public transport, located on a bus route (No.16 service) and a number of bus stops within walking distance of the site. The nearest bus stop is within 80 metres. These bus stops provide a frequent</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/6 – LAND AT STEATITE WAY, STOURPORT**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>bus service, 6 days a week to Stourport on Severn Town Centre and Bewdley.</p> <p>The site is subject to a current planning application for up to 106 dwellings (reference 15/0623/OUTL). It is in the hands of a development company and is available for development. There are no physical constraints that prevent the site from being released for development.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/18 AND MI/33– LAND AT WILDEN LANE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP03548</a>	Object	<p><b>M1/18 North of Wilden Lane industrial site.</b></p> <p>I am hugely opposed to any more industrial units on Wilden Lane. We are surrounded by industrial units in this area, many of which are empty.</p> <p>The Worcester Road has had units empty for years, why build more? There is also the Hoo Farm Industrial Estate and the Worcester Road premises.</p> <p>A majority of the residents of Wilden Lane live very close to the road and we already suffer fast traffic speeding HGV's (over the weight limit) that are hurtling down the road at all times of the day and night and more industrial units would add to this.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Wilden has become unbearable since the sugar beet development. Access out on to the A449 McDonalds island is horrendous at rush hour and beyond. At 6.45pm it took me 25minutes to exit Wilden Lane as the traffic generated on the A449 from the new lights do not give way for Wilden traffic. It is much worse at real rush hour with traffic tailing back.</p> <p>Any industrial units will add to noise, air and road pollution and be detrimental to the road and residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0321</a>	Support	<p><b>MI/18</b> My client's support the zoning of their two sites for employment purposes and the removal of M1/18 from the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02475</a>	Object	<p><b>MI/33</b> - People should care about our wildlife. Their habitats deserve to be protected &amp; not continually destroyed. Greenfield sites, nature reserves, and any other site considered necessary for human beings, can be built on or disposed of whenever National or Local Government bodies say so!</p> <p>Rivers get polluted with land waste affecting &amp; killing fish. Huge turbines are built causing the deaths of thousands of birds. Badgers, who are thought to be carrying bovine TB, are killed indiscriminately.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04202</a>	Support	<p><b>MI/33</b> - My client's support the zoning of their two sites for employment purposes.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3436</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Area of outstanding natural beauty.</li> <li>2. Roads are already congested/roads cannot cope at present.</li> <li>3. Not enough infrastructure to cope.</li> <li>4. Lack of privacy.</li> <li>5. Noise levels will increase.</li> <li>6. Effect on wildlife.</li> <li>7. No control on my neighbours/anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>8. Loss of view.</li> <li>9. Loss of productive agricultural land.</li> <li>10. Lack of GP surgeries/dentists etc. /local shops etc.</li> <li>11. Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>12. Rather look at present field rather than housing estate.</li> <li>13. Would you like it next to your home?</li> <li>14. Area chosen not suitable for all above reasons/build somewhere else!</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2147</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the proposed plan due to the loss of Green Belt when there are areas that are empty buildings in Kidderminster than can be used to more effect.</li> <li>• There isn't enough spaces in schools as there is</li> <li>• It takes too long to get any GP, dentists</li> <li>• The road network now struggles with the demand of vehicles let alone extra carbon footprint emissions.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2153</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status. The highly used Burlish Top Nature Reserve will be severely affected.</p> <p>Traffic at ALL times of the day is extremely busy. Extra 300+ properties centred around this area without additional major roads included in your plans will be very foolhardy. The traffic noise and higher emissions will be insufferable.</p> <p>The bus service is already abysmal, so using the car will be a necessity. GP's, Dentists and all local schools will</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			not be able to cope!
	<a href="#">LPPO2752</a>	Comment	<p>Several years ago this Council considered extending Burlish Park estate but decided not to as they were concerned this estate was already too large to consider further expansion. I believe this is still the case.</p> <p>The roads around Burlish Park are already very busy and have safety concerns, in particular the junction between Windermere Way and the Kidderminster/Stourport main road. The area around the schools has many parked cars at the start and end of the school day causing safety issues. The crossroads at Burlish Crossing suffers from heavy congestion especially at busy times.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3291</a>	Comment	This area is an attractive band of farmland forming a natural barrier between Stourport and Bewdley. The roads around Burlish Crossroads area is currently already subject to traffic congestion at many times of day, and the development would only exasperate this.
	<a href="#">LPPO3391</a>	Comment	An area with no direct public transport into the nearest town, increasing car traffic and air pollution, leaving residents with no alternative means of transport.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO2234</a>	Support	<p><b>Landscape Sensitivity:</b> Western edge of Stourport comprises several housing estates which are relatively exposed with little vegetation for screening. Potential development capacity of site is strongly influenced by landform which rises to NE edge. Western boundary will need careful treatment to define transition to wider landscape. GI is proposed along front of site and will incorporate linear SuDS.</p> <p><b>Accessibility to Amenities:</b> Stourport benefits from wide range of services. Site has good access to town centre with local facilities including schools and doctors within 2km walk.</p> <p><b>Highways and Transportation:</b> Bewdley Road North is subject to 30mph speed limit by most of site on approach to crossroads with footpath. Indicative masterplan shows access via Bewdley Road North. Bus services are close to site. Various facilities are within easy walking distance. A Transport Assessment will be completed.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk and Drainage:</b> Site lies in Flood Zone 1. Surface water flooding occurs within site alongside main road. These can be dealt with using cut off ditches or French drains. Bedrock geology is sandstone so soakage</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>rates expected to be good. Further work required to establish best form of attenuation for site.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> Anticipate that dwellings fronting main road may require additional glazing but is unlikely that noise will have significant adverse impact on development.</p> <p><b>Ground Conditions:</b> initial Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment shows it is unlikely site would be classified as contaminated land.</p> <p><b>Utilities:</b> 850mm aqueduct runs within western part of site with 350mm main parallel to it. 6m easements required. Mains also run along eastern and northern boundaries with 3m easements needed. Underground cable along northern boundary of site likely to require diverting. MP gas main may require lowering to allow site access.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Land Classification:</b> Site comprises Grade 3</p> <p><b>Suitability:</b> Site is considered suitable for development.</p> <p><b>Deliverability:</b> Agreement in place with landowner. Technical work shows no constraints likely to render site undeliverable. It is available now. Many potential impacts can be mitigated through design and may achieve positive outcomes through landscaping.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Site is sustainably located. Site is suitable, developable and available. It scores well in GB Review and SA.</p>
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO4912</a>	Support	<p>Taylor Wimpey is in control of site known as Land at Bewdley Road North, Stourport. It is promoted for residential led development including open space and other supporting infrastructure. See Development Vision document attached.</p> <p>Development Framework identifies following key features:</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• around 140 dwellings</li> <li>• vehicular and pedestrian access from Bewdley Road North</li> <li>• open space</li> <li>• SuDS</li> <li>• new enduring Green Belt boundary</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO272</a>	Object	<p>I object to any Green Belt development in or around Stourport. No Green Belt site should be considered until ALL brown belt sites in the area have been exhausted.</p> <p>I had no knowledge of the proposals until a few before closure of the time for objections to be lodged?</p> <p>The road can scarcely handle the volume of traffic currently using it, and speeding is a big problem on the run from Burlish Top to the Burlish traffic lights.</p> <p>Stourport has no bypass, or ring road to deal with increased traffic.</p> <p>Congestion in the area at school times is already a significant problem. Has anyone researched this at the Burlish traffic lights particularly?</p> <p>I can see little to support these proposals - esp. considering Green Belt development, by definition, should be vigorously opposed until proof of exhaustion of brown belt sites has been put forward and accepted.</p> <p>What part of the proposal "relieves pressure on Burlish Top Nature reserve"? What pressure?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1652</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt natural habitat.</li> <li>2. Lack of health care to support a higher population.</li> <li>3. Increase in traffic/pollution.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1655</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no bus routes, more cars will be needed to take children to already overcrowded schools</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Existing traffic issues esp. at school times in Lickhill Road/Windermere Way</li> <li>3. If there is no play area on the estate children will play in streets which could result in an accident</li> </ol>
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPP01574</a>	Object	We don't need any more buildings going up in this area. We have enough problems with traffic now coming in and out of Stourport. We don't want our Green Belt spoiled.
	<a href="#">LPP01760</a>	Object	<p>Opposes development sites L1/6/7, L1/5/ AKR/14, AKR/15.</p> <p>Believes that development will have a negative impact on people living in these areas as the values of their properties will drop because it will affect their outlook.</p> <p>Also concerned about traffic increase on Lickhill Lower, Lickhill and Lickhill North roads. Very busy during school run and speeding during weekends already an issue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01785</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to any development at Burlish Crossing.</li> <li>• Believes there are plenty of empty buildings in the district that could be redeveloped as an alternative.</li> <li>• Concerned about traffic in an already congested area.</li> <li>• Concerned about impact on wildlife and countryside.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01786</a>	Object	Objects due to concerns about traffic. Believes that Stourport wouldn't be able to cope with the influx of traffic that the proposal would cause.
	<a href="#">LPP01669</a>	Object	Stourport has a very poor road network and more houses will worsen, esp. The Kingsway as a country lane
	<a href="#">LPP01882</a>	Object	Object LI/5
	<a href="#">LPP01885</a>	Object	<p>Reference /5 it the increase in traffic could well be a very big problem. It is bad now.</p> <p>The above would be linked to it. We are so isolated at Severn Bank Park as it is.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			I'm sure there must be more brownfield sites in the area.
	<a href="#">LPP01687</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I understand the need for more homes but the concentration of 3 proposed sites in approximately 1 sqm, in an already populated area is a step too far.</li> <li>• The pressure on schools and doctors/the increase in traffic is unsustainable.</li> <li>• Farm land is valuable for Wildlife</li> <li>• Brownfield sites/former Burlish Golf Course should be utilised to minimise impact on existing houses</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01910</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley Road North is already a very busy road so more building would cause mayhem.</li> <li>• Local government said there would be more building on brownfield sites not on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01913</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development of land at Burlish Crossing due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic with no extra road to deal with an already very busy stretch of road</li> <li>3. Loss of wildlife habitat.</li> <li>4. Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>5. Increased pollution/noise.</li> <li>6. Lack of services to meet the demand of homeowners on proposed site.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01812</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The road and infrastructure cannot cope with any more traffic on the Bewdley Road and crossroads at peak rush hours.</li> <li>2. It is gridlocked most of the time which will also effect on the L/1/2 site proposed. The Kingsway will not be big enough to cope.</li> <li>3. The Nature Reserve is just coming back to how it should be.</li> <li>4. There are plenty of brownfield sites around WFDC area. For example the old school sites of Sion Hill and</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE L1/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Sladen, the Old hospital Wolverhampton Road and the amount of property that could be used for residential around the area is ample for any district.</p> <p>5. The boundaries between Kidderminster and Stourport are just yards apart - it should be kept as it is.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1984</a>	Object	<p>Objects to Burlish and Lickhill development:</p> <p>We object to any development on the Green Belt land and Greenfield sites.</p> <p>There is more than sufficient despoiled land and brownfield sites to accommodate having development – it is vital that Green Belt land is not developed in anyway.</p> <p>We wish to point out this is 2 objections.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO295</a>	Object	<p>Sites L1/5 Burlish Crossing represent an unacceptable use of Green Belt land, some would be better used as allotments.</p> <p>The traffic congestion at Burlish Crossing traffic lights with long queues in all directions at rush hour. The volume of traffic has increased substantially in the past 7 years, to the point where it can be difficult to leave our property. Further development will make the situation worse, without major road improvements.</p> <p>The increased traffic Burlish Top to the main Kidderminster - Stourport road represents a real safety hazard particularly to children at Stourport High School and users of the sports facilities. The road is very narrow and would not support increased traffic.</p> <p>Other core developments in Stourport, particularly M1/6 Steatite Way, will also increase the traffic at Burlish lights, I don't see how development at L1/5 can be integrated into the area with adequate transport facilities for both existing and new residents.</p> <p>The Option B site L1/5 Burlish crossing represents a loss of good agricultural land. This field and the adjacent</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			fields are an important habitat for birds, particularly in winter when lapwings gather in the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2050</a>	Object	<p>I was unaware of these proposals/deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/prime agricultural land for food production</li> <li>• Preferred option must be brownfield sites.</li> <li>• More traffic = more noise/pollution. Plan will compound area's existing traffic problems.</li> <li>• GP/dental surgeries/local schools already oversubscribed</li> <li>• Negative impact on businesses at top of Lickhill Rd and wild/plant life</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2052</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brownfield sites e.g. adjacent to Tesco should be used first.</li> <li>• Already long traffic queues and no bypasses unlike Bewdley/Kidderminster</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2014</a>	Object	Having moved to Bewdley to escape the 'rat race' we would never accept plans for a new housing estate on our doorstep, surrounded as we are by green fields/the River Severn. We strongly object to all the new planning proposals outlined which will cause traffic chaos esp. in the Bewdley Road/local area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2026</a>	Object	<p>The two reasons for my objection are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses mean more people and more cars which mean more fumes which is bad for health.</li> <li>• Bewdley Road can't cope with more cars at peak times morning/evening. There are already queues from the lights at Burlish traffic light, some very long.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2113</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Burlish Crossing area is already well populated.</li> <li>• We enjoy our view over Green Belt land and do not want to change it by development.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2114</a>	Object	Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites available.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2116</a>	Object	<p>Object to development of Green Belt land on Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Lickhill Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roads already busy at peak times, speeding outside of these.</li> <li>• Increased traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Lack of facilities GP surgeries/dentists/schools.</li> <li>• No Stourport bypass</li> <li>• How will emergency services cope?</li> <li>• Impact on plant/wildlife at Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• No need to use Green Belt land when there is enough brownfield sites around Wyre Forest District Council.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2118</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• increase in already congested traffic</li> <li>• Increase in noise/pollution from extra traffic.</li> <li>• bus service already poor</li> <li>• capacity issue; schools, doctors, dentists, hospital</li> <li>• loss of agricultural land</li> <li>• use brownfield land first</li> <li>• insufficient work</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no provision for road upgrade</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2139</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic noise and pollution</li> <li>Removal of agricultural land have an impact on the wildlife in the area</li> <li>Building of houses behind property will reduce value of her home.</li> <li>Lack of facilities in Stourport already, increasing population will stretch the existing services i.e. GPS, dentists and schools.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2075</a>	Object	<p>Objection to development at Burlish Crossing/Lickhill Road North:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>Traffic congestion on already busy B4195.</li> <li>Services e.g. Drs already overcrowded</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2368</a>	Object	<p>Object Kingsway/Burlish crossing/Bewdley Road North/Lickhill Road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic congestion, noise pollution/fumes</li> <li>Burlish top nature reserve would be ruined/wildlife lost</li> <li>Capacity of NHS services/Drs/dentists/schools and access by emergency services.</li> <li>Stourport has nothing to cope with extra traffic e.g. a bypass</li> <li>Don't build on the agricultural land instead do something for the community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2433</a>	Object	<p>My objection naturally centres around the building of houses under Option B, specifically relating to Burlish Crossing, just feet away from my own home. The provision of 157 houses on the site when coupled to the core sites of Wyre Forest Golf Club (L1/2) and Lickhill Road North (L1/6/7) would mean an additional 331 houses, perhaps 600 extra cars, in an area that struggles at times to cope with the volume of traffic currently. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The resultant reduction in air quality, additional noise pollution and increased damage to road surfaces would lead to further strain on local medical and other community services, protracted response times from emergency services and increased dangers to pedestrian and cycle traffic.</p> <p>Without adequate provision for additional schools, medical facilities and other community services I believe this option to be ill conceived.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02544</a>	Object	<p>Although I don't strongly agree with any of the options available but do strongly contest the Core development areas in the Burlish/ Lickhill areas, I do understand, just from the basic maths, that there is a need for additional housing within the district. However, I have raised my main concerns above to highlight the obvious issues that I assume someone within the Planning Policy Team has already considered.</p> <p>Following the drop-in and after having reviewed the documents again online I have a few points/queries to make, in particular in respect of the Core housing sites in the Burlish/Kingsway and Lickhill areas of Stourport and also the Option B sites, in particular the one at Burlish Crossing:</p> <p>In respect of the sites highlighted for Option B (especially within the Burlish/Lickhill area) I have a few concerns which I'd like to raise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Road networks and traffic - Both of the core housing sites at Lickhill and the Kingsway along with the Option B site at LI/5 would have a detrimental effect on the congestion within the local area. These three sites would potentially mean 331 new homes could be built within a 1/4 of a mile of each other, thus raising the concern that there could be potentially 331 more vehicles using the 3 main roads in this area being Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road and The Kingsway. Currently, even without these additional houses, the traffic at Burlish Crossings is already a complete nightmare and inconvenience for all commuters going to/from work and/or school. With these additional (potential) developments I can only assume that this congestion will continue to become a more difficult problem to solve.</li> <li>- Roads networks and safety - Similarly these additional vehicles will be using roads which are direct links</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to the High School and several primary schools within the area, which surely raises a safety concern? Should we be encouraging increased use of The Kingsway, Windermere Way and Lickhill Road given the number of children who use those routes to school every day? Also, if these sites in particular were to be developed where would the access to those 'estates' be? I would assume accessing a large housing development from any of these roads would mean that traffic systems would need to be put in place to ensure the safety of motorists and pedestrians alike - would this mean more traffic due to signalling on top of the expected increased in vehicle numbers?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Road networks/ The Bridge - it probably goes without saying that the traffic issues on the Stourport Bridge are already a major problem for the town. The Option B sites, in their vastness, backing onto the Areley Kings area of Stourport would only add to this problem. I have been informed that if a developer were to buy this land then a second bridge and supporting roads would be built - what would the impact of this buildings works be on the town's road infrastructure in the meantime? Also, where would that bridge be located and what would the environmental impacts of that development be?</li> <li>- Schools - The schools within the Burlish and Lickhill vicinity are already over-subscribed each year with many children being rejected from their first choice (and quite often most local) primary school. From the Plan document I can see that there are several options available to deal with the potential increase in children within the area, however 0.5FE proposals are almost a complete waste of time as sustaining a structure within a primary school with an additional 0.5FE is almost impossible with the current funding cuts being made by central government. What 0.5FE increase would do would be to unnecessarily force joint year group teaching in order to deliver efficient and break-even budgets. Your education team will well know that this is not the most effective way of delivering the curriculum and could also have negative effects on future OFSTED ratings, particularly if pressure is going to be put on to teaching staff to deliver to larger group of pupils. This is one of the easiest ways to make Stourport a less attractive town of choice as parents currently have the knowledge that primary schools within these areas are OFSTED good or outstanding! Similarly, 1FE primary schools are as difficult to sustain, especially within such areas where the majority of students receive only basic funding but the normal costs of running a school still have to be met. Have governors of all local primary schools been informed of the suggestions within the plan so that they can think about succession planning if any of these sites were to be developed? Would their budgets be able to handle any potential changes? Where would a new development for a 1FE school be situated if this were the route that was taken in Stourport, I would</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>assume it would be in the over-subscribed areas? If so, Green Belt?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Medical centres - As above for schools. Local medical centres, surgeries and hospitals are already working to capacity - would residents then be expected to travel longer distances into Kidderminster to seek medical attention? Would Kidderminster Hospital A&amp;E department be re-instated by the time all of the development is complete and these 5,400 dwelling have been built?</li> </ul> <p>In conclusion, I strongly object to the sites that have been included in the Core housing plans and Option B which would so strongly affect the Burlish and Lickhill areas of Stourport for all of the above mentioned reasons.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2906</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to this site being used.</li> <li>• It is a greenfield site.</li> <li>• Greenfield sites are subject to Green Belt status - should not be concreted or tarmacked over.</li> <li>• Traffic from site will create more congestion on an already busy road.</li> <li>• Fears it will increase traffic causing bottlenecks at areas in Burlish Park.</li> <li>• More traffic means more noise and pollution - hazardous to people's health.</li> <li>• Stourport doesn't have a good enough road infrastructure to cope with more vehicles.</li> <li>• There are no major roads - i.e. M roads for new residents to get to work (e.g. Birmingham etc.)</li> <li>• Insufficient schools to cope with more children.</li> <li>• Insufficient GP surgeries in the town to cope with more people.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land - good agricultural land.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife - horrendous for future generations.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO431</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object for the following reasons</li> <li>• loss of an area of natural beauty</li> <li>• there is no infrastructure to support the proposed development</li> <li>• roads are already gridlocked</li> <li>• anti social behaviour from new neighbours</li> <li>• longer waiting times at doctors/dentists etc</li> <li>• extra noise and pollution to what is a quiet neighbourhood</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• we bought our house fifteen years ago for the view of the Green Belt not to look at a new housing development</li> <li>• lack of privacy</li> <li>• loss of productive agriculture land</li> <li>• effect on wildlife</li> <li>• increased travel times to and from work</li> <li>• this area is not suitable for the size of the proposed development BUILD SOMEWHERE ELSE</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3335</a>	Object	Enough congestion along Bewdley Road North around the traffic lights as it is. Schools and doctors in the town cannot cope with extra families that are proposed.
	<a href="#">LPPO738</a>	Object	Development at Burlish field threatens nesting birds and rights of way. Major traffic congestion at crossroads without more housing. Lack of capacity in schools, doctors, dentists. Stourport needs a bypass.
	<a href="#">LPPO3433</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Quality of life will be affected.</li> <li>2. Bought our house with the added attraction of countryside views.</li> <li>3. Invasion of privacy.</li> <li>4. No control of neighbours including anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>5. Loss of value to my current property!</li> <li>6. Disruption of travel. Already have to plan times to get on and off drive.</li> <li>7. Increased travel time to/from work.</li> <li>8. Road already grid-locked during peak times 'Blackstone' in particular as not enough room for 2 way traffic including heavy goods vehicles.</li> <li>9. Increased noise and pollution levels.</li> <li>10. Not enough room in local schools also affecting GP surgeries and dentists. Most are already to their limits!</li> <li>11. Disruption to wildlife, have an affect on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>12. Loss of Green Belt!!</li> <li>13. Would you like to have all the above next to your home?</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3340</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic.</li> <li>• Traffic noise.</li> <li>• Crowded doctors and schools.</li> <li>• Nature.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3342</a>	Object	Proposals for Burlish/Lickhill areas - traffic already at standstill at peak times. Greenfields are all there is to separate 3 different towns. Doctors/dentists - hard to get appointment. Schools - not enough places.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO807</a>	Object	land at Burlish Crossing - no exceptional circumstances that would justify removal of site from Green Belt. Non-Green Belt sites are available in Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO3386</a>	Object	Object to proposals around Burlish.
	<a href="#">LPPO3397</a>	Object	Concerned at loss of Green Belt land so close to Burlish Top. Roads already very busy. Increased pollution from extra traffic will affect nature and young families. Stourport lacks road infrastructure of Kidderminster. Doctors, schools and hospital services not available to cater for this growth.
	<a href="#">LPPO4112</a>	Object	<p>I object to your proposals to build on Green Belt sites locally in the Burlish area. These proposals have come as quite a shock to the local residents, there has been talk of the council informing us with a leaflet or a mention in the local paper. This appears to have gone unnoticed by the majority of locals, and it seems we now have an unreasonable consultation period in which to voice our concerns and consider in a balanced measure “the people s “objections.</p> <p>It seems you have miscalculated the real requirements for housing preferring the easier option to build on Green Belt rather than brownfield. The infrastructure of Stourport is already struggling to cope with the number of school children, the traffic problems and the requirements on the national health system. I would like to add my strong objections to the deadline you imposed on us for this building project which appears to be a most ill conceived set of plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1793</a>	Object	Objects to development on the field parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North due to the following

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic - Bottle necks around Bewdley Road North/Burlish Crossing</li> <li>2. Environmental impact</li> <li>3. Radical impact on property values</li> <li>4. Disruption to the busy link road between Bewdley and Stourport which is already a problem at the Burlish junction.</li> <li>5. Pressure on local key infrastructure schools and NHS services</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1800</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/6/7, LI/5, LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure (especially roads) needs to be improved before any development can be considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic - the one way system around the town at key times of the day are often gridlocked. Another bridge over the river Severn would alleviate this.</li> <li>3. The crossroads on the Bewdley Road/Kingsway junction often have long queues again at certain times of the day.</li> <li>4. Putting more demand onto an already overloaded town without infrastructure improvements will destroy residents' quality of life aside from pollution issues.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1753</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/5 Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>Asks if there are any Brownfield sites that could be developed. Questions if more housing is really needed and if the population is really growing that much.</p> <p>Concerned that the current support services including doctors, police, schools and local transport won't be able to support a growing population without further investment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1667</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the destruction of Green Belt and resultant increase in already congested traffic/assoc pollution, where is promised bypass?</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor bus service</li> <li>Schools/Doctors already oversubscribed.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1677</a>	Object	<p>Object as follows:</p> <p><u>Kingsway</u>: traffic - already heavy at peak times/close to nature reserve.</p> <p><u>Garden Centre/Paddocks</u> Traffic/proximity to Nursing home</p> <p>review housing need and provision of schools/medical facilities</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1680</a>	Object	<p>I strongly object to the plans for building on Burlish crossing LI/5.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A loss of Green Belt and precious open land which will affect wildlife populations.</li> <li>The introduction of more traffic on already congested roads (peak periods) i.e. Kingsway, Bewdley Road, Windermere Way.</li> <li>More junctions causing even more traffic chaos.</li> <li>Stourport has already catered for more people. i.e. Tan Lane, Manor Road, Vale Road. Which will impact on local facilities such as GPs, dentists, schools etc.</li> <li>Stourport is notorious for peak time traffic jams which include Bewdley Road, Kidderminster Road, Hartlebury Road, Worcester Road and Dunley Road often causing gridlock.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1851</a>	Object	<p>I object, on the grounds of loss of Green Belt areas/agricultural land, the increase in traffic/(noise) and the loss/impact any development would have on wildlife, to plans to develop the field at the top of Kingsway that runs parallel with Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road North and the area currently a garden centre/horse paddocks on Lickhill Road.</p> <p>Development here would also increase class sizes (which are already high) and impact on the quality of education in local schools. Why can't these developments be built on brownfield sites.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1803</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>2. Increased traffic on all roads on Burlish Est., Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road (already suffer long tailbacks)</li> <li>3. Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes - risk to the health of local residents</li> <li>4. Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>5. Larger school classes.</li> <li>6. Lack of GP's and Dentists to cope with influx of patients.</li> <li>7. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites need to be utilised before Green Belt sites.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1764</a>	Object	Objection to option B due to lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. Building on Green Belt L1/5
	<a href="#">LPPO2010</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill and Bewdley Road</li> <li>• Health risks from traffic.</li> <li>• Increase in school places and classes getting bigger.</li> <li>• Lack of GP surgeries, emergency services.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitats.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests utilising sites old brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1823</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land is used for agricultural purposes.</li> <li>• Would loose the enjoyment of back garden.</li> <li>• Better sites to use.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1893</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to using Green Belt land for building purposes bordering Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North.</p> <p>Suggests prioritising the use of brownfield land before greenfield.</p> <p>Concerned about extreme traffic at peak times if the proposed site at Burlish Crossing goes ahead and a danger to the elderly tenants living on Severn Bank Park.</p> <p>Concerned that the doctors, dentists, schools are already full.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2001</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5.due to:</p> <p>Too much traffic - Stourport does not have a by-pass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2008</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Further development between Stourport and Kidderminster in the open area should not be permitted to prevent link-up of these two towns.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. Kingsway is already a dangerous road caused by speeding vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic will also affect time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. The impact of building houses would have significant impact on vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• There is no evident that there is a shortfall of housing in WFDC area which cannot be met by the using brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugar beet factory</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			(Kidderminster).
	<a href="#">LPPO2124</a>	Object	<p>I would like to strongly oppose the building on Burlish Park and my reasons are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Burlish Crossing is congested enough now, how will you deal with all this extra congestion potentials 314 cars added to the already congested crossroads? Causing problems for the emergency services and increasing likelihood of accidents.</li> <li>• Schools – insufficient school places at the newly built primary school.</li> <li>• Healthcare – Only 2 doctors in Stourport.</li> <li>• Noise pollution</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt. Sajid Javid communities secretary promised Green Belt would be protected. Has the Council ruled out all brownfield sites or estate regeneration; included unused land and surplus public sector land; looked to neighbouring authorities for provision?</li> <li>• There are enough brownfield sites e.g. Carpets of Worth, Chichester Caravans, SDF, Sugar Beet</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2125</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First heard on news</li> <li>• Retain the 3 towns own identities.</li> <li>• Traffic problems already unlike Bewdley/Kidderminster, Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Accommodate Wyre Forest housing needs on brownfield sites.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2028</a>	Object	<p>My objection is, because Stourport is popular with visitors, the Bewdley Road is busy at weekends and commuting working hours. A journey that normally take 15mins can take over an hour at peak times and I cannot see how the Bewdley Road would cope with more traffic from more homes equalling more congestion/more fumes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2036</a>	Object	<p>I object to the development in Kingsway/Lickhill Road areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roads here are not coping with the current amount of traffic esp. at peak times adding more traffic</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>would increase this problem and be dangerous for pedestrians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools/Doctors surgeries are currently stretched</li> <li>• Wildlife/residents will suffer if green spaces lost</li> <li>• Other areas/empty properties could be used</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2051</a>	Object	Use Brownfield sites before agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2373</a>	Object	<p>We had not received any notification of these plans which we think is disgraceful.</p> <p>The use of Green Belt Land makes a mockery of Green Belt Status, and is a precedent that will affect existing farmland, public access / rights-of-way.</p> <p>Stourport-on-Severn is expected to support the local allocation of houses but while Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster has a ring-road and a proposed new road to cope with both housing and extra traffic, Stourport-on-Severn does not have the existing or planned infrastructure to cope and the significant amounts of proposed traffic. This will have knock on environmental effects, and the traffic affecting existing local traffic and emergency service access at peak times.</p> <p>Local schools and NHS services are already stretched; there is no proposal for how this will be dealt with, and will lead to increased class sizes, longer waiting lists or people having to travel outside of the area which will further add traffic to areas where overspill fills the requirements.</p> <p>The plans will lead to a loss of both good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat. Skylarks, Linnets and other red-listed birds nest in these proposed sites. The use of the Kingsway field will also, we believe, have a significant impact on the diversity of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There is no evidence that in the Wyre Forest area the shortfall cannot be met by the use of brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport-on-Severn) and Sugarbeet Factory (Kidderminster).</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3516</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to object to Option B in planning for residential properties being built on L1/5 Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>Stourport is a bottleneck both getting over the bridge and driving from Burlish Crossroads.</p> <p>We do not have the infrastructure in Stourport. The need for a new bridge and road system, more schools, jobs and doctors. These facilities aren't there for the population it already has.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3423</a>	Object	<p>Object to these new developments as collectively the 3 sites would mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times already suffer from long tailbacks.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also initially affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destination.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes or unable to take in local children them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat: there are sky larks, linnets, and other red-listed birds resting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also have a significant impact in the vast variety of plants and wildlife on Burlish Top nature reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. There is no evidence that there is a short fall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites as has been the case on the old power station site (Stourport) and sugarbeet factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3467</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal will cause chaos to the existing area.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE L1/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Congestion at Burlish Crossing lights is a problem now.</li> <li>• Health care will cause a problem.</li> <li>• Most households now have two or more cars.</li> <li>• School places will be affected</li> <li>• The pollution</li> <li>• Also, our views.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3345</a>	Object	<p>Very concerned about developing sites in the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and Steatite Way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic an issue at Burlish Crossing,</li> <li>• Pressure on local schools already at capacity with waiting lists,</li> <li>• Pressure on GP's and NHS dentist,</li> <li>• Retaining Stourport's character and identity,</li> <li>• Threat to wildlife,</li> <li>• Pollution,</li> <li>• Additional traffic and places pressure on road network</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3310</a>	Object	<p>There is a lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries, dentists and public transport in this area.</p> <p>Stourport needs a good public transport infrastructure in place first and a decent and safe cycle path if you are going to increase the amount of houses.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>The field which runs parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North L1/5 Green Belt be built on, the increase in the traffic on the Bewdley Road would cause significant problems for all the residents living in the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area, on peak times now already long tail backs.</p> <p>More traffic noise and higher emissions from the increase of traffic resulting in the risk of health to local residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3331</a>	Object	Burlish Crossing L1/5 - Roads around Burlish Crossing are already heavily congested and additional traffic would cause further congestion at the Swan Hotel/High street junction.
	<a href="#">LPPO3333</a>	Object	I object to development on greenfield sites Burlish Crossing LI/5;
	<a href="#">LPPO2436</a>	Object	<p>I should like to object to the building of houses at Burlish Crossing (L1/5), just feet away from my house. They would mean an additional 331 houses together with the extra cars, in an area that cannot cope now at certain times of the day. A ring road surrounds Kidderminster already, a by-pass is already serving Bewdley but Stourport has nothing to cope with such volumes of additional traffic.</p> <p>The extra traffic would result in a reduction in air quality and additional noise, plus the unnecessary use of Green Belt land with no provision it seems for medical and educational services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3133</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed plans regarding development of Green Belt in the Burlish Crossing area.</p> <p>The first I heard about these proposed developments was approx. two weeks ago, when our local councillor wrote to us. The date of submission of views was not clear, and the information regarding the proposals fell far short of what would have been expected.</p> <p>The size of development is staggering. The population has not increased to any significant degree, the developments planned are a gross over build. Brownfield sites could manage the increase. Green Belt is there to protect from urban sprawl. It is a vital natural habitat. Once it is gone, it is gone. Environmental vandalism. There are not any great employer in the area expanding, there is not going to be a wave of new people coming to the area. In light of the decision to leave the EU, even less migrants are going to arrive. Only affordable housing is required, which is not going to be the case with houses built on fresh Green Belt land. The only winners are the developers, everyone else suffers. Increased traffic, emissions and noise along with a loss of</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>habitat for nature are assured.</p> <p>These are my views and I wish to register my voice of opposition to the plans.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2981</a>	Object	<p>Ref L1/5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>• This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugarbeet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2984</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public Rights of Way.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road, which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs.</li> <li>This increase in traffic will also inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes with resulting increased risk to the health of local residents.</li> <li>Bewdley has a bypass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel outside of the area to attend school.</li> <li>Lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>Loss of wildlife habitat; there are skylarks, linnets and other red4isted birds nesting in these fields. The impact of building houses on the Kingsway field would also, we believe, have significant impact upon the vast variety of plant and wildlife on Burlish Top Nature Reserve.</li> <li>Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> <li>There is no evidence that there is a shortfall of housing in the WFDC area which cannot be met by utilising Brownfield sites, as has been the case on the old Power Station site (Stourport) and Sugarbeet Factory (Kidderminster).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3990</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the proposed use for the area LI/5 Table 32.0.2 Stourport-on-Severn, for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt status. Our Green areas need to be protected at all costs, for existing &amp; future residents, and for the good of the environment and country as a whole. No Green Belt status areas should be up for consideration for housing.</p> <p>Overcrowding. All three of these proposed sites already have more than enough houses situated within a relatively small area. From what I have read, it would seem there is no evidence that this amount of new</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>housing is required in the Wyre Forest area, where the population growth is below the national average.</p> <p>I would hope that plans for housing in this area will be restricted to Brownfield sites only, and kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Increase in traffic and pollution. The Burlish Estate/Kingsway/Lickhill roads are more than busy enough as things are. More housing would inevitably increase the volume of traffic, traffic noise, and pollution to an unacceptable level for these areas.</p> <p>Quality of life. Green, unspoilt areas are vital to the health and well-being of all of us. We do not want to lose any more of our precious, green, open views. The three new school/college buildings have already encroached enough on our open landscape in this area of Stourport.</p>
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPP03561</a>	Object	Use of green/brownfield sites. All areas outstanding Bewdley particularly in Bewdley Road North area/Kingsway. Loss of floral and fauna, already eroded during last 25years.
	<a href="#">LPP04909</a>	Object	Having lived here just over a year why are you trying to build on green land as all governments say they will not build? The roads are not big enough for extra traffic. If you want to build use brownfield sites of which there are many. As a resident in this area it is bad enough to enter the main road as it is so please think again.
	<a href="#">LPP01808</a>	Object	Object to LI/5
	<a href="#">LPP01819</a>	Object	Loss of Green Belt status.
	<a href="#">LPP01779</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any loss of Green Belt that protects the countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>Concerned about increased noise and pollution due to traffic and the impact on the health of local residents.</p> <p>Suggests not building on the Green Belt but alternatively utilising land right by the school such as the Wyre Forest Golf course L1/2 and the land that runs behind Windermere Way and the Kingsway where children and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>parents are within walking distance. Suggests prioritising these sites before developing on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Concerned about lack of other facilities such as GP surgeries dentists and public transport in this area.</p> <p>Also concerned that Stourport lacks a good public transport infrastructure including a decent safe cycle path. This all needs to be done before any houses should be considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01794</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development due to the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Car crashing</li> <li>2. People may get run over</li> <li>3. Animals may get run over</li> <li>4. Lot busier</li> <li>5. Beeping of horns</li> <li>6. Wildlife like birds may become extinct</li> <li>7. No places for children to go to school</li> <li>8. Late for school and work and get fired.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01750</a>	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening the existing public right of way.</p> <p>If the field which runs parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North L1/5 Green Belt is to be built on, the increase in traffic on the Bewdley Road would cause significant problems for all residents living in the area. At peak times it's already congested.</p> <p>More traffic noise and emissions will risk the health of local residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01658</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>• Increase in traffic/pollution</li> <li>• Stourport is already a bottleneck</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local amenities – schools/GP Surgeries full.</li> <li>Use brownfield sites instead</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01763</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to building houses on the fields at the Kingsway, Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road North and on the garden centre and horse paddocks on the Lickhill Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be a loss of Green Belt areas, a lot more traffic with increased noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes. Stourport lacks a bypass.</li> <li>There will be loss of agricultural land, loss of wildlife habitat and impact on a variety of plants.</li> <li>More people needing facilities such as school, doctors, dentists etc.</li> <li>Asks if there are brownfield sites that could be used as an alternative.</li> <li>Objects to building on Green Belt areas.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02072</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic build up and road system not being able to cope with more traffic</li> <li>Sewers/water supply will it be able to cope</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02022</a>	Object	We don't want any building on Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPP02060</a>	Object	<p>Field which runs parallel with Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am very concerned about the traffic increase in this area. It is already increasing rapidly making it difficult for cars to join the road. These two applications will cause major problems.</li> <li>As we enter a change in the country through Brexit I am very concerned to see good agricultural land reduced. We will need to increase all food production and this, however tiny, will reduce the farming land in this area.</li> <li>I cannot understand why Green Belt land is being used when there are brown belt lands lying vacant around Stourport e.g. near Tesco. PLEASE use this land first.</li> <li>I am aware of the need of affordable housing – but put it in the right place – near shops or services so</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>people who do have their own transport can be serviced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please think VERY HARD about your plans. Do not take the easy option (for you) and reduce and concrete over our beautiful land.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2020</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is Green Belt land to be used when areas are available in Stourport? e.g. round Tesco store (currently an eyesore) not being considered.</li> <li>How will current roads be adapted to cope with resulting extra usage with likely 2 cars per house minimum and already overcrowded roads/queues stretching back to the by-pass in this area</li> <li>Emergency services – how will essential services be prioritised.</li> <li>How will extra schools/education, doctors/dentists etc. be provided</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2011</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bewdley Road North (B4195) is already a very busy road</li> <li>Traffic queues on most evenings back up from the four way traffic lights at Burlish Crossing, to the Roundabout in the A456.</li> <li>Cook's Nursery opposite this land is often open to the public on many weekends adding to traffic problems.</li> <li>Concerned that any road planned to access the site on the B4195 would be a major issue.</li> <li>Severn Bank Park residents have problems joining the B4195 at busy periods, it would be a lot worse with this development proposal.</li> <li>The land has Green Belt status and should be left as such.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1877</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road.</li> <li>Traffic noise and fumes, increased health risk.</li> <li>Extra influx on schools, so classes become larger or sent to other schools.</li> <li>Extra patients for GP's, longer waiting times.</li> <li>Loss of Green Belt land.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			6. Crime and anti-social behaviour quite low in this area at present, extra influx of people put this at risk.
	<a href="#">LPP01884</a>	Object	<p>Objects to L1/5</p> <p>Objects due to traffic congestion as it is already very difficult to approach the main road. When children are at school it is even more difficult.</p> <p>If more houses are built, it would be impossible as residents have to go out 20 minutes early just to get across the main road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01892</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't use Green Belt land when brownfield sites are available.</li> <li>• Inadequate facilities.</li> <li>• We need to safeguard what we have for future generations.</li> <li>• Only doing it for extra council tax and to provide for Birmingham overspill.</li> <li>• Planners have allowed developments go ahead before without listening to objections.</li> <li>• Building companies are too large and have too much money for objections to be noted.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01907</a>	Object	<p>I wish to make my comments and raise objections to the plans affecting all age groups living in the vicinity of these three areas.</p> <p>My list as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of Green Belt status which protects our countryside from urban sprawl and threatening the existing public rights of way.</li> <li>• Significantly increase of traffic on all roads in Burlish Park, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road which at peak times suffers significantly from long tailbacks at present.</li> <li>• This increase will inevitably affect the time taken for emergency services to reach the residents. Not to forget, for us, non car drivers, the appalling bus service that already exists and will certainly not improve the situation (already difficult getting to appointments).</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The erosion of what makes Wyre Forest special, the three towns keeping their separate identities.</li> <li>• GP surgeries and dentists will struggle to cope with such an influx of patients.</li> <li>• As an ex teacher, schools will definitely suffer – they are not big enough to cope – class sizes will increase and it will be back to mobile classrooms and lack of parking for parents picking up their children – adding to the traffic chaos.</li> <li>• The wonderful addition we have of Burlish Nature Reserve will be affected by loss of wildlife. There are skylarks, linnets and other red listed birds nesting in these fields and rare plant species too. These spaces are all too rare and must be cherished.</li> <li>• Surely there are many brownfield sites that can be utilised within Wyre Forest. Once again Stourport-on-Severn comes out worst affected.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a by-pass, Kidderminster a ring road but Stourport has nothing to alleviate or divert traffic.</li> <li>• My objections are not of the ‘in my backyard’ syndrome but a plea for an already over crowded little town not to grow anymore. We do not have the infrastructure to grow further and let us keep the cherished parts of put town that make it a place we want to live.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1994</a>	Object	<p>Objects to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kingsway</li> <li>• Burlish Crossing and Bewdley Road North</li> <li>• Lickhill Road</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2101</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Belt.</li> <li>• Traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2130</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic</li> <li>2. Loss of wildlife/Green Belt</li> <li>3. Emergency services access issues</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2553</a>	Object	Bewdley Road North is difficult now and with extra houses all coming onto this road it will make it worse. Stourport has enough traffic going through it and it comes to a stand still with the slightest problem and additional homes will not help this unless backed up by improved infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPPO2556</a>	Object	I feel the extra houses will impact hugely on the roads and things are difficult as it is, and with no news of any relief road Stourport will come to a stand still.
	<a href="#">LPPO2573</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to further housing development at the proposed plan B site in Burlish park.</p> <p>I believe a further housing development at this site will cause extreme traffic problems.</p> <p>Further traffic use of the Kingsway and Windermere Way, routes that are already busy. A strain on the public transport which is struggling to provide an adequate service. Local schools are already at capacity, there appears to be no plans to increase capacity The present infrastructure is not good enough to support extra traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2854</a>	Object	<p>Burlish Crossing site has following disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strain on existing facilities/traffic congestion/lack of employment opportunities would result in residents having to commute/access would be dangerous</li> <li>• Buffer between Stourport and Bewdley would reduce</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2900</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status</li> <li>• Significantly increase traffic on all roads on Burlish Estate, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road</li> <li>• Will affect the time taken for emergency services to reach their destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emissions of exhaust fumes</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to alleviate or deviate traffic.</li> <li>• Schools unable to take in local children</li> <li>• Lack of facilities such as GP surgeries and dentists to cope with the additional influx of patients.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Loss of good quality, productive agricultural land.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence of lack of Brownfield sites to utilise.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3306</a>	Object	Object to housing on 'Bewdley Road' (L/15) already too busy, which could lead to further congestion.
	<a href="#">LPPO3322</a>	Object	Building of 157 houses on Burlish crossing will cause tailbacks in all 4 directions from the traffic lights at Burlish cross roads? This junction already suffers large tail backs so these houses and the proposed 94 on Lickhill road will bring traffic to a standstill!
	<a href="#">LPPO4054</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to Burlish Crossing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is agricultural land and should be kept this way.</li> <li>With the growth of population and climate change turning farmland into housing is wrong.</li> </ul> </li> <li>To summarise the increase in housing will bring more traffic, noise and air pollution.</li> <li>Poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion need to be addressed in Stourport.</li> <li>Doctors will not be able to cope with more patients.</li> <li>Plans need to be put in place to alleviate these problems before any developments go ahead.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3441</a>	Object	<p>The roads on Burlish/Lickhill and Bewdley Road are already being used as rat runs and can't cope with any more traffic never mind the population with the inevitable building of houses.</p> <p>Houses mean requirements for schools and doctors and dentists and we are already at overflow point.</p> <p>Let's keep the bit of beauty we have left.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3048</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly object to loss of Green Belt status.</li> <li>Increase in traffic will cause more gridlock and affect response times of emergency services as it will take longer to reach their destinations.</li> <li>Object to the increase in road noise and extra pollution from exhaust fumes.</li> <li>Stourport does not have ring road or by pass like Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>Will more schools, GP and dental surgeries be built?</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Local wildlife habitats and productive agricultural land.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should remain undeveloped and unpopulated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3135</a>	Object	<p>The Burlish Crossing is already a busy junction. With the addition of the extra traffic and the problems of entering and leaving this development will cause even greater delays, noise and pollution.</p> <p>A lot of resident don't shop in Stourport. If more non-supermarket parking was planned, instead of being taken away, then this would boost the trade of the town centre and increase jobs. The District council is only interested in houses and not the effect the PEOPLE could have on the town in a positive way if better infrastructure was in place.</p> <p>(A new road for Kidderminster but nothing mentioned for Stourport with the proposed development at Pearl Lane!)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3234</a>	Object	<p>In reference to Policy 32, Site ref LI/5, paragraphs 32.1, 32.5.</p> <p>We chose to move to Burlish Crossing in-part because of its views on to the field and the rear of the property. We felt that this was right choice of town to raise our two young children. The class sizes at Burlish Park Primary are already at capacity. We continue to enjoy the views across the field and it is frequently commented on how nice it must be to have this view. The privacy it affords was a major selling point and as the estate agent informed us, was a reason why the house was more expensive than others in the area. If the field was too built on, we would not only fight it on every level but we would look to move from the Wyre Forest area. The field hosts a wealth of wildlife currently at risk, from bees and butterflies to birds and bats. I understand that we need more housing, but if Option B goes ahead, and there is to be a new housing estate on the field behind Burlish Crossing, we as a family shall fight it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2843</a>	Object	<p>Object to building on the field behind Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>It would urbanise the area and spoil the countryside Traffic issues would be compounded and lack of services,</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>e.g. Schools, Health Services.</p> <p>Development of brownfield sites in Kidderminster and an extension to the estates, including link road would be ideal.</p> <p>Traffic would be kept to the major roads heading to Worcester and M5 and the Birmingham Road. Better access for travel, Worcester Hospital and for Fire Services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO617</a>	Object	<p>Traffic at the Burlish traffic lights is already unacceptable. Extra housing on Kingsway, golf course or on Lickhill sites will make this severe issue even worse for everyone. The extra volume of cars will cause even more pollution and will impact on the environment. Building on Green Belt sites is unacceptable. Many brown field sites are not being developed, many parts of Stourport are derelict and run down, why can't these be utilised before destroying the parts of the town that are still attractive, unpolluted and well kept.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3402</a>	Object	<p>Need to protect Green Belt; loss of habitat, increased traffic, pollution, schools full, doctors would not be able to cope, no evidence to justify building on Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2444</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to object to plans which fall under proposal B to build housing on the Burlish Crossing Fields (L1/5).</p> <p>I see on the daily basis the level of traffic build up in this area at the lights, backing up along Bewdley Road North to the roundabout on the Bewdley bypass at Blackstone. Additionally, traffic build up on Burlish Crossing, Kingsway and Windermere Way. This weight of traffic would only be increased with the development of Burlish Fields. In Stourport there is no ring road, no relief road and no by pass. All traffic is forced through the town. This also has an impact on the ability of emergency services to reach those in need.</p> <p>The pressure on local schools will increase with local children unable to access their local school. The GP surgeries already have high numbers of patients and local dentists will all come under added pressure.</p> <p>The loss of Green Belt status is a major concern. Residents chose to live here because of the green space. We enjoy the views, the wildlife and the birds of prey that are seen over the fields. We need green spaces, they protect our countryside from urban sprawl and are home to a diversity of wildlife. Green space between</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Stourport and Bewdley identifies us as separate towns.</p> <p>The other sites identified at Stourport are all in different areas, dispersed, meaning that new provision cannot be centralised. Development in Stourport does not link anyone to major road networks; forcing everyone to commute through Stourport or Bewdley.</p> <p>I hope these issues raised are taken into account in the consultation process.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3336</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even more traffic noise.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• Erosion of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Possibly even more development even nearer to house.</li> <li>• Was never informed of this development – I can not express how strongly we object.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3337</a>	Object	Object to proposed allocations
	<a href="#">LPPO3415</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can't see justification for building at Burlish crossing:</li> <li>• Lack of roads/schools and doctors/dentists already busy</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3425</a>	Object	Object loss of Green Belt and good quality agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO3736</a>	Object	<p>The areas of Bewdley Road, Lickhill Road North and Areley Kings.</p> <p>Building houses in these locations to attract people who choose to commute out of the district to work would be disastrous as they would have to travel through the known congestion points in Kidderminster or Stourport in order to access the main arterial route, and the houses would be unattractive to category two residents as they are too far away from town centres.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3514</a>	Object	Object to L1/5 - congestion, lack of infrastructure of roads, education, jobs and facilities.
	<a href="#">LPPO3972</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt status, which protects our countryside from urbanisation, threatening the existing</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>public Rights of Way. Loss of good quality productive agricultural land. We think that building would have impact on the vast variety of plant and wildlife.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant increased traffic on all roads on Bewdley Road North, Burlish Estate and Lickhill Road which at peak times already suffer from long tail backs which will effect times for emergency services to reach destinations.</li> <li>• Traffic noise and higher emission of exhaust fumes with results of higher risk to local residents.</li> <li>• Bewdley has a By-pass, Kidderminster has a ring road, Stourport has nothing despite promises of a "By-pass."</li> <li>• Schools having larger classes, or unable to take in local children requiring them to travel to another area to attend school.</li> <li>• Lack of other facilities i.e. GP surgeries and dentists to cope with additional influx of patients.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4027</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to express my thoughts on the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review document and, in particular, the 2 options proposed for the 'additional' development sites.</p> <p>With regards to future development in Stourport on Severn, whilst I do not agree with all the proposed core development sites I do feel these offer sufficient provision for new homes within the Stourport area. These utilise suitable land around the Carpets of Worth and Parsons Chain area without encroaching on Green Belt or 'open land'. However, the proposal for development at Lickhill Road North does compromise open land and will, without doubt, add extra pressure to a very busy junction (Burlish Crossing traffic lights) which currently sees regular traffic queues outside residential properties.</p> <p>My main concerns centre around the Option B proposal for further development in Stourport in the Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top areas. These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. The fact there is no provision for infrastructure (i.e. road, schooling etc) upgrades alongside these additional buildings, which there is for Option A (additional development in Kidderminster) is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising. If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley? Is this another instance of these, smaller, towns being seen as the 'poor relation' to Kidderminster?</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4037</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing infrastructure is totally inadequate for the present volume of traffic,</li> <li>Local schools, doctors and dentists are already struggling to cope with existing numbers of occupants in these areas, and a significant increase in the number of houses would lead to an influx in students and patients</li> <li>Loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2068</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kingsway is already a very road between Kidderminster to Bewdley with speeding issues</li> <li>The proposal will impact on schools, doctors/dentists and wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2071</a>	Object	With only 1 bridge over the River Severn, Stourport town could not cope with a huge increase in traffic, a second bridge proposed earlier is still needed to ease congestion during peak times
	<a href="#">LPPO2077</a>	Object	Would make exiting traffics problems worse.
	<a href="#">LPPO2097</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of habitat.</li> <li>Green Belt status.</li> <li>GP surgeries.</li> <li>Increase of traffic.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2063</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way.</li> <li>Burlish Top Nature Reserve under threat/decrease in wildlife</li> <li>Lack of road infrastructure in Stourport/increase in traffic noise/pollution in area/total upgrade of roads in Wyre Forest would be necessary</li> <li>New areas of employment would be needed for house buyers</li> <li>Lead to extreme pressure on – schools, doctors, dentists, gas/electricity and water/sewage suppliers</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2013</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of Green Belt land</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic pollution caused by more vehicles.</li> <li>3. Impact on wildlife and birdlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO1858</a>	Object	<p>Stourport has enough new housing sites, building more would be disastrous. Our roads are too busy now. Kingsway is like a main road, and with new houses built at the field adjacent to Burlish Park, can only make it worse.</p> <p>Getting in and out of Stourport is very difficult because of so much traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2123</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use brownfield sites e.g. old power station site (Stourport) and Sugarbeet (Kidderminster)</li> <li>2. Unlike Bewdley/Kidderminster, Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>3. Increase in local traffic already congested a peak times = increase in noise/fumes</li> <li>4. Capacity issue GPs/dentists</li> <li>5. Loss of Green Belt /rights of way</li> <li>6. Effect on emergency services</li> <li>7. Loss of wildlife/agricultural land</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2143</a>	Object	<p>Increase in Vehicles on Bewdley Road North causing an increase in traffic pollution.</p> <p>Also an increase in traffic in Stourport which can already be grid locked currently has nothing to alleviate the traffic problems.</p> <p>Also a large increase in population would put a strain on local services i.e. doctors, schools which are already struggling.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2525</a>	Object	I am writing to lodge my concerns regarding the proposed plans to build 157 houses on the field in Burlish

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Crossing.</p> <p>Construction of these houses will seriously decrease the current value of neighbouring properties and spoil the uninterrupted views over the lovely fields. Exactly how close would these dwellings be to neighbouring properties?</p> <p>At the Council road show at the Civic Centre I was told that if it went ahead the Council would be unable to ask for funding from the developer towards improving the local infrastructure, I would therefore be very interested to hear what, if any plans the Council have for improving the roads and traffic flow around Windermere Way, Kingsway, Burlish Crossing and The Bewdley Road, ALL of which get grid locked at the moment without the addition of 157 more houses.</p> <p>The Council refused to allow a car boot sale on these fields a couple of years ago on the grounds that it would create too much traffic. So I ask the question, how is it now acceptable to build so many houses without any plans to improve the road system?</p> <p>I would be very interested to hear the Councils' views on this proposal and how they plan to ease the already severely overcrowded roads and carriageways.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01816</a>	Object	<p>Objects to LI/5 and LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stourport does not have the infrastructure to support sufficient increase in traffic.</li> <li>2. Burlish Crossing is already overwhelmed by traffic at peak times causing tailbacks,</li> <li>3. Loss of valuable Green Belt will lead to loss of wildlife.</li> <li>4. Impact on habitat - there are nesting skylarks and tawny owl</li> <li>5. Increase in traffic pollution</li> <li>6. Need to consider schools and Doctor's surgeries as they are already under pressure.</li> </ol> <p>Please reconsider your plans.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP01796</a>	Object	<p>Objects to any plans that involve building on Green Belt land for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are sufficient brownfield sites to exploit before needing to consider Green Belt</li> <li>2. Concerned about development around Burlish as the crossing is very busy.</li> <li>3. Concerned about access road to Bewdley for emergency services- at peak times Burlish crossing can be gridlocked.</li> <li>4. Infrastructure in and around Stourport - questions if it will be able to cope with the additional demand on services and roads.</li> <li>5. Green Belt needs to be retained to protect wildlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01674</a>	Object	I object to LI/5 because of already heavy traffic in area and already busy facilities e.g. Drs would not cope.
	<a href="#">LPP01646</a>	Object	Object loss of Green Belt and good quality agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPP01665</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I object to the increase in already congested traffic and related noise/emissions.</li> <li>• Doctors and hospitals already very busy.</li> <li>• Building on Green Belt will affect wildlife and lead to more flooding.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0524</a>	Object	Development of the Green Belt site bounded by Burlish Crossing, Bewdley Road and Elan Avenue would have a negative visual impact over adjacent properties for the second time since the completion of the Burlish Park development 40 years ago. (The previous occasion was the building of houses on the site of the former Stourport on Severn to Bewdley railway line.) The need for additional housing in this area can be met from the use of existing brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPP01777</a>	Object	Objects to the building of 157 houses on Burlish LI/5 as this is Green Belt land and also landscape character.
	<a href="#">LPP0708</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• Far too much traffic on a very busy road.</li> <li>• Accident waiting to happen.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE LI/5 – BURLISH CROSSING, STOURPORT

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO715</a>	Object	Bewdley Road North is heavily congested, especially at peak times.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO991</a>	Support	<p>LI/5 Land at Burlish Crossing</p> <p>The development of this site is less unacceptable than sites to the north, in that the town would extend out to the boundary of the former Burlish Common, of which the field is part. The next parcel to the northeast has already been developed (including Elan Avenue).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4536</a>	Support	Instead of LI/2, the Option B site LI/5 Burlish Crossing should be used, where it would be in closer proximity to the main road and to keep development more compact.
	<a href="#">LPPO2880</a>	Support	<p>I support the release of land at sites LI/5 subject to significant landscape considerations.</p> <p>The whole of the western edge of Stourport, lacks any landscaping, so enhance the views across to Burlish Top. It is appropriate that all settlements make a contribution to the current housing shortages. Even though the LPR commissioned research defines Wyre Forest as a self- sustaining housing market, it does not mean that, in the plan period, this might not change in different economic or transport circumstances. House prices in Wyre Forest compared to other districts in Worcestershire and nearby metropolitan boroughs are significantly lower and the reasons for this might change. The plan makes little provision for this area becoming more attractive because it is so cheap and commuting becomes easier with improved transport- such as new train station and services.</p> <p>However the above aspects need to be set out in the Local Plan at this stage so as to secure appropriate development.</p> <p>Green technologies, design codes, landscaping and materials guidance should also be set out at this stage so prospective developers are aware of the significance/importance of the site, It is an opportunity for the Council to set standards for the future as well as contribute to the housing market in an innovative way.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5006</a>	Support	The possible site at Burlish Crossing seems to be a sensible option. Access to the town would be straightforward and also from this position access to Kidderminster and Bewdley is simple because it is on the right side of the town.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/17 – STOURPORT MANOR

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO220</a>	Comment	Stourport Manor: this site appears to have 2 x tennis courts and perhaps some playing field. Any losses would need to be justified under NPPF Par 74 and SE policy.
	<a href="#">LPPO1783</a>	Object	<p>Objects to the proposed development on the “pitch put course” at Stourport Manor due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield site with mature trees and a valuable open space which is not farmland but a rare area of grass and hedges.</li> <li>• The proposed number of houses would be too dense to be sustainable and would be inappropriate so close to Hartlebury Common.</li> <li>• There are few amenities (i) No shop, (ii) Only a small school with limited room for expansion (iii) no bus stop (iv) Narrow road with no pavement (Wilden Top Road is basically single track).</li> <li>• Dangerous Junction- of Wilden Top Road and Hartlebury Road.</li> <li>• Heavy lorries (Talbot Landfill) frequently use Wilden Top Road.</li> </ul>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO808</a>	Object	Stourport Manor - Exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated to remove site from Green Belt. Non-Green Belt sites should be favoured first.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO992</a>	Object	Area characterised by steep scarp above Stour valley. This site is above top of scarp. Hotel should remain as isolated building in Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO25</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Stourport Manor. The current local transport infrastructure cannot support this development.</p> <p>At peak times traffic often queues on the Hartlebury Road as far as Wilden Top Lane, also backs up along Wilden Lane from the Stourport end. At the Kidderminster end, peak traffic queues are already backing up beyond the 40 mph limit. With the additional employment development on the site of the old settling pools this will only increase.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO MI/17 – STOURPORT MANOR

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The junction of Wilden Top Lane and Hartlebury Road is close to a summit in the road. That would make that junction unsuitable for access to any new development On Wilden Top.</p> <p>Bigbury Lane, (which is the main pedestrian access from existing housing at Wilden Top to Wilden Lane) has a narrow section with no footpath. This would be the primary road access to Wilden All Saints CofE Primary School, resulting in increased traffic volumes.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP01302</a>	Comment	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites and there are limited local facilities in Areley Kings. Housing development here will increase the traffic crossing Stourport Bridge and using the one-way system through Stourport.</p> <p>Development of this land would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0734</a>	Comment	Rectory/Pearl Lane would require extra roads even another river bridge!
	<a href="#">LPP03220</a>	Comment	<p>The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</p> <p>The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</p> <p>The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</p> <p>There is not enough provision for schools, doctors, dentist on this side of the bridge as the current facilities would not handle any more residents.</p> <p>Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock.</p> <p>As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper.</p> <p>Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</p>
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPP01260</a>	Comment	Development of these sites at Areley Kings would encroach into the open countryside and lead to further exacerbate the high level of traffic congestion across the bridge and add to air pollution in the town centre. This point is actually made in section 32.5 of the Review document.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP03394</a>	Comment	Can be serviced via public transport.
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPP01246</a>	Comment	<p>Concerns about significant levels of growth at Areley Kings (550 new dwellings under option B). This area is adjacent to the Malvern Hills District boundary and has already seen growth come forward within Malvern Hills District. The infrastructure implications of any site allocations within this area need to be carefully considered in the context of recent and planned development on the Malvern Hills side of the administrative boundary to ensure that sufficient capacity exists. In particular, the impact of growth on the current river Severn crossing within Stourport should be considered, particularly as there is no longer an intention to deliver the Stourport Relief Road in Local Transport 4.</p> <p>A number of issues have been raised about this site including: drainage, encroachment in the countryside, extra traffic which would lead to a new Air Quality Management Area to be implemented.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03276</a>	Comment	<p>It will be essential to be clear about the level of affordable housing and its provision. (Developers should not be allowed to agree a ratio of affordable development only to later reduce that ratio to ensure a higher profit).</p> <p>There are statements about the attraction of the Town Centre, but properties do not appear to be maintained to a high standard and the issue of the 'Buftons' building in Bridge Street has been unresolved for several decades. The development to link The Canal Basins with Bridge Street has yet to take place and is currently a car park.</p> <p>Any additional development in Areley Kings will increase demand on health and education services. The traffic system is under considerable strain. Areley Common is regularly congested and the tail back across the River Bridge backs up to Dunley Road and Areley Common. The Town Centre itself is frequently blocked.</p> <p>Social cohesion and the need to identify with your community is important for quality of life, levels of crime, etc. This should be a primary factor in retaining community boundaries and village identity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03285</a>	Comment	<p><b><u>Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane (AKR/14 and AKR/15)</u></b></p> <p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites and there are limited local facilities in Areley Kings. Housing development here will increase the traffic crossing Stourport Bridge and using the one-</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>way system through Stourport.</p> <p>Development of this land, on such a scale, would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat. Surely the refusal of the development on the Snipes has recognised this, and its principles would apply to other sites of major development in the area?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0235</a>	Comment	<p>The Pearl Lane developers are, we are told by the Officers at the presentation, going to be responsible for the provision of a second bridge and road improvements. Bearing in mind the link road to provide the access to the river on the North side to the bridge was to be the responsibility of the food store developer and Wyre Forest singularly failed to get other than a feeder road to the development there is little chance of getting this improvement at the costs indicated.</p> <p>Congestion from the South across the bridge is causing significant pollution as well as delays. Again we are told that the bridge is adequate with no proof given. If this is so this clearly shows that infrastructure improvements are urgently required North of the bridge without any further development.</p>
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPP0919</a>	Comment	<p>It is stated: “The site at Pearl Lane also has known drainage issues.” Although this recognises that there is an issue, I think that using the word ‘drainage’ without any further context might wrongly imply that this has to do with household drainage, or even foul drainage. What we are talking about is that in recent years overland flow from this site (currently agricultural) has exacerbated property flooding relating to insufficient capacity in the piped drainage system in the existing residential area. I agree with the final line of this section which states that “It is for the sites' promoters to justify their allocation and demonstrate how these constraints can be mitigated.” It is however fair to say though that the options are limited, namely ensuring that absolutely no additional discharge is being made from the site or making required improvements to the receiving piped system that runs through the existing residential development; neither option is straightforward and in exceedance events (more extreme than design) flood risk remains exacerbated.</p> <p>Suggested wording: “The site at Pearl Lane and the existing residential site adjacent have known surface water drainage and flooding issues which will require careful mitigation.”</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03685</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to option B.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any housing developments across the bridge into Areley Kings will have an effect on the environment and the quality of life of residents.</li> <li>More vehicles on the road will affect residents in the area as well as causing reduced air quality which could lead to health issues.</li> <li>Estimate: possibly 100-1500+ extra vehicles which leads to 2000+ extra journeys a day.</li> <li>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable and unmanageable.</li> <li>Funding should be targeted where there is sufficient scope to develop a manageable and workable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</li> <li>Increase in population and vehicles would need significant change to local infrastructure.</li> <li>Local infrastructure in Areley Kings is already at full capacity so there's no room for expansion - option B does not provide funding for improvements.</li> <li>Local roads are primarily country lanes.</li> <li>Only one local primary school - no room for more pupils.</li> <li>Additional patients at doctors/dentists will have an affect on the quality of services they provide.</li> <li>Local infrastructure will not cope with new development as there is no funding to improve what's already in place - creating unreasonable and unsustainable demands.</li> <li>Development attracts more development.</li> <li>Stourport/Areley Kings cannot take the levels of additional housing in option B let alone any additional future developments.</li> <li>Traffic in Stourport already causes gridlock especially at peak times.</li> <li>Congestion, roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volume of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians.</li> <li>It is not just the local population which uses Stourport Bridge to cross the river.</li> <li>Stourport is a tourist attraction as well as having caravan parks causing more people and cars to come to the area.</li> <li>Very limited employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>Options of creating new job opportunities are minimal even with funding which option B does not offer.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03525</a>	Object	1. There are already houses planned in this area, just over the border into Malvern Hills. Inhabitants of

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>these houses will inevitably be sharing the same services such as education, health etc and their additional vehicles will add to the existing congestion and pollution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Building more housing developments in the Areley Kings area would add even further to this. Congestion would particularly increase. As most of the facilities are not this side of the river, most people have to travel. In turn, this would exacerbate the problems in Stourport, particularly around the river crossing, Gilgal, Lion Hill, York Street. These roads are already particularly busy, gridlocked at times. This would dramatically increase pollution levels, reducing air quality.</li> <li>3. There have already been fatalities at the Pearl Lane/Dunley Road crossroads. Adding more traffic and access points in this locality would be extremely dangerous.</li> <li>4. Residents in Shrawley already have problems with speeding traffic and the roads through Holt and Ombersley are often gridlocked.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3512</a>	Object	Objection - lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. Building on Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3271</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object most strongly to any plans to build housing on greenfield sites in Areley Kings. The infrastructure of the village doesn't lend itself to further housing development. Lack of school facilities, health facilities, roads to the south, west are both narrow and tortuous. THE MAIN POINT IS THAT A SINGLE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIVER is obviously totally inadequate for further traffic feeding as it does a very limited traffic gyratory system in Stourport. Furthermore the view along the valley from Areley Kings Church towards the Abberley Hills is one of middle England's finest and would be destroyed forever should building be allowed to the west of Dunley Road. There are acres of brownfield site within the Wyre Forest area so why destroy our heritage, OUR GREEN AND PLEASANT LAND!! Looking to Kidderminster Town Centre there are streets of empty derelict shops so why not follow the current American pattern of popular 'In-town Living'? Area too of derelict factories south of Tesco's in Stourport.</p> <p>Another facet is the lack of public transport evenings and Sundays. Services gone and never to return.</p> <p>I trust that you will throw out this plan and look again at all the brown field sites around. I feel that no homework has been done yet again!</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3178</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional housing across the river on the Dunley Road side of Stourport would also cause severe traffic congestion as there is only one bridge for traffic to cross leading to and from the town.</li> <li>• The amount of traffic in Stourport has increased greatly in recent years due to additional housing and yet the infrastructure has not improved. There has been no additional schools, medical centres, hospitals in the Wyre Forest area and no improvement with the roads to help alleviate traffic, apart from a set of traffic lights at Burlish Crossing. What a difference that made! Over the years promises have been made by MPs to improve traffic problems by introducing a new relief road and bridge, but these promises have never materialised.</li> <li>• Stourport is already heavily congested and these traffic problems are increased in the summer months as it is popular with tourists.</li> <li>• Rather than improvements to the infrastructure of Stourport, we have witnessed a decrease in our facilities, i.e. Police, Fire Station, Leisure Centre and swimming pool, children's paddling pool in the Memorial Park. These facilities have all been moved to Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Although I object to the large housing estates and social housing on Green Belt land in theory I accept that with increased population and immigration there is a need for additional housing. But with increased population in an area, surely the facilities and infrastructure for that area should also be increased to cater for the increased needs of the populace.</li> </ul> <p>I would add that although I am against these concrete jungles taking over Green Belt land, it would appear that Kidderminster would be better placed to accommodate the additional housing, as its' infrastructure and facilities are far superior to that in place in Stourport. In addition, the proposed new road joining the A456 to the A449 would also help alleviate the additional traffic; whereas I believe there are no such new roads proposed for Stourport.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4110</a>	Object	<p>In relation to the two preferred options being put forwards for development it seems that the obvious option to adopt is option A as opposed to option B. I believe this to be for the following reasons:</p> <p>The infrastructure has to be key to this as the Kidderminster/Stourport/Bewdley area roads are already congested and Option B does not have any plan or allowance to ease this issue. Particularly in relation to the proposed houses west of the River Severn on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings, the area already has a</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>huge issue with people trying to get into Stourport over the bridge. The road layout in Stourport does not and will not ever be particularly traffic friendly and at peak times it can take over half an hour to do a mile journey from Areley Kings, through Stourport. Preferred Option B would plan to add 550 houses to Areley Kings side of the river. On the basis that the average house has 2 cars these days and with the main employment opportunities being offered in Kidderminster area that would be an additional 1100 cars trying to get over Stourport bridge and would make an already bad problem locally, even worse. It would be a nightmare to put 550 new houses on Areley Kings side of the river without a new bridge to account for the traffic.</p> <p>Schools - Option B with particular relevance to the proposed 550 houses in Areley Kings. This area is already overcrowded in schools with children having to take places in schools to Stourport side of the river as there are not enough places in the Areley Kings Schools. This matter will get worse with the proposed increase in housing. This point also links to the above point on traffic as if there is no proposal as part of preferred option B to increase school places to Areley Kings side of the river then this will mean more traffic to get children to Stourport schools, further deepening the issue of the bridge being a huge bottleneck for traffic.</p> <p>Employment — With particular relevance to the proposed housing in preferred option B to Areley Kings side of the river, these people would all need to travel through Stourport and over Stourport Bridge to get to their jobs as no large employment opportunities will be created to the west of the river.</p> <p>Natural Environment — The area to the west of the River Severn being proposed for development currently has a vibrant natural environment which is enjoyed by a lot of the local residents for dog walking, outdoor pursuits and most of all its natural beauty. Developing such an area with increased housing would have a huge impact on local residents' ability to enjoy the natural environment in which they live. The area is also home to a large amount of wildlife including birds whose habitat would be ruined by the preferred option B plan to build 550 houses on the land by Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4124</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development to the west of the river Severn would carry such massive infrastructure costs.</li> <li>Creating approx 1000 new homes to the west of Stourport, must inevitably require a new Severn crossing. Currently going from the west, crossing the river at Stourport can easily take 30 minutes.</li> <li>The schools, Doctors and other requirements, must surely make the whole concept run into many</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Millions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing traffic would make the situation far, far worse.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0352</a>	Object	<p>Most houses have 2 cars outside them. Building over 500 houses on the Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane sites is likely to generate something in the order of 1000 additional vehicles. Some of the journeys made in these vehicles will be in the direction of Worcester (B4196) or in the direction of Great Witley (A451) and so will not directly affect traffic flow in Stourport. However, the majority of journeys will be over Stourport bridge and through Stourport. This area already suffers traffic flow problems and it is not unusual for traffic to queue back along Dunley Road to the crossroads of A451 and B4194. If drivers take the alternative route to cross the River Severn by going along Ribbesford Road, known locally as the Switchback (B4194) to avoid Stourport bridge, they will add to the existing congestion in Bewdley.</p> <p>There is no scope to widen Stourport bridge and we are told that there is no possibility of an additional river crossing, so adding houses to the west of the river can only be detrimental to traffic flow through the town.</p> <p>The problem will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Paragraph 32.5 acknowledges the flood risk associated with the Pearl Lane site. The last flooding event was at the end of 2013 when run off from the agricultural land (Site WKR/14) affected houses backing onto Pearl Lane, in Cheviot Close and Abberley Avenue.</p> <p>Following that event, some remedial work was undertaken, but building 420 houses and concreting over WKR/14 can only increase the risk of a similar event happening again, unless significant drainage works are required as an essential part of any development and that these works GUARANTEE there will be no further flooding events.</p> <p>As with the traffic flow issue, the matter will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Areley Kings is a mainly residential area and there is little infrastructure by way of, for example, schools and shops. Building 550 houses in Areley Kings would increase the need for additional school places and shopping. Neither of which can be accommodated to the west of the River Severn and both of which will add to the problems of traffic flow already mentioned.</p>
Shrawley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01393</a>	Object	<p>Representation within Option B for new housing on the southern edge of Stourport, although other proposals within this Option may have some limited impact.</p> <p>Option B for 420 dwellings along Pearl Lane, Stourport, together with a further 130 dwellings at Rectory Lane, Stourport. In addition to the up to 62 dwellings on Pearl Lane approved by MHDC in April 2014, decision notice not issued until 25 February 2015.</p> <p>WFDC and MHDC have each recently refused an application from Gladman Land for up to 125 dwellings at Astley Cross, This could go to appeal which, if successful, could see a total of nearly 750 dwellings proposed along the boundary between WFDC and MHDC.</p> <p>New housing needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure, including roads. There are no current proposals for a second river crossing at Stourport.</p> <p>Implications for neighbouring villages within MHDC. The transport assessment undertaken by Myer Brown in February 2014, in support of the outline planning application for up to 62 dwellings in Pearl Lane, says in paragraph 4.6: Furthermore, the anticipated development traffic distribution is for most peak time trips to be to / from the south, towards Worcester, with only a quarter of trips or less being to / from Stourport. This assessment was to allay fears about increased traffic through the centre of Stourport but nevertheless does mean a large majority of such journeys would be along the B4196 through Shrawley as there is no sensible alternative route to the Worcester hinterland.</p> <p>The traffic assessment produced by Ashley Hemle Associates for the Gladman Land application appears to show</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>(Figure B5) that nearly 75% of the 8.00 to 9.00 am traffic was expected to head in the direction of Stourport, some 60% plus then going over the bridge, whilst only slightly more than 25% was towards Shrawley. It is difficult on an initial reading to understand the reasons why the assessment of two developments so near together should produce such different traffic flow estimates.</p> <p>Impact of Option B housing likely to be significant through too substantial for traffic travelling along the B4196. Peak time congestion along the A4133 from its junction with the B4196 at the Red Lion, Holt through Ombersley and beyond. Further large scale housing developments together with any expansion of the West Midlands Safari Park are likely to exacerbate the existing problems unless there is road infrastructure investment.</p> <p>MHDC and WFDC should work together with Worcestershire County Council to understand fully the traffic flow estimates arising from all the proposed housing developments along the MHDC/Wyre Forest boundary at Stourport together with other significant known and anticipated proposals within the area. They then need to assess the implications for the road network across this part of North Worcestershire before bringing forward proposals for investment to address the issues that such a holistic approach has identified.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0988</a>	Object	<p>AKR/14 Pearl Lane, Areley Kings</p> <p>This again is a viable site, if more housing is needed on that side of Stourport. We would however question its selection as the road on its east side constitutes a clear landscape boundary for the developed area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01768</a>	Object	<p>Object to Option B in planning for residential properties being built on AKR/15 Rectory Lane &amp; AKR/14 Pearl Lane.</p> <p>Stourport is a bottleneck both getting over the bridge and driving from Burlish Crossroads.</p> <p>We do not have the infrastructure in Stourport. The need for a new bridge and road system, more schools, jobs and doctors. These facilities aren't there for the population it already has.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0158</a>	Object	<p>Stourport infrastructure, is not sustainable in its current state, the addition of any housing to the West of the river bridge would produce more stress to those who need to cross the river, there are no doctors surgeries on</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the West bank and there is only one primary school, very limited employment opportunities and only convenience shopping facilities. The public transport provision is constrained along with domestic traffic by the limitations of the congested bridge and high street, which has been compounded by the addition of traffic lights to the North of the high street. It is not unusual for the queue for the bridge to reach half a mile long on holiday week end and Fridays. Any new domestic building would result in major pressure on the existing very fragile infrastructure. Majority of additional traffic would cross the bridge in order to reach services. Without a relief road the west side of the bridge could not survive a further addition of 500 dwellings, and should adjoining local authorities also approve additional dwellings in this area the whole area would result in social meltdown.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction is inevitable if building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how the access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction in inevitable it building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl  Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how the access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>The consultation plan already highlights potential problems with drainage on the Pearl Lane site as flooding is already common in Red House Road, any development on the West side of Pearl Lane would only compound this issue unless a very large delaying reservoir was installed, which of course does not come without its own safety risks. Similarly the proposed Rectory Lane site would also exasperate the existing flooding problems of Burnthorne Brook and Gladder Brook, both of which regularly burst there banks.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Both these proposed developments would be invasive to existing green field sites and expand the footprint of Stourport. These sites are adjacent to the District Council boundary, further development to these areas which are within Wyre Forest could simulate a reaction from the Adjacent Local authority to allow development adjacent to the any new residential area, compounding the pressures that have been identified above.
	<a href="#">LPP0187</a>	Object	I object to the proposed housing developments in Areley Kings paragraph32.5. I strongly feel that such housing would have a negative effect on the area including Stourport town, it would cause increased road traffic congestion in the wide area and air pollution. This pollution would certainly reduce air quality, resulting in exacerbation of respiratory ill health conditions. I therefore would ask the council to reject these plans.
	<a href="#">LPP0685</a>	Object	<p>We have visited the Areley Kings village hall for the presentation of the District Council Local Plan which was very well organised and with helpful officials to discuss individual's comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option B - serious traffic congestion, particularly when trying to cross the river Severn from Areley Kings. Need for a new bridge has already been recognised when development on this side of the river was considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion already a problem in Areley Common, and when using local shops. Car parking for local residents is needed or a one way system or traffic lights. An increase in population would make the situation worse.</li> <li>3. Development along Rectory Lane would spoil a quiet country walk and the unspoilt scenery.</li> <li>4. Narrow Rectory Lane is blocked by traffic coming in opposite directions and is used to try to avoid a queue of traffic in the Dunley Road trying to cross the bridge. To cross the bridge from the Walshes. A traffic light system at the Areley Common- Dunley Road junction needed if development resulted in a significant increase in population this side of the river.</li> <li>5. The area in Option B now threatened with building development does not form part of the Green Belt for Stourport. High density building, on the plot bordered by Rectory Lane, Dunley Road and the Bewdley Road would stand out as an ugly disfigurement of the landscape. Wildlife here- larks singing &amp; pheasants nesting. The larger designated area bordered by Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road does have</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			some shielding by trees and bank to make development less conspicuous.
	<a href="#">LPPO338</a>	Object	Object to the building of new homes in Stourport on Severn, 550 new homes mean a minimum of 1,100 more cars on the roads. We have a job, to get to Stourport now and on a Friday when the car boot is on it's impossible to go out before 1 O'clock with the congested roads into the town and there will be a minimum of 1,100 more people to go to the only 2 doctor's surgeries in the town. More pressure on local schools and more pollution from the cars in the town. Start with doing something about Kidderminster hospital, get that up and running before you start putting more people in Kidderminster and Stourport. We have to go to Worcester or Redditch hospital. Use Option A. The Wyre Forest council was going to build another bridge 18 years ago due to congestion in the town, bypass was promised 8 years ago, we have had a few very bad accidents with a few deaths on the Dunley Road. Need lights or a roundabout on the crossroads at Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road to slow cars and bikes down, it might save someone's life some day.
	<a href="#">LPPO2688</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b><u>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</u></b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b><u>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</u></b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools, shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2834</a>	Object	<p>Development from Stourport to Areley Kings will affect the environment/quality of life due to traffic congestion/pollution and would require significant changes to the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development attracts more development and Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Option B offers NO additional funding for improved local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: i.e. Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly <u>closed</u>), roads, schools, shops, employment etc.</p> <p>Expansion is not a viable option!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2727</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to view my concerns of future Wyre Forest plans to build 6000 homes by 2034.</p> <p>Most homes have three or more cars. This creates problems with streets being blocked with parked cars, which has a knock on effect to emergency vehicles, refuse emptying vehicles etc.</p> <p>My main objection would be the increase in traffic, in particular traffic to cross over the bridge in Stourport.</p> <p>When the saplings were planted around the perimeter of the field adjacent to Pearl Lane, I questioned the reason why, were told planning permission would only be granted if there is another bridge built to cross the Severn, as the current bridge in Stourport would not cope with the extra traffic.</p> <p>The traffic sometimes stretches back as far as the Pearl Lane crossroads, and on occasions even further. I can imagine it would be like that every day with the amount of houses being suggested and majority of the traffic going in that direction.</p> <p>I do fear what impact it will have on residents and their children who live in Areley Kings.</p> <p>We choose to live in a more semi rural area, and don't want to sit in queues of traffic every day. Therefore I will</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			oppose option B until you can come up with a plan i.e. the construction of a new bridge to ease the congestion over the current bridge in Stourport. The road infrastructure is already in place, at the site of the old power station
	<a href="#">LPP01864</a>	Object	Local facilities/services already nearly at capacity without adding to it.
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPP01863</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about development and the loss of floral and fauna. Also mentions history of flash flooding in Rectory Lane area.</li> <li>2. Concerned about lack of infrastructure (gas, sewerage, water) not available, particularly in Rectory Lane. Also lack of amenities, i.e. schools and doctors.</li> <li>3. Access over river bridge to Areley Kings area, 'Do we book a weekly slot for crossing?'</li> <li>4. Concerned at the lack of industrial/commercial sites to employ all extra residents.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01788</a>	Object	<p>Objects to site references AKR/14 and AKR/15 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on wildlife and questions if ground surveys have taken place</li> <li>2. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>3. Concerned about the impact of up to 1,000 more cars having to access Stourport over the single bridge.</li> <li>4. Additional pollution from vehicles</li> <li>5. No space in existing schools, hospitals, Doctors surgeries without extra funding.</li> </ol> <p>Believes that Areley Kings is already the poor part of Stourport as far as WFDC are concerned and Stourport is the poor part of Wyre Forest. Bewdley and Kidderminster are the main beneficiaries for everything concerned with WFDC and these proposed additional buildings will make matters worse.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01903</a>	Object	Any development will have an adverse affect on the area.
	<a href="#">LPP02356</a>	Object	Comment on Option B - 550 houses to be built on Pearl Lane/Rectory Road. This would create extra traffic and cause even more problems getting through already congested Stourport. The other options seem far more

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			sensible.
	<a href="#">LPP02618</a>	Object	<p>I live in Areley Kings and it frequently takes far too long to get across the bridge over the River Severn on Bridge Street as it is. During the rush hour the queue can back up along Dunley Road past Church Walk. It must be a nightmare for people trying to turn right out of Areley Common and another 550 houses will only exacerbate the situation. Your document states that the narrow Georgian road system in central Stourport is already borderline Air Quality Management. More greenfield development in the town will finally push it over the limit. I would be happy to see the brownfield sites developed, such as the old Chichester Caravan outlet in Vale Road and Parsons Chain in Hartlebury Road. Surely the core housing sites already agreed, together with the old Carpets of Worth site, would be more than enough to satisfy current residents who wish to stay in the town.</p> <p>In short unless and until money is allocated for a new bridge and relief road around Stourport, I really don't think building any more houses in Areley Kings is a viable option.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02689</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b><u>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</u></b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b><u>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</u></b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools, shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPQ2742</a>	Object	<p>If all the planned sites in the Areley Kings area were passed it would cause major problems ref the infrastructure. The bridge and current road systems are currently struggling with the traffic already using them without the addition of an extra few thousand vehicles that these proposed developments would bring. There would also be an extra strain on resources such as local schools, doctor's surgeries, dental practices etc.</p> <p>Until funding is supplied to support a ring road/ second bridge I would strongly suggest that you as our District Council strongly oppose any major building applications on the Areley Kings side of Stourport. Not opposed to any new builds as we do need more affordable housing in Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ4530</a>	Object	<p>Having attended the drop in session in Arley Kings &amp; the viewing the proposed development of the above references I am writing to lodge my OBJECTION to the proposal for this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional traffic from this proposed site will have to proceed onto the Dunley Road if wanting to access direction to Stourport or Bewdley, having to negotiate the already accident prone area cross road junction</li> <li>• Additional traffic will have to proceed over the river bridge which at peak travelling times can be banked up almost back to the crossroad junction-I write having experienced this on many, many occasions trying to get to my place of work on the Kidderminster Road, there being no other option than to travel over the bridge.</li> <li>• When repairs to structure or road surface over this bridge can add a further 20-30mins to any journey</li> <li>• Should Goldthorne Lane, commonly referred to as 'switchback' be closed off for any reason, flooding/road surface repair again traffic again has to be directed down towards Stourport via the Bridge.</li> <li>• Pearl Lane has become evermore popular for traffic cutting through to Bewdley/Stourport sounding at times like a Formula One race track.</li> <li>• There is no plan to change the existing road system, the existing is just NOT good enough to cope.</li> <li>• There are NO plans to increase &amp; add additional schools, (present being sited on The Walshes &amp; Astley) doctor surgeries within the proposed vicinity, surgeries are all within Stourport town, accessible only via 'The Bridge'.</li> <li>• It cannot possibly bring any employment over 'The Bridge' within the Areley Kings area, just an</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>additional increase of people which must be in excess of 2000, with an additional increase of vehicle movement in excess of 1000 using an already overstretched route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To accommodate this number of homes is just not logistically feasible given the infrastructure as it exists now.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3151</a>	Object	<p>Construction of houses at the sites in Areley Kings, Stourport, is inappropriate and disastrous for Stourport with only one bridge giving access to the town and Kidderminster beyond, extra vehicles would add to the existing congestion over Stourport bridge, Bridge street and High street where long queues of traffic are commonplace, and a journey of half a mile can take fifteen minutes or more.</p> <p>Dunley road is a busy road, even if traffic lights or a roundabout were installed to reduce the possibility of accidents the problem with traffic on the bridge would still not be alleviated. If the construction of another bridge was feasible the main objection to the proposed sites would be removed.</p> <p>Increase in population could overstretch local schools and doctors' surgeries whereas a large, new medical centre has recently opened in Kidderminster which could help to accommodate the increased population for option A.</p> <p>Road links to the main areas of employment Droitwich, Worcester and Malvern are inadequate and public transport for employment purposes are poor whereas the proposed construction of a new road for option A would improve traffic flow and reduce congestion in the Kidderminster area.</p> <p>No provision for improving traffic flow through Stourport with option B,</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3610</a>	Object	<p>AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth to be used for housing before AKR/14 Pearl Lane or AKR/15 Rectory Lane sites which have no infrastructure and would increase traffic on Stourport bridge and destroy farmland/wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food & entertainment.
	<a href="#">LPP03521</a>	Object	<p>You have to queue in traffic as far back as the entrance to my road. On a sunny day it can take over 30 mins. just to get over the river bridge into town. To build 100's of houses is crazy on this site that would mean 100 more cars. Stourport would become a 'GRIDLOCKED' Town.</p> <p>I myself have tried public transport to get to work (Diamond number 3 bus) which are totally unreliable, so that for most people is not an option.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04750</a>	Object	<p>There are drainage issues associated with the Pearl Lane site. On several occasions in the past Pearl Lane itself and houses in Abberley Avenue have been flooded by runoff from the agricultural land which is now proposed as a building site. The risk of future flooding will only increase if this area is covered in concrete and asphalt.</p> <p>Furthermore the LPR makes no mention of the remains of the Roman villa which lie under the Pearl Lane site. The LPR maintains that one of its overarching environmental principals is to protect important historic buildings, monuments, sites of archaeological significance ..." (LPR; paragraph 5.4c, p22).</p> <p>This villa is "important as one of the very few Roman agricultural sites to have been excavated in Hereford and Worcester. In particular there is very little evidence for aisled buildings in the West Midlands" (Hemmingway, J and Buteux V. 1992: <i>A Roman Site at Dunley Rd, Areley Kings</i>: HWCN 1136, p6) Any development would need to ensure that these remains are preserved for research and development by archaeologists in the future.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02402</a>	Object	<p>Option B must not be considered for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overriding factor above all else is the Stourport Bridge bottleneck. Living in Areley Kings we find that most days we are in a queue just to access the town. Every Friday this becomes an exceptional delay as the local car boot empties. Until a bypass is built any development should be refused in the Areley Kings area.</li> <li>2. How is the local school going to manage. Even if it is possible to be extended the access up Princess Way it is already overloaded and dangerous.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. How will the High School cope?</p> <p>4. Part of the proposed development is upon highly productive farmland.</p> <p>5. How will the local Doctors cope with additional patients in their fixed cramped and dilapidated old premises. (We note Kidderminster and Bewdley are both in possession of new Doctors premises).</p> <p>In view of all the development in the local areas how can Worcester Royal be expected to cope?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2445</a>	Object	<p>I am a resident of Stourport-on-Severn and I would like to make the following points as a result of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possible development sites at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane will not affect me directly but they will add a huge amount of traffic through Stourport. The town is already very congested at times and this amount of new housing would just add to an existing problem. If you try to get through the town from Areley Kings you can easily wait for 10 or 15 minutes to get across the bridge. The queues often stretch along Dunley road well past Areley Common. Additionally there are queues down Areley Common and trying to get out of Hermitage Way can be a nightmare!</li> <li>• Why not conduct a study on Thursday and Friday mornings to get a quantified measure of the issue? It is not only the rush hour traffic but mid morning can be particularly bad.</li> <li>• This will also add pressure to already stretched medical services with the 2 doctors' surgeries and other infrastructure necessary within any town.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2627</a>	Object	<p>Building houses here would increase commuter traffic through the known congestion points in Kidderminster or Stourport in order to access the main arterial route. The sites are too far away from town centres.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2305</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in the Areley Kings.</p> <p>1. Extra traffic and pollution potential. Most of this extra traffic will be trying to get to work and shop in Kidderminster going over one bridge through the one way system of Stourport. Traffic tailing back from the bridge up to Areley Kings, with waiting times of up to half an hour to get into Stourport, even worse to get to Kidderminster.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>2. Pearl Lane site has drainage issues. Our house backs on to Pearl Lane, we nearly flooded in July 2007 and did flood three times in November 2012. Following the flooding in 2012 we had to move out of our house for 6 months whilst the house was dried out and made habitable again. The flood water poured directly from the fields where this proposed development site is, straight across the road and through our house.</p> <p>3. Local schools are getting full or are already oversubscribed, with no physical room to expand. .</p> <p>4. Increased need for Doctor's surgeries and the hospital, too much pressure on already overstretched services.</p> <p>Most new development should be between Stourport and Kidderminster or on the outskirts of Kidderminster where there is better transport links around the wider area. No proposal for infrastructure improvements in Areley Kings, so for any significant development to take place on this side of the river there would need to be major infrastructure improvements including a second bridge.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02121</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Pearl Lane and Ribbesford Road/Dunley Road sites:</p> <p>Already under pressure services would be need improvement - roads, sewerage/waste disposal, schools and health facilities. Stourport already v. congested, by-pass needed</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02557</a>	Object	<p>Stourport is a good place to live apart from the traffic going over the main Stourport bridge into Stourport centre from the Dunley Road. Our concerns are at times we can't even get off our own driveway due to the traffic build up going into Stourport centre causing total gridlock.</p> <p>Therefore with the proposed plans to build more houses on plan B which I have already gave our opinion to planning officer at the civic hall. With nowhere for traffic to exit the town with out a build up of traffic causing a grid lock this is totally unacceptable for the local residents and local emergency services who already suffer traffic grid lock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02598</a>	Object	<p>We currently experience long delays along the Dunley Road leading into Stourport. The problem if further exacerbated by the parking of cars along Stourport High Street which slows the traffic down whilst they manoeuvre into the parking bays. With pedestrians also crossing the High Street of this busy little town the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic frequently grinds to a halt.</p> <p>The LPR does not allow for any additional Doctors Surgeries in Stourport. It is currently very difficult to get an appointment to see a Doctor. Again this can only get worse with the additional developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3144</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option B as we do not have the facilities to cope with any more houses or people in Stourport (Arley Kings). The roads are constantly grid locked at present, how would we cope with more traffic.</p> <p>There are no longer school places as our schools have been closed with the exception of one school, which would mean children going to school the other side of the river, which then again impacts massively on the traffic over the bridge.</p> <p>At present our doctors' surgeries are unable to accommodate the people in the area, it can be weeks before you can get an appointment – how will they cope with more.</p> <p>We have had discussions regarding the field on Pearl Lane before and were informed that this cannot be built on as it was an area of natural beauty – not sure why this has now changed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3196</a>	Object	<p>The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</p> <p>The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</p> <p>The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</p> <p>There is not enough provision for schools, doctors, dentist on this side of the bridge as the current facilities would not handle any more residents.</p> <p>The Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock. As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>houses which will be financially cheaper.</p> <p>Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04025</a>	Object	<p>My main concerns centre around the Option B proposal for further development in Stourport in the Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top areas. These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. The fact there is no provision for infrastructure (i.e. road, schooling etc) upgrades alongside these additional buildings, which there is for Option A (additional development in Kidderminster) is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising. If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley ? Is this another instance of these, smaller, towns being seen as the 'poor relation' to Kidderminster ?</p> <p>Areley Kings currently sees traffic queues into, and out of Stourport, on a daily basis which is increased at weekends and holiday times. The proposal to build in excess of 500 new homes will bring a huge increase in traffic over the single river crossing. This traffic will have to proceed through Bridge Street, which is a narrow street that frequently suffers from inconsiderate, and illegal, parking and onto the High Street. The increased volume of traffic will result in a drop in the air quality of the Bridge Street and High Street, whilst also adding greatly to the congestion. Increasing traffic congestion will also seriously hamper the access by emergency services vehicles, potentially, putting lives at risk. In the event of the Stourport bridge, the single river crossing, being unusable this increased traffic will have no option but to travel down narrow lanes to find an alternative route.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01766</a>	Object	Object to AKR/14 and AKR/15 due to congestion and lack of infrastructure of roads, education, jobs and facilities.
	<a href="#">LPP01776</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Pearl Lane AKR/14 and Rectory Lane AKR/15 build of 550 houses. Reasons for objection:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-infrastructure cannot meet the increased traffic flow over one access (the Stourport bridge).</li> <li>- This area is already congested and air pollution will increase causing health problems to the people living in this area and tourists visiting our small town.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			-The schools, GP surgeries and local hospital could not meet the needs of hundreds of new residents if they were to live in the small community.
	<a href="#">LPP0232</a>	Object	The proposed developments on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane along with the approved development in Malvern Hills district (Pearl lane) would put extra strain on the poor infrastructure in all directions and would cause more pollution in Bridge Street and the High Street. Areley Common is getting more congested. There is virtually no employment in the area. Areley Common First School was demolished in 2007 and replaced with houses. Astley School is difficult to access and is over subscribed. Children have to cross the congested bridge every day for school. No Doctors Surgery on this side of the bridge.
	<a href="#">LPP0247</a>	Object	<p>Building 550 houses on Pearl Lane / Rectory Lane is a really ill thought out option. Potentially increase the traffic crossing the bridge in Stourport by up to 500 to 800 cars twice daily. This crossing is already grinding to a halt twice daily and the additional traffic will result in tremendous hold ups in the town its self.</p> <p>Major effect of these additional houses is the effect on infrastructure, i.e. Doctors and Schools both of which are not coping, without the addition of potentially 1567 new houses, potentially 4700 residents if plan B is adopted using facilities that are already failing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01840</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doesn't want any development in Areley Kings.</li> <li>Should build on brown sites where possible to protect countryside and wildlife as well as having land to produce food.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0154</a>	Object	Proposed development on Pearl lane and Rectory lane will have an adverse impact on the neighbourhood, the bridge in Stourport already struggles to cope with the amount of traffic crossing into the town centre, can take 30 minutes to get from Arley Kings into Stourport. Another 600 houses will increase gridlock to an unsustainable level. Rectory Lane is a one car width lane with no passing points or pavements, highly unsuitable for a housing estate. No pavements on Pearl lane or Ribbesford Road so unsuitable for pedestrians. Option B has no plans for added infrastructure, where are extra school places, doctors, etc needed to sustain all these extra families coming from?
	<a href="#">LPP0237</a>	Object	To develop west of Areley Kings (Pearl Lane, Rectory Lane) would place even more traffic stress on the

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/14 – PEARL LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			congested River Severn crossing into Stourport, on local transport and services, as well as encroaching on open countryside and outstanding natural undulating views from Rectory Lane.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO809</a>	Support	Pearl Lane - Suitable and sustainable site for housing. Meetings held with officers re development potential. Landscape strategy can be put into place. Drainage information submitted and no further comments raised. Site is less sensitive than Green Belt sites to north of town. Detailed highways information submitted by site promoter to County Council. Awaiting response. (see attachment). LPA has detailed promotional document explaining how site can come forward and technical constraints can be addressed.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPP05058</a>	Comment	Rectory/Pearl Lane would require extra roads even another river bridge!
	<a href="#">LPP03219</a>	Comment	<p>The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</p> <p>The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</p> <p>The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</p> <p>There is not enough provision for schools, doctors, dentist on this side of the bridge as the current facilities would not handle any more residents.</p> <p>Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock.</p> <p>As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper.</p> <p>Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</p>
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP05031</a>	Comment	<p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites and there are limited local facilities in Areley Kings. Housing development here will increase the traffic crossing Stourport Bridge and using the one-way system through Stourport.</p> <p>Development of this land would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat.</p>
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPP05049</a>	Comment	Development of these sites at Areley Kings would encroach into the open countryside and lead to further exacerbate the high level of traffic congestion across the bridge and add to air pollution in the town centre. This point is actually made in section 32.5 of the Review document.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPP05054</a>	Comment	<p>It will be essential to be clear about the level of affordable housing and its provision. (Developers should not be allowed to agree a ratio of affordable development only to later reduce that ratio to ensure a higher profit).</p> <p>There are statements about the attraction of the Town Centre, but properties do not appear to be maintained to a high standard and the issue of the 'Buftons' building in Bridge Street has been unresolved for several decades. The development to link The Canal Basins with Bridge Street has yet to take place and is currently a car park.</p> <p>Any additional development in Areley Kings will increase demand on health and education services. The traffic system is under considerable strain. Areley Common is regularly congested and the tail back across the River Bridge backs up to Dunley Road and Areley Common. The Town Centre itself is frequently blocked.</p> <p>Social cohesion and the need to identify with your community is important for quality of life, levels of crime, etc. This should be a primary factor in retaining community boundaries and village identity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05055</a>	Comment	<p><b><u>Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane (AKR/14 and AKR/15)</u></b></p> <p>There is no supporting infrastructure for the development of these two sites and there are limited local facilities in Areley Kings. Housing development here will increase the traffic crossing Stourport Bridge and using the one-way system through Stourport.</p> <p>Development of this land, on such a scale, would be out of keeping with the local character and detrimental to wildlife particularly in the adjacent woodland habitat. Surely the refusal of the development on the Snipes has recognised this, and its principles would apply to other sites of major development in the area?</p>
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPP05059</a>	Comment	<p>Concerns about significant levels of growth at Areley Kings (550 new dwellings under option B). This area is adjacent to the Malvern Hills District boundary and has already seen growth come forward within Malvern Hills District. The infrastructure implications of any site allocations within this area need to be carefully considered in the context of recent and planned development on the Malvern Hills side of the administrative boundary to ensure that sufficient capacity exists. In particular, the impact of growth on the current river Severn crossing within Stourport should be considered, particularly as there is no longer an intention to deliver the Stourport</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Relief Road in Local Transport 4. A number of issues have been raised about this site including: drainage, encroachment in the countryside, extra traffic which would lead to a new Air Quality Management Area to be implemented.
	<a href="#">LPPO5045</a>	Comment	<p>The Pearl Lane developers are, we are told by the Officers at the presentation, going to be responsible for the provision of a second bridge and road improvements. Bearing in mind the link road to provide the access to the river on the North side to the bridge was to be the responsibility of the food store developer and Wyre Forest singularly failed to get other than a feeder road to the development there is little chance of getting this improvement at the costs indicated.</p> <p>Congestion from the South across the bridge is causing significant pollution as well as delays. Again we are told that the bridge is adequate with no proof given. If this is so this clearly shows that infrastructure improvements are urgently required North of the bridge without any further development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5056</a>	Comment	Can be serviced via public transport.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO4949</a>	Support	<p>Site is outside Green Belt and identified as option B site. Taylor Wimpey are promoting land beyond the area currently identified to ensure that sufficient open space and supporting infrastructure. See attached plan at Appendix 1. The site has been extended beyond the existing tree belt.</p> <p>A Development Vision document has been prepared (appendix 2) which pulls together a wide range of technical information. Key features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• up to 150 dwellings</li> <li>• vehicular and pedestrian access from Dunley Road</li> <li>• Approx. 7.62Ha public open space</li> <li>• Provision of SUDs</li> <li>• comprehensive pedestrian network</li> </ul> <p>Analysis concludes that site is suitable, deliverable and developable.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP04951</a>	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Landscape Sensitivity:</b> Site directly abuts existing western residential edge of Areley Kings. Southern part of site is adjacent to A451. To SW,W and NW landscape opens towards wooded valleys and rolling hills. Site forms W facing slope between settlement edge and wider landscape. The development strategy will help integrate proposals into landscape and mitigate potential impacts.</li> <li>• <b>Accessibility to Amenities:</b> Site has good access to local services and Stourport town centre via number of routes. Areley Kings has primary school, village hall, churches, newsagents, post office, convenience store, pharmacy and public houses.</li> <li>• <b>Highways and Transportation:</b> Preliminary Indicative Masterplan shows that site access can be provided by upgrading existing service road off Dunley Road. Connections along Ribbesford Road and Rectory Lane could be provided to link into existing rights of way. Regular bus services run along Dunley Road into Stourport and Kidderminster. Nearby facilities are within walking distance from site. A Transport Assessment will be completed to assess wider impacts.</li> <li>• <b>Flood Risk and Drainage:</b> Site in flood zone 1. Burnthorn Brook runs along N boundary but topography means any potential flooding would have minimal impact as site slopes to its N boundary. On site attenuation likely to be in form of balancing pond along N boundary.</li> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> It is anticipated that any dwellings along W and S boundary would need to face existing roads in order to protect rear gardens. Noise is unlikely to have significant adverse impact.</li> <li>• <b>Ground Conditions:</b> Majority of site underlain by Wildmoor Sandstone Formation. Minimal risk of contamination shown by initial assessment.</li> <li>• <b>Utilities:</b> Any costs required to upgrade existing network will be met by developer.</li> <li>• <b>Agricultural Land Classification:</b> Site comprises mostly Grade 3 with some Grade 2.</li> <li>• <b>Deliverability:</b> Agreement in place with landowner.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03513</a>	Object	Objection - lack of infrastructure, roads, water, schools, doctors. Building on Green Belt
	<a href="#">LPP05014</a>	Object	In relation to the two preferred options being put forwards for development it seems that the obvious option to adopt is option A as opposed to option B. I believe this to be for the following reasons:

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>The infrastructure has to be key to this as the Kidderminster/Stourport/Bewdley area roads are already congested and Option B does not have any plan or allowance to ease this issue. Particularly in relation to the proposed houses west of the River Severn on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings, the area already has a huge issue with people trying to get into Stourport over the bridge. The road layout in Stourport does not and will not ever be particularly traffic friendly and at peak times it can take over half an hour to do a mile journey from Areley Kings, through Stourport. Preferred Option B would plan to add 550 houses to Areley Kings side of the river. On the basis that the average house has 2 cars these days and with the main employment opportunities being offered in Kidderminster area that would be an additional 1100 cars trying to get over Stourport bridge and would make an already bad problem locally, even worse. It would be a nightmare to put 550 new houses on Areley Kings side of the river without a new bridge to account for the traffic.</p> <p>Schools - Option B with particular relevance to the proposed 550 houses in Areley Kings. This area is already overcrowded in schools with children having to take places in schools to Stourport side of the river as there are not enough places in the Areley Kings Schools. This matter will get worse with the proposed increase in housing. This point also links to the above point on traffic as if there is no proposal as part of preferred option B to increase school places to Areley Kings side of the river then this will mean more traffic to get children to Stourport schools, further deepening the issue of the bridge being a huge bottleneck for traffic.</p> <p>Employment — With particular relevance to the proposed housing in preferred option B to Areley Kings side of the river, these people would all need to travel through Stourport and over Stourport Bridge to get to their jobs as no large employment opportunities will be created to the west of the river.</p> <p>Natural Environment — The area to the west of the River Severn being proposed for development currently has a vibrant natural environment which is enjoyed by a lot of the local residents for dog walking, outdoor pursuits and most of all its natural beauty. Developing such an area with increased housing would have a huge impact on local residents' ability to enjoy the natural environment in which they live. The area is also home to a large amount of wildlife including birds whose habitat would be ruined by the preferred option B plan to build 550 houses on the land by Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in Areley Kings</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5017</a>	Object	I live in Areley Kings and it frequently takes far too long to get across the bridge over the River Severn on Bridge

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Street as it is. During the rush hour the queue can back up along Dunley Road past Church Walk. It must be a nightmare for people trying to turn right out of Areley Common and another 550 houses will only exacerbate the situation. Your document states that the narrow Georgian road system in central Stourport is already borderline Air Quality Management. More greenfield development in the town will finally push it over the limit. I would be happy to see the brownfield sites developed, such as the old Chichester Caravan outlet in Vale Road and Parsons Chain in Hartlebury Road. Surely the core housing sites already agreed, together with the old Carpets of Worth site, would be more than enough to satisfy current residents who wish to stay in the town.</p> <p>In short unless and until money is allocated for a new bridge and relief road around Stourport, I really don't think building any more houses in Areley Kings is a viable option.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05019</a>	Object	Comment on Option B - 550 houses to be built on Pearl Lane/Rectory Road. This would create extra traffic and cause even more problems getting through already congested Stourport. The other options seem far more sensible.
Stourport Cricket Club	<a href="#">LPP05021</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned about development and the loss of floral and fauna. Also mentions history of flash flooding in Rectory Lane area.</li> <li>2. Concerned about lack of infrastructure (gas, sewerage, water) not available, particularly in Rectory Lane. Also lack of amenities, i.e. schools and doctors.</li> <li>3. Access over river bridge to Areley Kings area, 'Do we book a weekly slot for crossing?'</li> <li>4. Concerned at the lack of industrial/commercial sites to employ all extra residents.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP05022</a>	Object	Local facilities/services already nearly at capacity without adding to it.
	<a href="#">LPP05029</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are already houses planned in this area, just over the border into Malvern Hills. Inhabitants of these houses will inevitably be sharing the same services such as education, health etc and their additional vehicles will add to the existing congestion and pollution.</li> <li>2. Building more housing developments in the Areley Kings area would add even further to this. Congestion would particularly increase. As most of the facilities are not this side of the river, most people have to travel. In turn, this would exacerbate the problems in Stourport, particularly around the river crossing,</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Gilgal, Lion Hill, York Street. These roads are already particularly busy, gridlocked at times. This would dramatically increase pollution levels, reducing air quality.</p> <p>3. There have already been fatalities at the Pearl Lane/Dunley Road crossroads. Adding more traffic and access points in this locality would be extremely dangerous.</p> <p>4. Residents in Shrawley already have problems with speeding traffic and the roads through Holt and Ombersley are often gridlocked.</p>
Shrawley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO5032</a>	Object	<p>Representation within Option B for new housing on the southern edge of Stourport, although other proposals within this Option may have some limited impact.</p> <p>Option B for 420 dwellings along Pearl Lane, Stourport, together with a further 130 dwellings at Rectory Lane, Stourport. In addition to the up to 62 dwellings on Pearl Lane approved by MHDC in April 2014, decision notice not issued until 25 February 2015.</p> <p>WFDC and MHDC have each recently refused an application from Gladman Land for up to 125 dwellings at Astley Cross, This could go to appeal which, if successful, could see a total of nearly 750 dwellings proposed along the boundary between WFDC and MHDC.</p> <p>New housing needs to be accompanied by adequate infrastructure, including roads. There are no current proposals for a second river crossing at Stourport.</p> <p>Implications for neighbouring villages within MHDC. The transport assessment undertaken by Myer Brown in February 2014, in support of the outline planning application for up to 62 dwellings in Pearl Lane, says in paragraph 4.6: Furthermore, the anticipated development traffic distribution is for most peak time trips to be to / from the south, towards Worcester, with only a quarter of trips or less being to / from Stourport. This assessment was to allay fears about increased traffic through the centre of Stourport but nevertheless does mean a large majority of such journeys would be along the B4196 through Shrawley as there is no sensible alternative route to the Worcester hinterland.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>The traffic assessment produced by Ashley Hemle Associates for the Gladman Land application appears to show (Figure B5) that nearly 75% of the 8.00 to 9.00 am traffic was expected to head in the direction of Stourport, some 60% plus then going over the bridge, whilst only slightly more than 25% was towards Shrawley. It is difficult on an initial reading to understand the reasons why the assessment of two developments so near together should produce such different traffic flow estimates.</p> <p>Impact of Option B housing likely to be significant through to substantial for traffic travelling along the B4196. Peak time congestion along the A4133 from its junction with the B4196 at the Red Lion, Holt through Ombersley and beyond. Further large scale housing developments together with any expansion of the West Midlands Safari Park are likely to exacerbate the existing problems unless there is road infrastructure investment.</p> <p>MHDC and WFDC should work together with Worcestershire County Council to understand fully the traffic flow estimates arising from all the proposed housing developments along the MHDC/Wyre Forest boundary at Stourport together with other significant known and anticipated proposals within the area. They then need to assess the implications for the road network across this part of North Worcestershire before bringing forward proposals for investment to address the issues that such a holistic approach has identified.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5033</a>	Object	<p>Developments from Stourport into Areley Kings will affect the environment/quality of life due to traffic congestion/pollution and would require significant changes to the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Development attracts more development and Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>Option B offers NO additional funding for improved local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly <u>closed</u>), roads, schools, shops, employment etc.</p> <p>Expansion is not a viable option!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5037</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b><u>Existing traffic congestion:</u></b> Travel delays are currently commonplace. Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b><u>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</u></b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for everyone.</p> <p><b><u>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</u></b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools, shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b><u>Employment opportunities:</u></b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5041</a>	Object	<p>We have visited the Areley Kings village hall for the presentation of the District Council Local Plan which was very well organised and with helpful officials to discuss individual's comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Option B - serious traffic congestion, particularly when trying to cross the river Severn from Areley Kings. Need for a new bridge has already been recognised when development on this side of the river was considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion already a problem in Areley Common, and when using local shops. Car parking for local residents is needed or a one way system or traffic lights. An increase in population would make the situation worse.</li> <li>3. Development along Rectory Lane would spoil a quiet country walk and the unspoilt scenery.</li> <li>4. Narrow Rectory Lane is blocked by traffic coming in opposite directions and is used to try to avoid a queue of traffic in the Dunley Road trying to cross the bridge. To cross the bridge from the Walshes. A traffic light system at the Areley Common- Dunley Road junction needed if development resulted in a significant increase in population this side of the river.</li> <li>5. The area in Option B now threatened with building development does not form part of the Green Belt for Stourport. High density building, on the plot bordered by Rectory Lane, Dunley Road and the Bewdley Road would stand out as an ugly disfigurement of the landscape. Wildlife here- larks singing &amp; pheasants nesting. The larger designated area bordered by Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road does have some</li> </ol>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			shielding by trees and bank to make development less conspicuous.
	<a href="#">LPPO5043</a>	Object	Object to the building of new homes in Stourport on Severn, 550 new homes mean a minimum of 1,100 more cars on the roads. We have a job, to get to Stourport now and on a Friday when the car boot is on it's impossible to go out before 1 O'clock with the congested roads into the town and there will be a minimum of 1,100 more people to go to the only 2 doctor's surgeries in the town. More pressure on local schools and more pollution from the cars in the town. Start with doing something about Kidderminster hospital, get that up and running before you start putting more people in Kidderminster and Stourport. We have to go to Worcester or Redditch hospital. Use Option A. The Wyre Forest council was going to build another bridge 18 years ago due to congestion in the town, bypass was promised 8 years ago, we have had a few very bad accidents with a few deaths on the Dunley Road. Need lights or a roundabout on the crossroads at Pearl Lane and the Dunley Road to slow cars and bikes down, it might save someone's life some day.
	<a href="#">LPPO5051</a>	Object	Object to Option B in planning for residential properties being built on AKR/15 Rectory Lane & AKR/14 Pearl Lane.  Stourport is a bottleneck both getting over the bridge and driving from Burlish Crossroads.  We do not have the infrastructure in Stourport. The need for a new bridge and road system, more schools, jobs and doctors. These facilities aren't there for the population it already has.
	<a href="#">LPPO5053</a>	Object	I wish to object most strongly to any plans to build housing on greenfield sites in Areley Kings. The infrastructure of the village doesn't lend itself to further housing development. Lack of school facilities, health facilities, roads to the south, west are both narrow and tortuous. THE MAIN POINT IS THAT A SINGLE BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIVER is obviously totally inadequate for further traffic feeding as it does a very limited traffic gyratory system in Stourport. Furthermore the view along the valley from Areley Kings Church towards the Abberley Hills is one of middle England's finest and would be destroyed forever should building be allowed to the west of Dunley Road. There are acres of brownfield site within the Wyre Forest area so why destroy our heritage, OUR GREEN AND PLEASANT LAND!! Looking to Kidderminster Town Centre there are streets of empty derelict shops so why not follow the current American pattern of popular 'In-town Living'? Area too of derelict factories south of Tesco's in

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>Stourport.</p> <p>Another facet is the lack of public transport evenings and Sundays. Services gone and never to return.</p> <p>I trust that you will throw out this plan and look again at all the brown field sites around. I feel that no homework has been done yet again!</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05060</a>	Object	I object to the proposed housing developments in Areley Kings paragraph 32.5. I strongly feel that such housing would have a negative effect on the area including Stourport town, it would cause increased road traffic congestion in the wide area and air pollution. This pollution would certainly reduce air quality, resulting in exacerbation of respiratory ill health conditions. I therefore would ask the council to reject these plans.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0989</a>	Object	Again this is a viable site, but we would question its selection as it would constitute a salient of the town into the countryside, where the edge of the town is defined by roads, which are a clear landscape barrier.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP0810</a>	Object	Rectory Lane - not Green Belt but is visually sensitive as adjoins Conservation Area. Pearl Lane site relates better to settlement as should be preferred.
	<a href="#">LPP05015</a>	Object	<p>Objects to site references AKR/14 and AKR/15 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Impact on wildlife and questions if ground surveys have taken place</li> <li>2. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>3. Concerned about the impact of up to 1,000 more cars having to access Stourport over the single bridge.</li> <li>4. Additional pollution from vehicles</li> <li>5. No space in existing schools, hospitals, Doctors surgeries without extra funding.</li> </ol> <p>Believes that Areley Kings is already the poor part of Stourport as far as WFDC are concerned and Stourport is the poor part of Wyre Forest. Bewdley and Kidderminster are the main beneficiaries for everything concerned with</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			WFDC and these proposed additional buildings will make matters worse.
	<a href="#">LPP05023</a>	Object	Any development will have an adverse affect on the area.
	<a href="#">LPP05027</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to option B.</li> <li>• Any housing developments across the bridge into Areley Kings will have an effect on the environment and the quality of life of residents.</li> <li>• More vehicles on the road will affect residents in the area as well as causing reduced air quality which could lead to health issues.</li> <li>• Estimate: possibly 100-1500+ extra vehicles which leads to 2000+ extra journeys a day.</li> <li>• Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable and unmanageable.</li> <li>• Funding should be targeted where there is sufficient scope to develop a manageable and workable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</li> <li>• Increase in population and vehicles would need significant change to local infrastructure.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure in Areley Kings is already at full capacity so there's no room for expansion - option B does not provide funding for improvements.</li> <li>• Local roads are primarily country lanes.</li> <li>• Only one local primary school - no room for more pupils.</li> <li>• Additional patients at doctors/dentists will have an affect on the quality of services they provide.</li> <li>• Local infrastructure will not cope with new development as there is no funding to improve what's already in place - creating unreasonable and unsustainable demands.</li> <li>• Development attracts more development.</li> <li>• Stourport/Areley Kings cannot take the levels of additional housing in option B let alone any additional future developments.</li> <li>• Traffic in Stourport already causes gridlock especially at peak times.</li> <li>• Congestion, roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volume of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians.</li> <li>• It is not just the local population which uses Stourport Bridge to cross the river.</li> <li>• Stourport is a tourist attraction as well as having caravan parks causing more people and cars to come to the area.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited employment opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• Options of creating new job opportunities are minimal even with funding which option B does not offer.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5030</a>	Object	<p>Any development to the west of the river Severn would carry such massive infrastructure costs.</p> <p>Creating approx 1000 new homes to the west of Stourport, must inevitably require a new Severn crossing. Currently going from the west, crossing the river at Stourport can easily take 30 minutes.</p> <p>The schools, Doctors and other requirements, must surely make the whole concept run into many Millions.</p> <p>Increasing traffic would make the situation far, far worse.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5034</a>	Object	<p>If all the planned sites in the Areley Kings area were passed it would cause major problems ref the infrastructure. The bridge and current road systems are currently struggling with the traffic already using them without the addition of an extra few thousand vehicles that these proposed developments would bring. There would also be an extra strain on resources such as local schools, doctors surgeries, dental practices etc.</p> <p>Until funding is supplied to support a ring road/ second bridge I would strongly suggest that you as our District Council strongly oppose any major building applications on the Areley Kings side of Stourport. Not opposed to any new builds as we do need more affordable housing in Wyre Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5035</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to view my concerns of future Wyre Forest plans to build 6000 homes by 2034.</p> <p>Most homes have three or more cars. This creates problems with streets being blocked with parked cars, which has a knock on effect to emergency vehicles, refuge emptying vehicles etc.</p> <p>My main objection would be the increase in traffic, in particular traffic to cross over the bridge in Stourport.</p> <p>When the saplings were planted around the perimeter of the field adjacent to Pearl Lane, I questioned the reason why, were told planning permission would only be granted if there is another bridge built to cross the Severn, as</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>the current bridge in Stourport would not cope with the extra traffic.</p> <p>The traffic sometimes stretches back as far as the Pearl Lane crossroads, and on occasions even further. I can imagine it would be like that every day with the amount of houses being suggested and majority of the traffic going in that direction.</p> <p>I do fear what impact it will have on residents and their children who live in Areley Kings.</p> <p>We choose to live in a more semi rural area, and don't want to sit in queues of traffic every day. Therefore I will oppose option B until you can come up with a plan i.e. the construction of a new bridge to ease the congestion over the current bridge in Stourport. The road infrastructure is already in place, at the site of the old power station</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5036</a>	Object	<p>Any new housing developments across the bridge from Stourport into Areley Kings will have a major detrimental effect on the environment and the quality of life for all those residing in that area i.e. all vehicles needing to travel across the Bridge from the Dunley Road and all residents living on the circular route through Stourport Town would feel the effects as well as an increasingly reduced air quality could cause additional health issues.</p> <p>500 new houses = 2000+ new residents (adults/children) = possibly 1000-1500+ additional vehicles. = 2000 + additional car journeys per day. Of course these are only estimates but based on existing practise of normal family life.</p> <p>Such increases in population and vehicular usage would require significant changes to the local infrastructure; however, as the local infrastructure of Areley Kings is already full to capacity at present and options of expansion is not possible due to the geography of the area and Option B does not provide additional funding for any improvements, Option B is not a sustainable option for Areley Kings and Stourport.</p> <p>The local roads are primarily country lanes, with one local primary school in Areley Kings it would put impossible demands on the school to find school placements for the potentially significant amount of additional future primary school age children. Doctors and dentist placements are already at a premium: additional patients would</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>detrimentally affect the quality of services they could provide.</p> <p>There is also the other factor that development attracts more development. Once planning permission is granted for one area it sets the scene for planning permission to be granted for further ongoing developments. Stourport and Areley Kings cannot take these levels of additional housing proposed in Option B, let alone any further proposed future developments.</p> <p><b>Existing traffic congestion: Travel delays are currently commonplace.</b> Existing traffic congestion to access the Bridge in Stourport and travel through the town is already causing gridlock particularly at peak hours, exacerbated by delivery lorries to shops, bus routes through the town to Areley Kings, Bewdley, Worcester and Kidderminster. Congestion: roadside parking, accessing car parks, and high volumes of traffic cause immense problems for car users, residents and pedestrians i.e. noise pollution, air pollution, increased congestion and traffic delays.</p> <p>Traffic from Worcester and surrounding districts access one of three bridges to cross the River, Areley Kings Bridge take a high percentage of these traffic flows, therefore it's not just the local population using the Bridge and the Town route!</p> <p>As Option B is primarily focusing on Areley Kings and Bewdley and offers no additional funding towards improving the local infrastructure to accommodate new developments: roads, schools, shops, employment etc, local services/facilities would be put under significantly increased and totally unreasonable and unsustainable demands. Expansion or improvement is not an option with or without additional funding for improvements.</p> <p><b>Transitional residential population and day visitors:</b> Stourport town and Riverside is already recognised as an inland tourist attraction drawing thousands of people and cars into the town from all over the West Midlands, Worcestershire and surrounding counties, as well as numerous residential and seasonal caravan parks in Stourport creating thousands of additional tourists and transitional residents in the area. Severe traffic delays for cars and buses are commonplace when roads become gridlocked both into and out of Stourport. Additional proposed developments on Option B numbering in the hundreds would create an unsustainable situation for everyone.</p> <p><b>Local Infrastructure - Stourport:</b> Doctors, Dentists, Leisure Centres (non-existing), toilets (mostly closed), schools,</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>shops.</p> <p>Facilities and services are very limited at best, provided only to accommodate the local community of past years; they now find themselves only just coping with the increased population as it is today. Expansion is not a viable option.</p> <p>Our local roads are narrow and mostly bordered by residential properties and along Areley Common we have the additional problem of residential roadside parking on both sides of the road, reducing traffic to single flow weaving between parked cars. With delivery lorries, refuse wagons and buses this is an ongoing major issue. Additional traffic flows would only cause complete gridlock.</p> <p><b>Employment opportunities:</b> Stourport and Areley Kings have very limited employment opportunities. Main sources of employment would be Worcester or Kidderminster; this would be better provided by Option A. Options of creating additional job opportunities for new housing developments are extremely minimal even with additional funding, which Option B does not offer.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> There is currently an ongoing gridlock situation within the town centre, very slow and stationary vehicles with their engines running emit higher levels of pollutants reducing the quality of the air within the limited confines of York Street, Bridge Street and High Street, this issue is known to cause increased health problems for all those within the vicinity.</p> <p>Additional housing developments within Areley Kings and Stourport would only add to the current problems that are caused by significantly high levels of traffic flows across the bridge and through the town.</p> <p>Option B is not funded, unworkable, unsustainable, unmanageable and reliant on developers' charity. Funding should be targeted where there is scope to develop a manageable expansion programme of local amenities befitting new developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5044</a>	Object	<p>Most houses have 2 cars outside them. Building over 500 houses on the Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane sites is likely to generate something in the order of 1000 additional vehicles. Some of the journeys made in these vehicles will</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>be in the direction of Worcester (B4196) or in the direction of Great Witley (A451) and so will not directly affect traffic flow in Stourport. However, the majority of journeys will be over Stourport bridge and through Stourport. This area already suffers traffic flow problems and it is not unusual for traffic to queue back along Dunley Road to the crossroads of A451 and B4194. If drivers take the alternative route to cross the River Severn by going along Ribbesford Road, known locally as the Switchback (B4194) to avoid Stourport bridge, they will add to the existing congestion in Bewdley.</p> <p>There is no scope to widen Stourport bridge and we are told that there is no possibility of an additional river crossing, so adding houses to the west of the river can only be detrimental to traffic flow through the town.</p> <p>The problem will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Paragraph 32.5 acknowledges the flood risk associated with the Pearl Lane site. The last flooding event was at the end of 2013 when run off from the agricultural land (Site WKR/14) affected houses backing onto Pearl Lane, in Cheviot Close and Abberley Avenue.</p> <p>Following that event, some remedial work was undertaken, but building 420 houses and concreting over WKR/14 can only increase the risk of a similar event happening again, unless significant drainage works are required as an essential part of any development and that these works GUARANTEE there will be no further flooding events.</p> <p>As with the traffic flow issue, the matter will be further exacerbated if houses are also built on the area known locally as 'The Snipes' which is part of Malvern Hills DC.</p> <p>Areley Kings is a mainly residential area and there is little infrastructure by way of, for example, schools and shops. Building 550 houses in Areley Kings would increase the need for additional school places and shopping. Neither of which can be accommodated to the west of the River Severn and both of which will add to the problems of traffic flow already mentioned.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5052</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional housing across the river on the Dunley Road side of Stourport would also cause severe traffic</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>congestion as there is only one bridge for traffic to cross leading to and from the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of traffic in Stourport has increased greatly in recent years due to additional housing and yet the infrastructure has not improved. There has been no additional schools, medical centres, hospitals in the Wyre Forest area and no improvement with the roads to help alleviate traffic, apart from a set of traffic lights at Burlish Crossing. What a difference that made! Over the years promises have been made by MPs to improve traffic problems by introducing a new relief road and bridge, but these promises have never materialised.</li> <li>Stourport is already heavily congested and these traffic problems are increased in the summer months as it is popular with tourists.</li> <li>Rather than improvements to the infrastructure of Stourport, we have witnessed a decrease in our facilities, i.e. Police, Fire Station, Leisure Centre and swimming pool, children's paddling pool in the Memorial Park. These facilities have all been moved to Kidderminster.</li> <li>Although I object to the large housing estates and social housing on Green Belt land in theory I accept that with increased population and immigration there is a need for additional housing. But with increased population in an area, surely the facilities and infrastructure for that area should also be increased to cater for the increased needs of the populace.</li> </ul> <p>I would add that although I am against these concrete jungles taking over Green Belt land, it would appear that Kidderminster would be better placed to accommodate the additional housing, as its' infrastructure and facilities are far superior to that in place in Stourport. In addition, the proposed new road joining the A456 to the A449 would also help alleviate the additional traffic; whereas I believe there are no such new roads proposed for Stourport.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5062</a>	Object	<p>Stourport infrastructure, is not sustainable in its current state, the addition of any housing to the West of the river bridge would produce more stress to those who need to cross the river, there are no doctors surgeries on the West bank and there is only one primary school, very limited employment opportunities and only convenience shopping facilities. The public transport provision is constrained along with domestic traffic by the limitations of the congested bridge and high street, which has been compounded by the addition of traffic lights to the North of the high street. It is not unusual for the queue for the bridge to reach half a mile long on holiday week end and Fridays. Any new domestic building would result in major pressure on the existing very fragile</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>infrastructure. Majority of additional traffic would cross the bridge in order to reach services. Without a relief road the west side of the bridge could not survive a further addition of 500 dwellings, and should adjoining local authorities also approve additional dwellings in this area the whole area would result in social meltdown.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction is inevitable if building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how this access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>Increased pressure to the A451 / B4194 junction in inevitable it building work is undertaken on the proposed Pearl   Lane side. This junction already has a poor track record as far as accidents are concerned so any additional pressure on this junction would potentially result in increased loss of life, unless some major reconsideration of traffic flows at this intersection are undertaken. Access to the Dunley Road/ Rectory lane site would increase traffic on a small section of road that is currently very narrow and isolated from major traffic flows. Major consideration would need to be given as to how this access and egress form any development proposed in this area.</p> <p>The consultation plan already highlights potential problems with drainage on the Pearl Lane site as flooding is already common in Red House Road, any development on the West side of Pearl Lane would only compound this issue unless a very large delaying reservoir was installed, which of course does not come without its own safety risks. Similarly the proposed Rectory Lane site would also exasperate the existing flooding problems of Burnthorne Brook and Gladder Brook, both of which regularly burst there banks.</p> <p>Both these proposed developments would be invasive to existing green field sites and expand the footprint of Stourport. These sites are adjacent to the District Council boundary, further development to these areas which are within Wyre Forest could simulate a reaction from the Adjacent Local authority to allow development adjacent to the any new residential area, compounding the pressures that have been identified above.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPPO2225</a>	Object	<p><b><u>Objection to Rectory Lane (AKR/15)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop alternative site this is not a brownfield site and is in agricultural use - important after Brexit.</li> <li>• Local schools/hospitals lack capacity</li> <li>• Traffic congestion on local road network</li> <li>• Danger to pedestrians</li> <li>• Additional flood risk</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5016</a>	Object	Building houses here would increase commuter traffic through the known congestion points in Kidderminster or Stourport in order to access the main arterial route. The sites are too far away from town centres.
	<a href="#">LPPO5025</a>	Object	<p>We object to the development at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane in the Areley Kings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extra traffic and pollution potential. Most of this extra traffic will be trying to get to work and shop in Kidderminster going over one bridge through the one way system of Stourport. Traffic tailing back from the bridge up to Areley Kings, with waiting times of up to half an hour to get into Stourport, even worse to get to Kidderminster.</li> <li>2. Pearl Lane site has drainage issues. Our house backs on to Pearl Lane, we nearly flooded in July 2007 and did flood three times in November 2012. Following the flooding in 2012 we had to move out of our house for 6 months whilst the house was dried out and made habitable again. The flood water poured directly from the fields where this proposed development site is, straight across the road and through our house.</li> <li>3. Local schools are getting full or are already oversubscribed, with no physical room to expand. .</li> <li>4. Increased need for Doctor's surgeries and the hospital, too much pressure on already overstretched services.</li> </ol> <p>Most new development should be between Stourport and Kidderminster or on the outskirts of Kidderminster where there is better transport links around the wider area. No proposal for infrastructure improvements in Areley Kings, so for any significant development to take place on this side of the river there would need to be</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			major infrastructure improvements including a second bridge.
	<a href="#">LPP05038</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fields around the area flood frequently and this has caused major issues some years ago.</li> <li>• The traffic is already struggling to move on key times of the day.</li> <li>• The cross roads that encompasses Dunley Road is a danger spot for car accidents and there have been many traffic accidents and I believe fatal ones too.</li> <li>• There is not enough provision for schools, doctors, dentist on this side of the bridge as the current facilities would not handle any more residents.</li> <li>• The Stourport bridge is not capable of such large amounts of traffic and any further major capacity would bring the area to gridlock. As the bypass with a second bridge is so costly there must be better locations to build houses which will be financially cheaper.</li> <li>• Finally we all believe that the proposed housing sites shown are not viable due to transport issues, financial issues and lack of services.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP05039</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to Option B as we do not have the facilities to cope with any more houses or people in Stourport (Arley Kings). The roads are constantly grid locked at present, how would we cope with more traffic.</p> <p>There are no longer school places as our schools have been closed with the exception of one school, which would mean children going to school the other side of the river, which then again impacts massively on the traffic over the bridge.</p> <p>At present our doctors' surgeries are unable to accommodate the people in the area, it can be weeks before you can get an appointment – how will they cope with more.</p> <p>We have had discussions regarding the field on Pearl Lane before and were informed that this cannot be built on as it was an area of natural beauty – not sure why this has now changed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05042</a>	Object	To develop west of Areley Kings (Pearl Lane, Rectory Lane) would place even more traffic stress on the congested River Severn crossing into Stourport, on local transport and services, as well as encroaching on open countryside

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			and outstanding natural undulating views from Rectory Lane.
	<a href="#">LPP05046</a>	Object	The proposed developments on Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane along with the approved development in Malvern Hills district (Pearl lane) would put extra strain on the poor infrastructure in all directions and would cause more pollution in Bridge Street and the High Street. Areley Common is getting more congested. There is virtually no employment in the area. Areley Common First School was demolished in 2007 and replaced with houses. Astley School is difficult to access and is over subscribed. Children have to cross the congested bridge every day for school. No Doctors Surgery on this side of the bridge.
	<a href="#">LPP05050</a>	Object	Object to AKR/14 and AKR/15 due to congestion and lack of infrastructure of roads, education, jobs and facilities.
	<a href="#">LPP05012</a>	Object	<p>Stourport is a good place to live apart from the traffic going over the main Stourport bridge into Stourport centre from the Dunley Road. Our concerns are at times we can't even get off our own driveway due to the traffic build up going into Stourport centre causing total gridlock.</p> <p>Therefore with the proposed plans to build more houses on plan B which I have already gave our opinion to planning officer at the civic hall. With nowhere for traffic to exit the town with out a build up of traffic causing a grid lock this is totally unacceptable for the local residents and local emergency services who already suffer traffic grid lock.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05018</a>	Object	<p>Option B must not be considered for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overriding factor above all else is the Stourport Bridge bottleneck. Living in Areley Kings we find that most days we are in a queue just to access the town. Every Friday this becomes an exceptional delay as the local car boot empties. Until a bypass is built any development should be refused in the Areley Kings area.</li> <li>2. How is the local school going to manage? Even if it is possible to be extended the access up Princess Way it is already overloaded and dangerous.</li> <li>3. How will the High School cope?</li> <li>4. Part of the proposed development is upon highly productive farmland.</li> <li>5. How will the local Doctors cope with additional patients in their fixed cramped and dilapidated old</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			premises? (We note Kidderminster and Bewdley are both in possession of new Doctors premises).  In view of all the development in the local areas how can Worcester Royal be expected to cope?
	<a href="#">LPPO5020</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doesn't want any development in Areley Kings.</li> <li>Should build on brown sites where possible to protect countryside and wildlife as well as having land to produce food.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5024</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Pearl Lane and Ribbesford Road/Dunley Road sites:</p> <p>Already under pressure services would be need improvement - roads, sewerage/waste disposal, schools and health facilities. Stourport already v. congested, by-pass needed</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5026</a>	Object	<p>My main concerns centre around the Option B proposal for further development in Stourport in the Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top areas. These proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible. The fact there is no provision for infrastructure (i.e. road, schooling etc) upgrades alongside these additional buildings, which there is for Option A (additional development in Kidderminster) is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising. If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley? Is this another instance of these, smaller, towns being seen as the 'poor relation' to Kidderminster?</p> <p>Areley Kings currently sees traffic queues into, and out of Stourport, on a daily basis which is increased at weekends and holiday times. The proposal to build in excess of 500 new homes will bring a huge increase in traffic over the single river crossing. This traffic will have to proceed through Bridge Street, which is a narrow street that frequently suffers from inconsiderate, and illegal, parking and onto the High Street. The increased volume of traffic will result in a drop in the air quality of the Bridge Street and High Street, whilst also adding greatly to the congestion. Increasing traffic congestion will also seriously hamper the access by emergency services vehicles, potentially, putting lives at risk. In the event of the Stourport bridge, the single river crossing, being unusable this increased traffic will have no option but to travel down narrow lanes to find an alternative route.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
	<a href="#">LPP05028</a>	Object	<p>AKR/20 – Carpets of Worth to be used for housing before AKR/14 Pearl Lane or AKR/15 Rectory Lane sites which have no infrastructure and would increase traffic on Stourport bridge and destroy farmland/wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Stourport must remain a well maintained historical town with accommodation over shops.</p> <p>Provide coach parking, public transport and more public toilets to encourage visitors to visit day/night for food &amp; entertainment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05040</a>	Object	<p>Construction of houses at the sites in Areley Kings, Stourport, is inappropriate and disastrous for Stourport with only one bridge giving access to the town and Kidderminster beyond, extra vehicles would add to the existing congestion over Stourport bridge, Bridge street and High street where long queues of traffic are commonplace, and a journey of half a mile can take fifteen minutes or more.</p> <p>Dunley road is a busy road, even if traffic lights or a roundabout were installed to reduce the possibility of accidents the problem with traffic on the bridge would still not be alleviated. If the construction of another bridge was feasible the main objection to the proposed sites would be removed.</p> <p>Increase in population could overstretch local schools and doctors' surgeries whereas a large, new medical centre has recently opened in Kidderminster which could help to accommodate the increased population for option A.</p> <p>Road links to the main areas of employment Droitwich, Worcester and Malvern are inadequate and public transport for employment purposes are poor whereas the proposed construction of a new road for option A would improve traffic flow and reduce congestion in the Kidderminster area.</p> <p>No provision for improving traffic flow through Stourport with option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05047</a>	Object	<p>Building 550 houses on Pearl Lane / Rectory Lane is a really ill thought out option. Potentially increase the traffic crossing the bridge in Stourport by up to 500 to 800 cars twice daily. This crossing is already grinding to a halt twice daily and the additional traffic will result in tremendous hold ups in the town its self.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			Major effect of these additional houses is the effect on infrastructure, i.e. Doctors and Schools both of which are not coping, without the addition of potentially 1567 new houses, potentially 4700 residents if plan B is adopted using facilities that are already failing.
	<a href="#">LPP05048</a>	Object	<p>I am a resident of Stourport-on-Severn and I would like to make the following points as a result of the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The possible development sites at Pearl Lane and Rectory Lane will not affect me directly but they will add a huge amount of traffic through Stourport. The town is already very congested at times and this amount of new housing would just add to an existing problem. If you try to get through the town from Areley Kings you can easily wait for 10 or 15 minutes to get across the bridge. The queues often stretch along Dunley road well past Areley Common. Additionally there are queues down Areley Common.</li> <li>• Why not conduct a study on Thursday and Friday mornings to get a quantified measure of the issue? It is not only the rush hour traffic but mid morning can be particularly bad.</li> <li>• This will also add pressure to already stretched medical services with the 2 doctors surgeries and other infrastructure necessary within any town.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02564</a>	Object	<p>Having attended the drop in session in Arley Kings &amp; the viewing the proposed development of the above references I am writing to lodge my OBJECTION to the proposal for this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional traffic from this proposed site will have to proceed onto the Dunley Road if wanting to access direction to Stourport or Bewdley, having to negotiate the already accident prone area cross road junction</li> <li>• Additional traffic will have to proceed over the river bridge which at peak travelling times can be backed up almost back to the crossroad junction-I write having experienced this on many, many occasions trying to get to my place of work on the Kidderminster Road, there being no other option than to travel over the bridge.</li> <li>• When repairs to structure or road surface over this bridge can add a further 20-30mins to any journey</li> <li>• Should Goldthorne Lane, commonly referred to as 'switchback' be closed off for any reason,</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			<p>flooding/road surface repair again traffic again has to be directed down towards Stourport via the Bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pearl Lane has become evermore popular for traffic cutting through to Bewdley/Stourport sounding at times like a Formula One race track.</li> <li>• There is no plan to change the existing road system, the existing is just NOT good enough to cope.</li> <li>• There are NO plans to increase &amp; add additional schools, (present being sited on The Walshes &amp; Astley) doctor surgeries within the proposed vicinity, surgeries are all within Stourport town, accessible only via 'The Bridge'.</li> <li>• It cannot possibly bring any employment over 'The Bridge' within the Areley Kings area, just an additional increase of people which must be in excess of 2000, with an additional increase of vehicle movement in excess of 1000 using an already overstretched route.</li> <li>• To accommodate this number of homes is just not logistically feasible given the infrastructure as it exists now.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02597</a>	Object	<p>We currently experience long delays along the Dunley Road leading into Stourport. The problem is further exacerbated by the parking of cars along Stourport High Street which slows the traffic down whilst they manoeuvre into the parking bays. With pedestrians also crossing the High Street of this busy little town the traffic frequently grinds to a halt.</p> <p>The LPR does not allow for any additional Doctors Surgeries in Stourport. It is currently very difficult to get an appointment to see a Doctor. Again this can only get worse with the additional developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05057</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Pearl Lane AKR/14 and Rectory Lane AKR/15 build of 550 houses. Reasons for objection:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-infrastructure cannot meet the increased traffic flow over one access (the Stourport bridge).</li> <li>- This area is already congested and air pollution will increase causing health problems to the people living in this area and tourists visiting our small town.</li> <li>-The schools, GP surgeries and local hospital could not meet the needs of hundreds of new residents if they were to live in the small community.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP05061</a>	Object	<p>Proposed development on Pearl lane and Rectory lane will have an adverse impact on the neighbourhood, the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO AKR/15 – RECTORY LANE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Responses
			bridge in Stourport already struggles to cope with the amount of traffic crossing into the town centre, can take 30 minutes to get from Arley Kings into Stourport. Another 600 houses will increase gridlock to an unsustainable level. Rectory Lane is a one car width lane with no passing points or pavements, highly unsuitable for a housing estate. No pavements on Pearl lane or Ribbesford Road so unsuitable for pedestrians. Option B has no plans for added infrastructure, where are extra school places, doctors, etc needed to sustain all these extra families coming from?

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO979</a>	Object	Travelling west on bypass, SVR bridge is gateway to open countryside. South of Riddings Brook the only buildings are the Leisure Centre so the land is relatively open. Our view is that the Green Belt should not change.
	<a href="#">LPPO2921</a>	Support	WA/BE/1 – Stourport Road Triangle – I support this allocation
Willsgrove Developments	<a href="#">LPPO1027</a>	Support	<p>Support WA/BE/1 (Stourport Road Triangle) for housing uses.</p> <p>There are insufficient sites within Bewdley's settlement boundary to accommodate the housing needs of the town.</p> <p>The site is a kilometre from the town centre and access to the town centre is easily achieved along well-lit pavements on a flat plain. The site is opposite the town's leisure centre and is one hundred metres' from the nearest secondary and primary schools. The site is readily accessible to local services and facilities by foot and local bus services. As such, it is a highly sustainable location for housing development.</p> <p>The site is currently on the market and as such is available for development. There are no physical constraints that prevent the site being released for development.</p> <p>The site represents one of the best opportunities to release a discreet parcel of land which will not intrude upon the wider landscape and which is also able to achieve a high degree of sustainability in terms of its connectivity to the town centre and other important local services, notably schools and the leisure centre</p>
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO839</a>	Support	<p>The Council supports the following sites which are included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and have the support of the local community:</p> <p>WA/BE/1 Stourport Rd Triangle (support removal from Green Belt)</p> <p>Early negotiations with potential developers have been and should be undertaken which would include negotiations over infrastructure, water management and community facilities such as school places/physical</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			extensions and road improvements
	<a href="#">LPPO252</a>	Comment	<p>I support the case for new housing developments to be located to avoid increased congestion and pollution in the centre of the town. I am concerned about the site on Stourport Road being identified for new housing. I have two particular concerns on this.</p> <p>1. Impact it will have on already chaotic traffic congestion and parking problems experienced in the road generated by the two schools, Children's Centre, Sports Centre, Tennis Club and SVR and especially at school entry and finishing times.</p> <p>2. This land should be retained for community use to deal with the lack of facilities and shortage of developable land in the town centre including the need for adequate long stay car and coach parking.</p> <p>If the triangle is to be developed for housing, then it is imperative that other sites on the river side of the road, i.e. the schools, Leisure Centre and piece of land up to the new Bridge be earmarked for community use. The addition of new housing may benefit the school in terms of numbers attending, but it may mean that expansion of their facilities will be required including additional classrooms and increased parking provision. There has also been talk of siting a theatre at the school for combined community use. A comprehensive assessment of community need is required before land in this area is committed for housing and mitigating measures should be included to offset the current and potentially worsening traffic and parking issues. These measures to include: -</p> <p>a) The establishment of a long stay car park for the town including coach parking, preferably with toilet facilities that might also be used for the school, sports centre, tennis club and SVR visitors.</p> <p>b) 20mph zone from the By-Pass through to the town centre.</p> <p>c) Improvements to the riverside walks from the town through to the By-Pass bridge with ramped access suitable for wheelchair users onto the bridge from both sides of the river.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>d) Investigation of possible relocation of Tennis Club to new site close to sports centre to share in use of community long stay car park. Existing site to become available for housing. Possible grants for new/ improved tennis facilities.</p> <p>e) Improvements in public transport and infrastructure to encourage walking, cycling and alternative access arrangement to the schools and other facilities in the road to reduce impact of car use, congestion and pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04163</a>	Comment	The only reasonable proposals seem to be on the ground opposite the leisure centre in Bewdley. Even then would have to use a road that is already a seriously dangerous road especially during school entering and exiting times. It creates congestion, foolish parking and difficulties for residents. I'm sure the police would verify this.
	<a href="#">LPP0579</a>	Object	<p>Bewdley High School is full.</p> <p>Worcester Hospital cannot cope, will Kidderminster Hospital return to its original status, including A&amp;E, Kids Ward, etc.?</p> <p>With hundreds of houses being built where is the Green Belt going to end, are we just going to join with Stourport and Kidderminster. The Government keeps saying build houses, are we going to lose all our character (fields, hedges etc.)</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0590</a>	Object	Stourport Road Triangle has already been bought by a land bank company who knows the Government is relaxing the laws on Green Belt. A plot of land with an average price on it, has now been brought for a considerable amount of money.
	<a href="#">LPP031</a>	Object	I have great concerns to building 100 properties on this site. My concern is the addition to the chaos and danger to school children on Stourport Road. Current parking and congestion has not been solved around this area. An addition of 100 dwellings will only add to the danger and risk that is currently faced by the parents and children.
	<a href="#">LPP0129</a>	Object	100 new homes is far too many for this part of Bewdley. Presumably multi storey dwellings, completely out of

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>character of Georgian town.</p> <p>I hope that the old redbrick wall that runs alongside the proposed site and next to the public footpath be preserved. Is it 'listed'?</p>
	<a href="#">LPO575</a>	Object	<p>WA/BE/1 Stourport Road Triangle,</p> <p>We appreciate houses need to be built but if anyone tries to travel between 8:15 and 9:00 on a school morning they will see this is a traffic nightmare, with possibly another 2-300 cars from the 100 units. This will cause even more chaos, with also the safari park new hotel and coach drop off point, this could add 100s of cars and vehicles to this stretch of the Stourport Road and surrounding area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO1580</a>	Object	<p>The roads will be terrible right by the school. I am sure they will not cope with these children.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO2760</a>	Object	<p>Policy 6B notes the need to safeguard and enhance open countryside, maintain openness to Green Belt and the provision of infrastructure and Policy 25C allows development on Green Belt only for small scale affordable housing in special circumstances.</p> <p>The developments on site reference WA/BE/1, WA/BE/5 AND WA/BE/3 are contrary to the policies noted above. For example site WA/BE/1 is development of 100 homes in an area of only 3.67 ha of Green Belt is not small scale. It is a very concentrated development.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6B.</p> <p>Concerning infrastructure, all Wribbenhall sites will be affected by the bottleneck of the Bewdley bypass where it ends at the Kidderminster end and traffic connects with the Habberley Road. The addition of a potential Traveller site on the Habberley Road would further add to this congestion. Plus the development of the Safari Park and the increase in tourist traffic related to this. I cannot see where the plan addresses adequately the issues that the increased traffic would create.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3138</a>	Object	<p>As a Bewdley resident who lives on Kidderminster Road, the proposals to build 100 on the triangle adjacent to the roundabout is an awful proposal which will put extra pressure on an already 'full' small town. The schools are full. The medical centre is very busy. This part of Bewdley is already grid locked at rush hour and busy all day.</p> <p>The Safari Park's water park, when it is built, will already be adding a huge amount of traffic to the road. When paired with the possible development by Burlish crossing, again a road which has long queues, in Stourport which links with the bypass roundabout -no one will be getting anywhere!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2132</a>	Object	Disruption to the eco system/wildlife, may affect Riddings Brook footpath.
	<a href="#">LPPO2414</a>	Object	Object to the proposed developments south of the Habberley Road, the Stourport Road triangle and at Catchems End. Without extensive improvements to road, transport and other elements of infrastructure and services, none of these developments could be supported without damaging Bewdley and the amenities of its current residents. As these improvements are not proposed, the housing developments should not be allowed.
	<a href="#">LPPO2473</a>	Object	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt land: I understand from the recent questionnaire completed by residents that one of the main concerns was the protection of Green Belt land. This proposal highlights a number of areas that are protected as Green Belt, in particular the land behind Sandbourne Drive (ref: WA/BE/1). I have concerns that any plans to develop this site will bring additional noise and will affect privacy. There would also be a significant impact on the neighbourhood with the loss of open aspect from the properties.</p> <p>In addition any development of this site will increase traffic in an areas which is already a concern due to the schools traffic. The proximity to the by-pass will make any access roads to the site difficult and an increased road hazard, impacting on highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>The Green Belt is what makes Bewdley and the Severn Valley so desirable and a conservation area, any reduction at the main access points to the town will be out of character and a considerable visual impact.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2692</a>	Object	<p>Please reconsider siting 100 houses on land Stourport Road /Bewdley Bypass.</p> <p>Expanding the school population has already has caused horrible congestion problems for residents, parents and general traffic, especially buses and coaches.</p> <p>Another service road access will cause further problems for Bewdley and the Bypass access particularly at busy times. Increasing development at this point is inappropriate.</p> <p>The whole plan needs more research in my view.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3482</a>	Object	<p>100 new houses will increase the traffic on Stourport Road in the rush hour.</p> <p>Double yellow lines should be extended on the school side of the road the full length of the road from the traffic lights to the school entrance and also at the corner of the road accessing the new houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3988</a>	Object	<p>Our views with regard to Green Belt review and Local Plan 2019.</p> <p>A) Why are 3 out of 4 sites proposed in Wribbenhall. Unfair allocation and there must be other options the other side of the river. If we can find space for caravans there, why not housing?</p> <p>B) Disparity with the number of dwellings. i.e. 30 dwellings on 4.27 Ha (Highclere) and 100 on 3.67 Ha (Stourport Road).</p> <p>C) Landscape ruined on one of the gateways to Bewdley. Without care you will be destroying what attracts the visitors in the first place.</p> <p>D) Precedent set for 'incursion' into Green Belt when permission given for Safari Park. Why not continue allowing development for housing - local peoples needs - on land to the side of it.</p> <p>E) Wrong to think of by-pass as new boundary. Consider Bromsgrove, Evesham (we could go on, and on).Do we</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>really want Wyre Forest to look like those. We can do better, let's show the way!</p> <p>F) Environment map shows WA/BE/1 to be at risk of flooding. Having lived near for 30 years we can confirm that that risk is very real.</p> <p>G) Suggest you take a look at the congestion on Stourport Road between 3pm and 3.30pm term time. (WA/BE/1). There appears to be little or no solution to this at the moment or indeed for the future. Another 100 houses would mean total gridlock.</p> <p>H) Last but not least as far as we are concerned. There are slow worms living on WA/BE/1. These are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4193</a>	Object	Specifically in relation to Bewdley the identified site on the Stourport Road would represent a significant intrusion into the green gap between Bewdley and Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO4850</a>	Object	We object to the use of this land for any type of development on the basis that it is part of the Green Belt which was put in place to put a gap between town settlements.
	<a href="#">LPPO565</a>	Object	<p>I object to 100 houses being built on the Stourport Road Triangle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• this area is prone to flooding, the river Severn can flood right up to the brook by Sandbourne Drive, where will all the extra water &amp; waste go?</li> <li>• the land is Green Belt. There is lots of wildlife around the area including bats &amp; owls</li> <li>• the local schools are already full to capacity</li> <li>• the medical centre &amp; local hospitals are already overworked &amp; not able to cope with the current number of residents</li> <li>• between 8.15-9.00 &amp; 2.30-3.30 every day during school opening it is absolute chaos, the road cannot cope with the school traffic as it is. It is an accident waiting to happen, the addition of 200+ cars from the housing development would only add to this chaos.</li> <li>• the roads are already full to capacity with safari park traffic especially during the spring/summer &amp; this</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/1 – STOURPORT ROAD TRIANGLE, BEWDLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>will be considerably worse with the future hotel &amp; leisure development at the safari park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>we want to attract visitors to Bewdley, this is one of the main entrances into our town, 100 houses built onto this beautiful area of Green Belt would certainly not have the same attraction.</li> </ul>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPO833</a>	Support	<p>WA/BE/1 Stourport Road triangle: Qualified support: For housing and its removal from the Green Belt. The housing should be a mix of affordable homes, home for the elderly and private housing. If this triangular piece of land is to be developed for housing, then it becomes imperative that other sites on the river side of the road, i.e. the schools, leisure centre and piece of land up to the new bridge are earmarked for community uses. The addition of new housing may well benefit the school in terms of numbers attending but it might also mean that some expansion of their facilities will be required, including additional classrooms and increased parking provision. In the past there has also been talk of siting a theatre at the school for combined community use. A comprehensive assessment of community need is required before land in this area is committed for housing and that in any event, mitigating measures should be included to offset the current and potentially worsening traffic and parking issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO4091</a>	Support	<p>Agree with Stourport Road triangle suggest that anything west of the river is not chosen for building due to traffic congestion/pollution/ violation through Bewdley Town Centre which is not acceptable.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02922</a>	Support	WA/BE/5 – Land South of Habberley Road – I support this allocation
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0981</a>	Support	This site encroaches into the Green Belt in a relatively narrow gap between Bewdley and Kidderminster. If a developer provided a link road between Habberley Road and Kidderminster Road then release of site from Green Belt would be acceptable.
	<a href="#">LPP0184</a>	Comment	Already too much traffic along this end of Habberley Road to permit building of 45 dwellings on this land. A smaller number would be more reasonable, in addition to a road through to meet the round about of the by pass taking traffic away from the houses at this end of Habberley Road. This would also relieve build up of traffic at the no right turn at Catchems end, and the volume of traffic along Bewdley Road because of the enforced left turn.
	<a href="#">LPP01926</a>	Comment	It was with great regret that as residents in New Road for the past 46yrs we heard of the proposed developments for this area. Over those years the traffic flow has increased greatly with the Safari Park, The Mercure Hotel and extra housing. The work due to be carried out in time by the Safari Park will cause congestion. All traffic going into Bewdley, off the Habberley Road has to turn left causing congestion at the island. Habberley Road is not big enough to take larger vehicles especially on the bend past Habberley Valley. WE do hope you will reconsider your plans.
	<a href="#">LPP01968</a>	Comment	<p>The proposals for general domestic homes in the area are again set out to cover very considerable tracts of Green Belt land. Again why not build within the brown belt confines of Kidderminster. Where there is land that is in need of regeneration. Help a town that has suffered a downturn from lack of industry and the building of excess supermarkets, poor authority funding and decaying dwelling and old crumbling shops.</p> <p>The buildings at Wribbenhall that are proposed on an already very busy and often dangerous road that gets congested to a point that causes problems for residents and other road users. The poorly thought out junction at Catchem's End creates many traffic hold ups and encourages drivers to take dire risks by turning right instead of left to go round the already fully congested island. These proposals are certainly putting lives at further serious risk.</p> <p>The only reasonable proposals seem to be those of building at the back of St Ann's school and on the ground opposite the leisure centre in Bewdley. Even then the latter would have to use a road that is already a seriously dangerous road especially during school entering and exiting times. It creates congestion, foolish parking and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>difficulties for residents. I'm sure the police would verify this.</p> <p>All of the proposals will have a devastating effect on the already overloaded infrastructure of a small and at present attractive town. It doesn't have enough parking as it is. The schools will be overloaded, at increased class sizes. The medical centre has just been improved to cope with demands and this will create further problems. The road system barely copes as it stands and will no longer be a small country town. With the only main hospital being Worcester which it takes a good hour to reach, and already puts lives at risk, the granting of such proposals for large scale building will only increase the dangers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02375</a>	Comment	Many not aware of consultation until day before and not all have email preventing them responding in time.
	<a href="#">LPP03979</a>	Comment	<p>The new flood defence should have been fitted as the temporary one before did not work. Water came from river upstream round through the houses flooding behind the barrier.</p> <p>The footing for a new flood defence would need a new fence like the one on Severn Side South.</p> <p>The ring road island and the ring road should have gone through.</p> <p>This short section, be done, the government have now to give money to get road works improvements, this land should still be highway.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04063</a>	Comment	Specifically In relation to Bewdley the sites on the Habberley road -one for housing the other possibly for travelling showpeople would represent a significant intrusion into the green gap between Bewdley and Stourport and Kidderminster respectively and in the case of the latter the proposed squeezing of 200 houses onto the former site would not exactly enhance or facilitate entry into the town.
	<a href="#">LPP04167</a>	Comment	WA/BE/5 Land South of Habberley Road, in Green Belt albeit proposed removal is suggested. The site sounds to be problematic due to drainage issues. Where is the guarantee that this will be addressed and to the optimum level?
	<a href="#">LPP0654</a>	Object	There are very few good reasons to object to the development of this site for housing although there are some

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>acknowledged technical difficulties and highway issues that must be resolved.</p> <p>This is a low lying piece of land which is frequently waterlogged, and it may not be possible to naturally drain surface water into any local watercourse and to pump could be an expensive option.</p> <p>I object to the use of this road as access to WA/BE/5, as the junction of New Road, the main Kidderminster Road and the cul-de-sac is already fraught with danger. Likewise, an access on to the Habberley Road is far from ideal.</p> <p>I believe that any access on to this site should be directly from the roundabout on the A456.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0837</a>	Object	<p><b>WA/BE/5 land south of Habberley Road. Qualified Objection.</b> Very concerned with the impact this development may have on the openness and the important Green Belt tenet of preventing the coalescence and maintain the visual gap between the towns. Its development should only be allowed in very exceptional circumstances i.e. to provide/fund/enable an extension of the By-pass to the Habberley Road to mitigate the traffic chaos at Catchems End.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01579</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - more houses will make it worse.</li> <li>• Schools/GPs won't cope</li> <li>• It's Green Belt land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02814</a>	Object	<p>I would like to raise my objection to the proposal for the site for travelling showpeople and housing south of Habberley Road in Bewdley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effect of proposal on thriving businesses in the area</li> <li>• Effect on wildlife</li> <li>• Joining of Bewdley to Kidderminster</li> <li>• Junction at Catchems End is not suitable for large heavy vehicles and there is already traffic congestion from the Safari Park.</li> </ul> <p>There are many proposed options but I think many more solutions could be found and used rather than just going</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			straight to Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPP03159</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed site does not meet the requirements for such sites as defined in PPTS (2012) referred to in para 8.35. The site has no residential development on it. The structures that are in existence are temporary and located right near the road.</li> <li>2. The proposal goes against the requirement of PPTS (2012) that sites located on Green Belt land are “inappropriate development”. Given the availability of other sites not in Green Belt we see no grounds for an exception to be made especially considering the negative impact that such a site would make to the “open access” requirement for Green Belt.</li> <li>3. Previous development proposals have been rejected with a planning inspectors ruling that there should be no encroachment on this area.</li> <li>4. Further development adjacent to our drive that serves three properties would increase the problem of traffic.</li> <li>5. Impact on the exceptional wildlife.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP01782</a>	Object	<p>Objects to WA/BE/5. The proposed land is a Green Belt area</p> <p>Habberley Road is an extremely busy road providing infrastructure to local business leisure and hotel needs.</p> <p>The site proposed is nearby to Bewdley's largest hotel and would not enhance the area to prospective clients.</p> <p>The local highways governing this road would surely oppose the constant movement of large articulated vehicles on this B category road creating a potential safety risk to other road users.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01928</a>	Object	<p>We are extremely concerned about the proposed developments that converge onto the B4190 Habberley Road. Traffic leaving the Heath Hotel and Pines Golf Club have to be very careful when entering this B road due to the series of bends on it. Plans for the Safari Park hotel will increase traffic in this area.</p> <p>The proposed development is also being on Green Belt land.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2218</a>	Object	<p>Local Plan Review (2016-2034) Consultation Policy 33 - Bewdley Site Allocations - WA/BE/5</p> <p>Objects to the proposal for the development of Green Belt land between the Habberley Road and the A456.</p> <p>The main reasons for my objection are as follows:</p> <p><b>1. Areas of Separation</b></p> <p>If the policy is not to encroach on Green Belt land unless the most exceptional circumstances exist, I cannot see any logic in the selection of this location.</p> <p>New Road is effectively the line of the boundary beyond which open countryside stretches to the outskirts of Kidderminster. I can only assume that the selection has been made on the basis that this could be regarded as an “in-fill” site and therefore the impact would be negligible. I would strongly suggest that this is an inaccurate description and would only be accurate if the Mercure site was itself heavily built up and could therefore be regarded as the outermost point of built-up Bewdley.</p> <p>In fact, the hotel is in attractive rural grounds and blends well into the countryside. None of the entire north-eastern boundary of the designated area can in any sense be described as directly adjoining developed, i.e. built up, land. The vast majority of the adjoining area is open countryside/parkland, privately owned and maintained by the hotel but generously made available to local residents for recreational and social purposes. The developed area of the hotel, including car-parking and exercising facilities, only represents a very small proportion of the entire area. My contention therefore is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the designated plot of land is effectively part of the countryside surrounding the town of Bewdley and is no different from the other, designated “green space” between Bewdley and Kidderminster. The rear of New Road is the edge of the town and there is effectively nothing from there up to the first Kidderminster houses at the top of Bewdley Hill, other than greenery.</li> <li>- there is no man-made boundary, in the form of the A456 road, towards which any extension of the town might, on the basis of certain logic, extend</li> <li>- it is therefore an area which, on the above grounds alone, should be excluded from any long-term plan which might otherwise invite developers to try their hand at filling in the space between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Suitability of the area for building.</b></p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The Bewdley Neighbourhood Plan which included a similar proposal for this site contained areas of possible flooding in the neighbourhood. I was somewhat surprised to notice that the area in question was not mentioned within this category. When I bought my Bewdley property I was apprehensive in noting what Seven Trent thought about these fields: namely that they are subject to significant risk of flooding. Looking at your document, it appears that this risk has been noted and “that the site would require careful design to take into account the need for a channel to take surface water run-off to the site in times of heavy rainfall. This would be incorporated into a larger area of open space “ This need does however have further implications for the way in which the site is used — please see Density below.</p> <p><b>3. Road access</b></p> <p>It is hardly necessary for me to point out the existing problems with the roundabout on the A456 and the adjoining roads and therefore the undesirability of adding to them by additional residential development. The fact that this development is described as “Habberley Road” infers that there would be no access to the A456. It is hard to see in any case how the latter would be practicable. But access into Habberley Road is not without its implications: again, with the existing road layout, any traffic from the new development into Bewdley would add to the problem of the A456/Safari Park roundabout as of course all traffic coming down the Habberley Road into Bewdley is routed around it.</p> <p><b>4. Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>The designated land is historically agricultural. Of all the miles of boundary surrounding Bewdley which adjoin agricultural land, why should it be just this one (and a couple of others) where a change of use is to be considered and where developers are thereby to be encouraged?</p> <p><b>5. Density</b></p> <p>On looking the intended density of the several Bewdley sites which are currently under consideration, I noted that the site in question is at a level of about 26/27 per hectare. This is, at first sight, similar to WA/BE 5 (Stourport Road) and at a level considerably higher than BR/BE/6 (Highclere) which seems to be favoured with the density of only about 7/ha. There may be good reasons for this significant discrepancy (by a factor of almost 4) but I am not aware of them. This question of density is of course an important point since on it depends, to a large degree, the</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>impact on adjoining residential property.</p> <p>Another significant way in which this land is being unfavourably treated with regard to density is associated with the flood risk. As mentioned above, there is a problem potential flooding and the way around this is a channel to take away surface water. “This would be incorporated into a larger area of open space.” The implication of this is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectively, less than the stated 1.71 hectares will be available for building, and so the sharing of the burden of new developments on existing householders becomes even more uneven and unfair. Looking at Bewdley as a whole.</li> <li>The building development will be concentrated on the south-western part of the site which unfortunately is that which joins existing properties most closely. It may also be worth noting that the existing properties include bungalows where the effect of new, probably two-storey (or even higher) housing on adjacent properties is even more damaging. Your reaction to that may well be: well, that is something which can be taken into account at the detailed planning stage. As a resident however, I have little confidence that in the heat of that planning stage, when there are pressing political and financial questions at stake for all concerned, the needs of just a few existing residents are going to count for much.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2376</a>	Object	<p>I object to Habberley Road site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It goes against all previous planning advice.</li> <li>Constant movement of traffic on/off the site. The B4129 is busy rural road extra traffic would make it very dangerous.</li> <li>Hotel/golf club will suffer</li> <li>Damage to the local environment/wildlife.</li> <li>Residents would be affected by noise/ability to sell property</li> <li>There is no legal obligation to provide land for any further housing in Bewdley.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3280</a>	Object	<p>I would like to object to the plans for WA/BE/3 and WA/BE/5 houses development.</p> <p>My reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The increase in parking and other highway issues this would bring.</li> <li>• How this will affect the schools, which are already over subscribed.</li> <li>• Waiting times and care at the dentist and doctors with an increase in the population.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3499</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposals for the <b>Habberley Road site (WA/BE/5)</b> for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• previous planning applications have been rejected and a study of its planning history shows a potential bronze age burial mound and a planning inspectors ruling that there should be no encroachment of the area between Kidderminster and Bewdley.</li> <li>• The B4129 is already a very busy road and this would lead to further traffic problems and potential accidents.</li> <li>• Negative effect on two established thriving businesses.</li> <li>• Harm to the environment</li> <li>• Effect on housing prices.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3644</a>	Object	<p>The development I understand would include circa 45 new homes but has the potential to ruin the surrounding country area, cause increased traffic at the already congested Catchems End junction and have an impact on local tourism and trade.</p> <p>The Hotel will look over this new development and this has the potential to damage their business and reduce visitors to the area who would want the feel of escaping to the country.</p> <p>The residents on New Road and Habberley Road would be severely impacted in terms of their view, potential traffic</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and parking issues (there's never enough parking on a new housing development) but also the area is popular with local people for dog walking, runners and walkers alike let alone the amount of wildlife seen in the area. The wildlife and environment would suffer significantly.</p> <p>There would be many more neighbours who would lose out if we lose this beautiful piece of land than there would be gain because of this development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03235</a>	Object	<p>We DO NOT support the proposal for development at the rear of New Road, Bewdley.</p> <p>Traffic at the road island at the end of New Road.</p> <p>The pollution and road safety dangers presented are obvious.</p> <p>When the West Midlands Safari Park have completed their new development plans and an 'open all year' Water Park, 1000 seater Conference Hall etc has been built and a new entrance installed whereby traffic will enter and leave from this small island, the traffic will be at a permanent standstill - with backlogs affecting both Kidderminster Ring Road and traffic approaching from Bewdley Town Centre and beyond.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04093</a>	Object	<p>I feel the planned building of over 100 new houses in the area is far more than the area can stand. The extra strain on the roads in the area which are already at breaking point is unacceptable. The loss of Green Belt land should be avoided at all cost as once it has gone that is it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04152</a>	Object	<p>South of Habberley Road WA/BE/5</p> <p>My reasons for objections are for all 3 sites and are as follows;</p> <p>I inquire what the special circumstances are to justify the areas concerned as being an exception to the rule regarding building on rural land? I feel sure all of this would be taken into account as a reason for refusal if a local member of public applied for the same building permission on these sites</p> <p>* In my personal view the character of the approach to the well known Georgian town of Bewdley, which attracts</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>many tourists to the region will potentially be detrimentally affected and that an erosion of Green Belt/ rural areas can lead to a 'sprawl ' of built up environments.</p> <p>* I recognize that “there is no right to a view” in legal terms, however loss of a view (whether it be by local residents or approaching visitors to the town of Bewdley) is not necessarily irrelevant when it comes to planning permission. The enjoyment of the current natural view and the rural character it maintains is an important part of the amenity and aesthetics of this area I feel that the effect of the proposed development on the character of the neighbourhood will be altered in opposition to its existing established historical and rural character that is enjoyed.</p> <p>Bewdley is a town known for its outstanding beauty, from a public view point and in keeping with the present government’s promotion of 'Localism', I would hope that such matters are taken into consideration when they are raised by local people.</p> <p>* I am concerned about ongoing enforcement of correct status of use for the proposed sites. How will the local authority ensure present/ future owners &amp; users of the development meet showground/ traveller status. Could I inquire as to the rigor, status criteria and check resources that would be put in place? I assume that these would have to be clearly presented and budgeted for with presentation of any planning permission.</p> <p>* Living in the area for the amount of time that I have, I'm aware of the amount of fatal and near fatal road traffic incidents on the Habberley Road. I feel that it is important to prevent any increase in traffic which could be generated by the establishment of a site using haulage type/ size vehicles onto and off this road. I fear an increasing adverse affect on current highway safety with larger vehicles 'swinging in/out of the site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4173</a>	Object	<p>This relates to the overall plans for Bewdley as set out in the Wyre Forest Local Plan review: in particular section 33</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p><u>Building on Green Belt land:</u> I understand from the recent questionnaire completed by residents that one of the main concerns was the protection of Green Belt land. This proposal highlights a number of areas that are protected</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>as Green Belt.</p> <p>The Green Belt is what makes Bewdley and the Severn Valley so desirable and a conservation area, any reduction at the main access points to the town will be out of character and a considerable visual impact.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04186</a>	Object	<p>The proposals to build potentially 45 houses in the land south of Habberley Road is an awful proposal which will put extra pressure on an already 'full' small town. The schools are full. The medical centre is very busy. Assuming most homes have 2 cars, this would bring an extra 250 plus cars onto Kidderminster Road. This part of Bewdley is already grid locked at rush hour and busy all day. Queues build down toward the safari park and along the bypass as cars approach roundabout. This begins at 3.30pm every day and goes on until after 6pm. This extra pressure on the road would be a nightmare for all Bewdley residents who queue to get in and out of Bewdley every day as it is. The Safari Park's water park, when it is built, will already be adding a huge amount of traffic to the road. When paired with the possible development by Burlish crossing, again a road which has long queues, in Stourport which links with the bypass roundabout -no one will be getting anywhere!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04189</a>	Object	<p>Having read the proposals for the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, I am objecting to WA/BE/5.</p> <p><b>Highways Problems</b> - The A456 and B4129 in Wribbenhall are already very busy, and to build new homes in this area would cause even more congestion.</p> <p><b>Loss of Green Belt</b> - All this area is Green Belt land and previous planning inspectors have ruled there should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster. Planning history shows a site of historical interest on the Habberley Road.</p> <p><b>Services</b> - To build more houses in this area at a time when services are stretched, makes no sense. We are seeing cuts to Fire Services, Health Service and Schools.</p> <p><b>Environmental Issues</b> - All of these plans raise many environmental issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04513</a>	Object	<p>The field behind New Road the road at the top has been closed to stop traffic abusing it. Narrow roads again it will affect the environment.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04615</a>	Object	Object to the proposed developments on the other side of the river in Bewdley, i.e. south of the Habberley Road, the Stourport Road triangle and at Catchems End. Without extensive improvements to road, transport and other elements of infrastructure and services, none of these developments could be supported without damaging Bewdley and the amenities of its current residents. As these improvements are not proposed, the housing developments should not be allowed.
	<a href="#">LPP04704</a>	Object	<p>Policy 6b notes the need to safeguard and enhance open countryside, maintain openness to Green Belt and the provision of infrastructure and Policy 25 c allows development on Green Belt only for small scale affordable housing in special circumstances.</p> <p>The developments on site reference WA/BE/1, WA/BE/5 AND WA/BE/3 are contrary to the policies noted above. For example site WA/BE/1 is development of 100 homes in an area of only 3.67 ha of Green Belt is not small scale. It is a very concentrated development. Site</p> <p>All of these sites are currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6b.</p> <p>Site WA/BE/3 in option B currently incorporates the run off rain water from the Queensway estate and there are obvious environmental concerns of developing on this site</p> <p>Concerning infrastructure, all Wribbenhall sites will be affected by the bottleneck of the Bewdley bypass where it ends at the Kidderminster end and traffic connects with the Habberley Road. The addition of a potential traveller site on the Habberley Road would further add to this congestion. Plus the development of the Safari Park and the increase in tourist traffic related to this. I cannot see where the plan addresses adequately the issues that the increased traffic would create.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0314</a>	Support	My clients welcome the inclusion of their land (Site WA/BE/5) as a Core Housing Site. The site is available for development within the first 5 year phase of the new local plan. My clients support the removal of their local plan from the Green Belt. Subject to the re-zoning via the new local plan, my clients will, with others as required work as a draft Master Plan for their land. This will be discussed with the LPA and others as required.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BE/5 – LAND SOUTH OF HABBERLEY ROAD

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP04098</a>	Support	<p>The Council supports the following sites which are included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and have the support of the local community:</p> <p>WA/BE/5 Land south of Habberley Road (support removal from Green Belt)</p> <p>Early negotiations with potential developers have been and should be undertaken which would include negotiations over infrastructure, water management and community facilities such as school places/physical extensions and road improvements</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04851</a>	Support	<p>We object to the use of this land for any type of development on the basis that it is part of the Green Belt which was put in place to put a gap between town settlements. However there are extenuating circumstances here since a road is badly needed to link the Habberley Road with the Bewdley By-Pass to avoid the ridiculous situation we have at Catchem's End where all traffic must turn left. As a result we have an area which is heavily affected by vehicle fumes. Indeed we understand that this area is one of the most heavily polluted areas in the Wyre Forest District. Funds should therefore be found for a link road. On this basis we would agree to residential dwellings being constructed on this site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05135</a>	Support	<p>Bewdley: OK to build on Catchem's End site WA/BE3 and Habberley Road providing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drainage pipes are installed (preventing flooding from brook by Queensway).</li> <li>2. Parking space is allowed (for vehicle using Lodge Close from pub).</li> <li>3. Green park/play area is installed.</li> <li>4. Bus stop provided</li> <li>5. Local store/newsagents.</li> </ol> <p>No building on other sites in Bewdley.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPQ2655</a>	Comment	<p>1.) Access. Main access from the town to the site will be Park Lane. I am sure you are aware that this is already a very busy road (particularly at peak school times) and poses serious threat to pedestrians utilising the route. An increase in traffic flow will therefore increase this risk.</p> <p>2.) Ecological Importance of the site. I am sure you are aware that Ancient Woodland is present to the south of the proposed area for development. Housing and increased 'hard landscaping' will produce run off which will ultimately produce pollution and undue pressure on Snuff Mill Brook. Should you still deem it necessary for the site to be included on the plan, and should development be proposed, it will be imperative to carry out a full Ecological Appraisal of the site, prior to the submission and/or determination of any planning application.</p> <p>As a young person, I understand the need for increased housing, particularly in Bewdley (I myself find it frustrating that I have had to move out of my home town simply because of the lack of affordable / available housing!). However, I do believe that building on this site (or to the west of the River for that matter) is not a sensible or sustainable option for the growth of Bewdley and that an alternative solution should be sought.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2913</a>	Comment	<p>I see the proposal is for single-storey housing, which I take to mean it is being considered for retirement housing.</p> <p>In some ways this would be a lovely spot in which to have a retirement bungalow – attractive and peaceful and very close to town. However, people looking ahead to their retirement will be thinking of the time when they can no longer drive. To walk into Bewdley is dangerous down Park Lane with no footpath, and the climb back up Park Lane or Wyre Hill is daunting and many would be unable to tackle it.</p> <p>To catch a bus they would have to walk up and down from Hales Park, which again is not practical for many, especially with heavy shopping.</p> <p>If, on the other hand, the houses are taken by car drivers, how is the narrow road network in this area to cope with even a modest increase in the traffic flow?</p> <p>So although I can see the thinking behind allocating a site close to the town centre for such housing, I don't believe it is a practical option.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0978</a>	Comment	We thought that the upper portion of the site might be used, as the assessment sheet suggests, but are told that Bewdley Civic Society (who know the area better than we do) consider the site wholly unsuitable, relying on the views of a Planning Inspector several decades ago that the site should never be developed. Here we have to defer to local knowledge.
	<a href="#">LPP0718</a>	Object	Development off Highclere would lead to serious accidents on roads - narrow and twisty, no pavements. Unsuitable proposal.
	<a href="#">LPP0744</a>	Object	Object to proposed development on Highclere Fields for following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• steeply sloping with no bus or local shop</li> <li>• limited parking in area - roads narrow, no pavements, poor visibility</li> <li>• well used for recreational pursuits - dog walking, informal play</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0687</a>	Comment	Highclere downgrade to Option B but preferably not built on at all. Agree with Stourport Road triangle suggest that anything west of the river is not chosen for building due to traffic congestion/pollution/ violation through Bewdley Town Centre which is not acceptable.
	<a href="#">LPP0386</a>	Comment	Access is suggested as available via existing hammerheads but these roads are narrow with several partially blind bends. They may be able to cope with increased domestic traffic but the passage of delivery and emergency vehicles could be a problem.
	<a href="#">LPP0584</a>	Comment	Want BR/BE/6 removed from the core sites and replaced with part of the site in option B at Catchem's End. This would avoid the increase in traffic through Welch Gate that any development at Highclere would cause.  Other than very small scale, development should be avoided West of the River Severn in Bewdley to avoid adding to the increasing congestion and air quality problems already faced by the town.
	<a href="#">LPP03093</a>	Comment	I would prefer site WA/BE/3 Catchems End to be designated as a Core Site instead of site BR/BE/6 Land off Highclere. The reason for this is that any development in the Highclere area would inevitably add more traffic passing through the Welchgate / top of Load Street area which is an Air Quality Management location. Any

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			additional air pollution in this area should be avoided and additional traffic would only make the air quality worse. In addition the extra traffic passing through this area and then over Bewdley Bridge would only increase the regular congestion in Bewdley Load Street. I believe that there should only be very small scale development on this side (west) of the River Severn and any necessary, more major developments should take place on the Wribbenhall (east) side.
	<a href="#">LPP02517</a>	Comment	<p>Bewdley's character is bound in by its geographic layout and history. Its uniqueness is worthy of preservation and any restrictions on further developments being built near the town could ensure its preservation.</p> <p>I can appreciate both sides of the problem - growth and expansion as opposed to preservation. A dilemma and can see there is no easy resolution to this and the many similar situations that will arise for the area in the future.</p> <p>Having lived in Birmingham, due to expansion and immigration, many districts that were regarded as being respectable and under the control of authority have now become less desirable. Bewdley and its surrounds are far from being in a similar state, but my experiences should convey a warning of the changes that can happen in a lifetime.</p> <p>Your greatest dilemma, as I see it, is in deciding whether to take a short or long term view of the problem whilst taking into consideration the beautiful area we live in and how quickly it can all change.</p> <p>With regard to Highclere I am in favour of a good result for the protesters and can only await the outcome of the committee's decision on the matter. Before a final decision is taken, I trust the committee will seriously consider the effects this and any other building projects planned for Bewdley will have on its historical heritage. Apart from this aspect, the serious traffic problems that will result within the town and all of the very difficult to negotiate roads adjoining the town need to be studied. Bewdley, with its obvious restrictions is very limited in the number of residents easily accommodated in the part of town under discussion. There are problems accessing the town via Park Lane or Wyre Hill by either foot or vehicle. Visitors will comment on the problems of trying to pass oncoming vehicles. Wyre Hill with its many cottages and parking problems is extremely narrow to negotiate and is relatively free of accidents due to care taken by familiar users of it and, in the main, its limited use.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPQ2536</a>	Comment	<p>Highclere is not suitable for land development. If access is from the current infrastructure of Park Lane / Wyre Hill this will cause numerous traffic bottlenecks and dangerous access. Wyre Hill becomes exceptionally narrow around the school and, in reality, people going to Kidderminster will use Park Lane which again is very narrow. In addition, there is already a bottleneck around the church with cars exiting Park Lane merging in with traffic from all sides.</p> <p>I firmly believe that we require the correct development in the right place in Bewdley. We need nice bungalows for the older residents who will then release their 4 bed houses to families releasing smaller houses for younger residents. Highclere is not suitable for a development for the elderly - there is no bus access and residents requiring access to the medical centre, if unable to walk (and Park Lane is steep for the elderly) will have to drive - no parking spaces!</p> <p>I have no objection to development but this land is wholly unsuitable and will cause more problems that it solves.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ4162</a>	Comment	The only reasonable proposals seem to be those of building at the back of St Ann's school.
	<a href="#">LPPQ4166</a>	Comment	For many years this has been a potential site and in fact was proposed for planning in the 1970s, hence the layout design of Highclere and Highclere Drive to accommodate this.
	<a href="#">LPPQ688</a>	Object	<p>A) Traffic increase on Park Lane which is steep with poor visibility and is used by school children where there is no footway</p> <p>B) Shops are ½ mile away but down a steep path, new houses are very likely to use cars to access.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ755</a>	Object	<p>Object to land off Highclere being a core site. Development anywhere West of the river is not an option. Increased traffic flow will exacerbate pollution in Welch Gate.</p> <p>Core site of Highclere is said PARAGRAPH 33.1 “ to have easy access to services and facilities” This may be so in mileage terms, the roads to town, Park Lane and Wyre Hill are narrow and tricky already and increase in traffic will worsen this. They are already difficult for pedestrians and dozens of children use Park Lane as a route to and from the High School &amp; St Annes. There is no bus route for non drivers who cannot walk up and down the steep</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			hills to services or facilities.
	<a href="#">LPP0673</a>	Object	<p>I object strongly to this part of the plan.</p> <p>Very concerned at proposal for housing development adjacent to Highclere. This is inconsistent with other objectives and policies in the plan which support the retention of Bewdley's valuable open spaces and the reduction of traffic. The development of infill sites can be accepted, but see no justification for the use of valuable Greenfield open space on this side of Bewdley.</p> <p>Development would generate significant additional traffic on Park Lane. This road, used by school children and pedestrians, is narrow with blind bends and no pavement, no bus route, no local shop, detrimental to the air quality improvement zone and increased congestion. Additional traffic on this road is unacceptable.</p> <p>The natural beauty of these fields and their value for recreational purposes will be lost as stated in the last Government Inspectors' report which rejected any development of this area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0675</a>	Object	<p>I object to the proposal that Highclere be considered for core housing site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The road network- access only via Highclere (Drive)- Park Lane/Wyre Hill already congested</li> <li>2. Safety to children- St Annes School as a result of additional traffic</li> <li>3. Not on a bus route</li> <li>4. Area used by local residents for walking</li> <li>5. Area of beauty adjacent to Golden Valley</li> <li>6. More suitable areas- Wribbenhall and Stourport Road- easy to access to by-pass</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP035</a>	Object	Object to development of Highclere fields.
	<a href="#">LPP040</a>	Object	I am extremely concerned about the effect any housing development will have on the surrounding road network around Highclere Fields. Park Lane and Wyre Hill are very narrow, and the congestion, particularly at rush hour and school start and finish times, is already unacceptable. There is no transport infrastructure in place, so all

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>movements will be in private cars. Walking is not an option, particularly for older people, as the site is at the top of a steep hill above the town, whichever way you access it.</p> <p>The bypass is not the answer, evidenced by the fact that it is not used by the majority of people currently, so why should that situation change.</p> <p>There are also strong arguments against the site being developed from an environmental viewpoint, both in terms of deterioration in air quality and the destruction of yet more urban green land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO44</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Highclere. The land is used by walkers and is habitat for wildlife - leading down to ancient woodland. The increase in volume of traffic with access from Wyre Hill or Park Lane would be dangerous. Proposals for small development of retirement bungalows not appropriate because of access to town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO45</a>	Object	<p>Objects to development at Highclere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the site has high landscape value</li> <li>the water run off into Snuff Mill Brook would have a detrimental effect</li> <li>Access in / out of the site is unsuitable for any increase in traffic</li> </ul> <p>Bewdley Town Council has agreed that this site is unsuitable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO53</a>	Object	<p>I would like to express my views on the proposed development. I live in Park Lane and use these fields daily for walking my dogs as do many other people living locally, to walk them elsewhere would mean taking them out in the car. Any development would increase the traffic going up and coming down Park Lane. Park Lane is very steep and narrow in places two vehicles can not pass and some vehicles travel up far too fast. I frequently walk up and down as do many school children, I tend to avoid this when it is icy because it is so easy to slip and be hit by a vehicle, however the school children still do, any increase in traffic will put them at risk.</p> <p>For every property built there will be a minimum of two vehicles and no bus service as the access is unsuitable for large vehicles.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			On balance I think the proposal is unsuitable.
	<a href="#">LPP054</a>	Object	<p>Bewdley Town Council agrees with residents that the land known as Highclere Fields is unsuitable for the proposed development.</p> <p>My objections are as follows.</p> <p>Previously refused for development - reason was it was an area of outstanding natural beauty plus other reasons which have not changed and many of them have got worse.</p> <p>The access to this land would be via Park Lane and or Wyre Hill, these roads cannot take more traffic and are extremely dangerous to motorists and pedestrians and in particular school children. Car ownership has increased since the last application and parking on the roads has made hazards behind belief. This increase in traffic will make air pollution even more of a problem and would again impact on people's health.</p> <p>There are suitable sites in the area which would be more beneficial to all parties concerned and I would ask you to reject this planning application.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP066</a>	Object	<p>I am concerned that the development would cause a number of problems in the local area:</p> <p>The increased volume of traffic around Park Lane, Wyre Hill and by the local school St Anne's. It would be difficult to get good access to the site from the existing road structure. I am sure there are much better options available to the local planners, I understand that this particular field was some years ago designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty by the planning inspector, if permission was granted this would be the thin end of the wedge and more applications would be forthcoming to extend the site. I hope you will consider my comments when making your final decision.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP071</a>	Object	<p>Area congested with traffic, no pavement down the steepest part of the hill and barely room for cars to pass. More houses will lead to more traffic. Dangerous enough, why make it even more so? Wyre Hill unsuitable for even the amount of traffic that there is.</p> <p>Highclere area used for walking and relaxing. Council should reduce the amount of traffic in Bewdley</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			The attraction of Bewdley is that it allows easy access to the countryside, has pleasant views and clean air.
	<a href="#">LPP081</a>	Object	Objects to development at Highclere. The increase in traffic along Park Lane would be dangerous to pedestrians, many of whom are school children.
	<a href="#">LPP0114</a>	Object	<p>Infrastructure will not cope with further development. Already problems with school parking. Already bungalows in the area up for sale that could be utilised.</p> <p>Already too much pollution around Welsh Gate, further development will only increase that.</p> <p>With the bus system around here and the roads being so narrow during school times there is already too much congestion &amp; with more vehicles being around this area it will be putting our children &amp; older residents at more risk of accidents</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0117</a>	Object	<p>Problem with this site is vehicular access. The three means of accessing Bewdley Town Centre from this site are a) Winbrook/Welch Gate, b) Wyre Hill and c) Park Lane. Neither of these routes can take an increase in traffic.</p> <p>Route a) Winbrook/Welch Gate is a narrow road up to the junction with Dog Lane, it is difficult for buses to manoeuvre and impossible for a lorry to pass a bus. Congestion already occurs in that area. Additional traffic generated by development in Highclere would cause gridlock in this area. There are already air quality issues at this point due to stationary traffic - this would be exacerbated by development at Highclere.</p> <p>Route b) Wyre Hill is very narrow and with parked traffic down one side is already reduced to a single carriageway. This route can not take the additional traffic that would be generated by development at Highclere.</p> <p>Route c) Park Lane is steep and narrow with no pavement. It already suffers congestion and is not suitable for additional traffic. This route is walked by people coming from the town to the present housing in Park Lane and Highclere INCLUDING SCHOOL CHILDREN. There is already conflict between traffic and pedestrians. Additional traffic generated by further development at Highclere will inevitably lead to pedestrian injuries or death.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Please note that Bewdley Town Council consider the Highclere site unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Reject the Highclere site for further development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0119</a>	Object	<p>I object to the inclusion of this greenfield site behind existing houses at Highclere for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The extra traffic generated by the proposed new housing development has 'nowhere to go'.</li> </ol> <p>Park Lane is narrow, twists, blind bends, is steep, it is hard to pass two vehicles and most importantly it has no pavement. Dangerous for pedestrians. The elderly, schoolchildren Mums with pushchairs and people working and shopping in Bewdley have to hope that the traffic coming around a blind spot can stop.</p> <p>Moving the extra traffic away from Park Lane and putting it down Wyre Hill is not much better, parked cars effectively reduce the road to a single carriageway.</p> <p>The area of Welch Gate would also be badly affected by extra vehicles from Wyre Hill producing more pollution and forming a bigger queue at the junction with Dog Lane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There are no facilities in the Park Lane/Highclere area. No Bus Stop, No shop, No children's playground, not even a postbox. Consequently people have to use their cars all the time to go shopping and for trips to the medical centre, library and everything that Bewdley offers. See point 1. above about the deleterious effect of extra car journeys.</li> <li>3. Loss of the greenfield site behind Highclere would mean that the existing local residents would lose the amenity of being able to walk on footpaths there. There is no other area of park anywhere near Highclere.</li> </ol> <p>My objection to the inclusion of Highclere as a potential housing site can be included in the draft Local Plan consultation.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0120</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of local land for recreational/amenity, inc environmental and nature aspects.</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibility of future development</li> <li>• Loss of many public footpaths/wildlife</li> <li>• Develop the area as a nature reserve, as an asset to Bewdley.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0143</a>	Object	The plan does not comment on the issue of extra traffic travelling down Park Lane. This is a key issue, especially at peak times. A traffic impact study is needed. Great caution is required before any action that increases traffic flow up and down this road, especially the steep and winding section. Extra Highclere traffic will use this route!
	<a href="#">LPP0175</a>	Object	Impact on traffic flow through Bewdley. It's on top of the hill, so although within 0.5 mile of Load street, not easily accessible. Very unlikely that new residents (especially elderly) would walk down and back up after visiting the shops.
	<a href="#">LPP0334</a>	Object	<p>I oppose the preferred scheme. Any building in Bewdley is unwise due to the layout. I am particularly concerned with the proposed building on Highclere fields.</p> <p>My reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already very high air pollution in the town</li> <li>• Gridlocked roads at peak times (Park lane and Wyre Hill narrow and without pavements)</li> <li>• Increased car usage as there are no near bus stops or shops</li> <li>• Highclere fields have many ash trees- aren't these endangered though ash dieback in other areas? If so shouldn't they be protected?</li> <li>• Highclere is Green Belt! A beautiful spot used by many of the local community</li> <li>• Several bird species and butterflies would loose their habitat</li> </ul> <p>Many other reasons to refuse planning on this site. Please consider them. Without major road improvements, any large building projects would greatly add to the existing problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0340</a>	Object	I strongly object to the inclusion of Highclere Fields as a possible housing development site. My reasons are as

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>follows.</p> <p>Unsuitability- Access via Park Lane/ Wyre Hill, both of which are narrow roads, poor visibility, dangerous for those walking as no proper footpaths, blind bends, additional traffic will cause chaos.</p> <p>Natural Beauty- This field has always been considered an area of outstanding natural beauty, development of any sort will destroy this forever. The landowner has her own development ideas which are impractical and would set a precedent for future development and be difficult to resist. Your policy statement includes 'not an area of significant value for recreation, beauty, tranquillity, wildlife.' All these criteria apply to Highclere fields. These fields should be a priority for protection.</p> <p>Bewdley town- Relies heavily on tourists, so destroying its attractiveness to visitors by turning it into a commuter town, would destroy the very essence of why people visit.</p> <p>Alternatives- Have you considered land opposite/ adjacent to the Mercure Hotel, Defunct site of Medical Centre/Library, land opposite Bewdley High School.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0383</a>	Object	<p>Object. This site did not form part of the Bewdley Town Council Development Plan.</p> <p>Land west of the river is not as suitable for development due to the increased congestion this will cause as people travel through the town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0171</a>	Object	<p>Development off Highclere: 30 bungalows would increase the existing developments (Highclere &amp; Highclere drive) by 40%, so quite significant. Nearest shops are in the town centre - although only 0.5 mile away, there is a very steep hill (50 m height difference), which elderly people are unlikely to manage. Therefore an increase in road traffic of at least 30 cars would be inevitable. The nearest route is Park Lane, which is single lane in places with poor visibility. Park Lane is frequented by many pedestrians (especially school children), and has no foot way on the narrow parts. The junction with Load street is also an accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>St Anne's primary school use Highclere drive as a suitable place to teach cycling, as it is a cul-de-sac. It's unlikely</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this can continue if it becomes a through road.</p> <p>If included for development, it must be unconditionally max 30 bungalows - any planning applications for a larger number or larger houses must be rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO302</a>	Object	<p>Concerned with regard to the inclusion of the land off Highclere within the core site allocation.</p> <p>Difficult to comprehend the inclusion of this land being driven by local landowners offering the land for development or the reasoned justification for inclusion. To my mind the reasoned justification is not considered and without good justification.</p> <p>I would point out the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Table 33.0.1 makes reference to 30 dwellings and 33.2 'very limited single-storey development'. Discussions with the officers related this to elderly person bungalows. What elderly person will select a bungalow at the top of a hill with the nearest bus route a good distance and severe incline walk away with no local shops. Once accepted, this proposal would soon be converted into at least 50 two/three storey dwellings. This would then lead to precedence for the development of land adjacent to Dry Mill Lane.</li> <li>2. Traffic pollution is already at potentially high risk levels within the town. Entrance and exit from the site would be via the town adding potentially an additional 100 vehicles through the town twice a day. The access to and from Park lane in both directions is hazardous and conflicts with the Town Council's Policy INF1&amp;2 as the majority of traffic flow will be through the town centre.</li> <li>3. The junction of Park Lane and Birch Tree Road, which is a very sharp right / left hand bend is of insufficient width and hazardous to both motorists and pedestrians especially at work / school times. The steep stretch of Park Lane towards the town centre is again hazardous to motorists and without a pavement. School children during autumn and winter are at high risk, the footpath cut throughs are not used as they are not maintained, unlit and, in parts, very steep and slippery.</li> <li>4. Any increase in traffic from the town centre or by-pass into Highclere is unacceptable.</li> <li>5. There is only one access available from Highclere onto Park Lane, the access shown off Hernes Nest is a</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>private road and should not be shown as such.</p> <p>6. The site is totally unsuitable for development and should not have been considered initially.</p> <p>7. Any development will destroy the landscape, take away valuable urban green land and its recreational use. It will be seen from the by-pass and from the higher vantage points such as Wharton park and be an intrusion into the local landscape.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0759</a>	Object	<p>Para 33.1 Site does not have easy access to services and facilities e.g. No bus service, No shops within ½ mile (then downhill/uphill to town centre). A car will be essential for trips.</p> <p>Para 33.2 Reference to 30 single story dwellings This implies bungalows and bungalows imply older residents, up to 60 extra cars, courier vans and grocery deliveries will be made - the traffic flow will be immense and add to the existing dangers on Park Lane and Birch Tree Road. Air quality will be compromised.</p> <p>The existence of extra dwellings on site will destroy the recreational value of the field.</p> <p>The plan will run from 2018 to 2034, in that period development of the site BR/BE/6 will lead to pressure from the landowner to develop further landholdings to the West along Cleobury Road and the by pass. This will prolong anxiety, if granted it would destroy the unique location that is currently enjoyed.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0826</a>	Object	<p>Object to any large-scale housing west of the river for reasons of poor infrastructure and sustainability (including a lack of public transport possibilities), exacerbation of traffic and pollution/air quality problems in the town, visual impact of the landscape quality of the area and surface water drainage issues.</p> <p>Site BR/BE/6 land off Highclere: The factors mentioned in the above paragraph apply here. The natural beauty of this site is well-documented in the government's report when its development was rejected at the appeal hearing in 1989. While there have been changes in the planning framework the value of this landscape has not altered, so the comments are still valid.</p>
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP0841</a>	Object	The Council strongly opposes the site at Highclere and it will not be included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Justification for this includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is of high landscape value on the West side of Bewdley where development is not supported by the community;</li> <li>• Water run off would put undue pressure on Snuff Mill Brook;</li> <li>• Road access via Park Lane/Wyre Hill into and out of the site is very restrictive;</li> <li>• No easily accessible public transport provision;</li> <li>• Development on the west side of the town is unsustainable due to the traffic congestion and subsequent air pollution which will have an adverse effect on the existing AQMA;</li> <li>• Accessing services from sites on the west of the town would be difficult due to the restricted access via the Welch Gate AQMA. This would result in any development becoming "divorced" from the town and unlikely to contribute to the town's economy or enhance community cohesion.</li> </ul> <p>The Council have received strong local opposition to the inclusion of this site and it is our opinion that 30 units can be catered for elsewhere through windfall development, or by allocating 30 dwellings over the three remaining preferred sites.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPP01078</a>	Object	<p>Proposed allocation BR5/BE6 – Although we note the comments set out in paragraph 33.2 of the reasoned justification we still have significant concerns regarding the allocation of this site. Particular care will be required if the unimproved grassland and nearby LWS are to be effectively protected from the adverse effects of development and we would strongly recommend further work be done to determine whether this is feasible prior to the final allocation being accepted. In particular we would emphasise the difficulties associated with maintaining species rich grassland in public open space.</p> <p>In addition we reiterate the need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist on any of the sites using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been fully considered in the evidence base or SA for the plan. This may have the effect of rendering the plan unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for sites listed in Table 33.0.1 and 33.0.2 is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP01663</a>	Object	I would like to object to the redevelopment of Highclere fields for housing. The fields are used by dog walkers and there is easy access for all. Building on this site would be detrimental to the wellbeing of the residents in that there would be increased traffic on the narrow roads and more air and noise pollution.
	<a href="#">LPP02885</a>	Object	The roads to and from the town to this area are barely accessible now – Park Lane is unsuited for more traffic – an extensive length has no footpath and is very narrow as well as being the preferred route for local children to walk to school. Wyre Hill – absolutely unable to take increased traffic. Up Wyre Hill – past the local primary school which will be even busier with increased population, or down Merricks Lane and into Welch Gate, already known ‘Black Spot.’
	<a href="#">LPP02967</a>	Object	<p>As a resident of Highclere I feel compelled to register my objection to any proposal to build on the Highclere site. Apart from the fact that it would destroy the natural landscape and beauty of this area, I would also point out the very obvious traffic problems that it would generate.</p> <p>Access via Park Lane or Wyre Hill would present a lethal cocktail of problems for both pedestrians and traffic. Much of which is too narrow to accommodate passing traffic, and off course the lack of a public footpath in much of these 2 roads could have devastating consequences.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03003</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to the development of the Highclere fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area provides an amenity for walkers as can be seen in the many footpaths crossing the fields.</li> <li>• It is a green lung between the by-pass and the houses already built.</li> <li>• There would be poor access to narrow roads in the area and would put a further strain on the already overcrowded street of Bewdley.</li> <li>• It would greatly increase the problems around the school, increasing the risk to the children.</li> <li>• As there is no bus route covering the site it would considerably add to the number of cars as can be seen by the number of cars per household already, usually at least two per house, which adds to the congestion of the roads as few houses can accommodate them all. It also leads to more gardens being covered with hard surfaces which causes more water run off.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP03063</a>	Object	<p>For us, the main concern is Highclere Field, and so we wish to register our strongest objection to it being part of “Plan A” for the erection of new homes in the area, in fact, to be considered at all.</p> <p><b>Traffic volume and infrastructure:</b> If you have ever been to the Wyre Hill area and spent a bit of time there, you will be aware of the sheer volume of traffic that already runs through what was conceived as a quiet, residential area. On an ordinary day, the amount of cars that make their way up and down the likes of Park Lane, Wyre Hill, Hales Park, Merrick’s Lane, even Sandybank goes way beyond what the area was set out to cope with.</p> <p>Adding more cars to this with the development of Highclere would have a catastrophic effect to an already incredibly congested area. Even if you did create a direct access to the by-pass (which wouldn’t be easy given the ravine that separates Highclere Field and the bypass), the reality is that most new residents would choose a route via Park Lane, Wyre Hill etc. This would present the most direct route into town, for amenities such as shops, pubs etc that Wyre Hill doesn’t offer.</p> <p>Roadworks in the area have been a rather frequent occurrence in recent years, and every time one of the feeder roads to Wyre Hill and Park Lane or the roads connected to the former is shut (as has been the case this last weekend), traffic on Wyre Hill turns into complete mayhem. This would be made worse still if another 30, 40 houses (and up to 100 cars) were added to the built up area in that part of Bewdley.</p> <p><b>Health and safety:</b> On school days, especially during drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic situation on Wyre Hill is quite precarious. There have been many near misses and even some accidents involving school children. Many parents living close by already feel it’s not safe for their children to walk the short distance from home to St Anne’s School – a situation that would be further aggravated by additional traffic from Highclere Field.</p> <p>Park Lane and Sandybank, too, present real H&amp;S issues that would increase further. Both are used by many pedestrians (most notably students of Bewdley High School) but both lack in suitable footpaths. Children are required to walk along the often busy roads before they reach the town centre and any increase in traffic will increase the potential for accidents on roads which were never designed for this kind of high volume of traffic.</p> <p>For many dog walkers, Highclere Field is the only accessible area that in the long winter mornings and evenings</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>isn't completely dark. It is possible to walk but at the same time feel safe, with nearby houses offering low levels of light. The adjacent big field does not offer anything similar and dog walkers would be restricted to walking on the pavements.</p> <p><b>Environment:</b> Many people come to Bewdley as it has a reputation of being an area of outstanding natural beauty. Set in the middle of the countryside of the Wyre Forest, it could be assumed that there are many, easy accessible country walks available to residents and visitors. However, that's not the case, in particular on the Wyre Hill side of Bewdley. One of the few areas easy to reach for residents for recreational purposes is Highclere Field, which is used by many for dog walking and play (it's safe for kids due to its proximity to houses) and be in touch with nature.</p> <p>Highclere Field has been untouched in many, many years and this means that a number of rare species of plants and especially animals have been able to thrive. Species I have observed myself are amongst others: buzzard, kestrel, nightingale, goldcrest, cuckoo, waxwing, bat, bumblebees (different kinds), butterflies (different kinds), foxes, hedgehogs, slowworm and grass snakes.</p> <p>Building on Highclere Field would mean valuable terrain for rare species would be irretrievably lost. This is not the kind of Bewdley residents of the town and the Wyre Forest envisage their children and grandchildren to grow up in.</p> <p><b>Conclusion ;</b> Like many other residents and visitors, we have the strongest of objections to any kind of building work to be carried out on Highclere Fields. In a survey from 2 years ago, residents made it clear that Highclere Field should not be on the list of proposed building sites. We were therefore very surprised that it had been placed on the list by WFDC, not only that, but that it is, in fact, part of Plan A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03065</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to you to object to the planned building on the field behind Highclere in Bewdley.</p> <p>This is a terrible location as not only is it Green Belt land, but the accessibility to the site for both firstly the building firms and ultimately the residents will impact incredibly badly on the surrounding area. The road down to Bewdley is a single lane and the opposite way is a busy primary school. The pollution surely is a price too high to</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>pay alone without the dangers being taken into consideration.</p> <p>I trust you will turn this proposal down.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01872</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not build on Highclere.</li> <li>Two dangerous narrow roads plus a B road leading to two bottlenecks, Welch gate and Bewdley bridge.</li> <li>Extra traffic would be a nightmare of traffic and car fumes.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01873</a>	Object	<p>From a Member of Highclere Fields Residents. Objects to housing development on Highclere Fields.</p> <p>Main reason for objection is because of impossible access. Both Park Lane and Wyre Hill roads are dangerous and narrow and cannot do with increased traffic of any kind.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01931</a>	Object	<p>I wish to Lodge my objection against the proposed development of the Highclere Fields. It would be dangerous to increase traffic flow on the narrow access roads to the area and increase harmful oxides of nitrogen and carbon into an already highly polluted environment of Welch Gate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02175</a>	Object	<p>It is very clear that these will not be very affordable houses for Bewdley families as the number of houses is small when compared to the numbers proposed on the other suggested sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02274</a>	Object	<p>Vehicular and pedestrian access via Wyre Hill and Park Lane, Areas of Park Lane and Wyre Hill have no public footpaths.</p> <p>Lack of services: The nearest shops are in Bewdley or The Lakes Road, local bus service operates from Wyre Hill forcing potential residents to use their own transport.</p> <p>Golden Valley is a beautiful area, separating existing residential from the Bewdley by-pass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02302</a>	Object	<p>I endorse Bewdley Town Council that if Option A is rejected in favour of Option B, no more development should be on the west bank of the River Severn. There are few local employment opportunities in Bewdley and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>amenities, further houses would increase traffic and pollution.</p> <p>Highclere was rejected in 1989 as totally inappropriate for development, the reasons remain. Plans are for retirement bungalows is a daft idea as site is steep and access from the town up steep and narrow footpath-less Park Lane or Wyre Hill. More vehicles adding to the air pollution in the town centre. Land used by locals, its loss would reduce Bewdley being a desirable tourist attraction for visitors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2303</a>	Object	<p>Object to Highclere fields site in Option B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steep slope with bad drainage problems.</li> <li>• Local Primary school is full.</li> <li>• Park Lane is a two lane road with two wide footpaths that goes into a very steep one lane road with no footpaths. Road is steep and dangerous when icy. We don't need any more traffic diverting through Welch Gate to avoid it</li> <li>• School children and others use this road daily.</li> <li>• Highclere fields are an amenity which should not be built on.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2331</a>	Object	<p>There are 3 more suitable sites East of the river in terms of 1) access to Kidderminster and Stourport, 2) not encroaching on Green Land. Transfer Highclere Site to an Option not a Core site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access used by schoolchildren is already dangerous with lack of pavements.</li> <li>• The map wrongly shows a road link between Hernes Nest/Highclere; there is no through road</li> <li>• No bus route/local shop, would increase car use/air pollution/risk of accidents.</li> <li>• Concentrate new building East of the river, esp. regeneration of brownfield sites in Kidderminster</li> <li>• Even if land available should be about planning not convenience.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2340</a>	Object	<p>I wish to respond to the local plan review, with respect to the plans for Bewdley. I attended the consultation event in St George's Hall, Bewdley on Wednesday 19th July. In particular, I wish to comment on what I will call the 'Highclere' site, which is the field beyond Highclere and Highclere Drive at the western extremity. I note that this</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>site is a 'core' site, and so I understand that whatever the objections and rational arguments, building of some sort on this site will go ahead. I hope this is a misapprehension on my part.</p> <p>In planning terms, I think this would be utter stupidity.</p> <p>Let me be clear:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I am not a habitual dog-walker, and losing this site to tarmac, bricks and concrete will be to the detriment of my access to countryside, but not to a very large extent.</li> <li>2. Developing the site for housing will, of course increase the traffic passing my house at the junction of Highclere and Park Lane, but I doubt I will notice much difference compared with the amount of traffic already passing.</li> </ol> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is foolish to extend the urban sprawl further west into open countryside.</li> <li>2. The increased traffic resulting from such a development will significantly increase the danger of accidents down the narrow part of Park Lane, where there is a dangerous absence of footpaths.</li> <li>3. There will be increased traffic passing St Anne's School where the road is already dangerously narrow.</li> <li>4. There will be increased traffic passing through Bewdley, where pollution from existing levels of traffic is already at dangerous levels</li> <li>5. As with most current residents of Bewdley, car journeys towards Kidderminster and Stourport for shopping, work, leisure facilities and cultural events far outweigh journeys towards Tenbury, Leominster and Ludlow.</li> <li>5. It is a fundamental planning error to develop sites at the maximum westward distance from these facilities while closer sites are available, just think of the extra car-miles involved!</li> <li>6. It is not worth protecting totem Green-Belt sites between Bewdley and Kidderminster when at present they provide so little if any public access. The expression 'Green Belt'...a 70 year old phrase, is preventing rational thought.</li> <li>7. The 3 sites on the eastern boundaries of Bewdley would be far more sensible from a planning point of view because they are less open to the objections given above</li> <li>8. The 3 sites on the eastern boundary of</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Bewdley would have far easier access to the main roads than the Highclere site.</p> <p>8. I am not sure that the planning staff are aware of the dangerous lack of footpaths in Park Lane.</p> <p>9. I suspect that at least some of the planners labour under the mistaken impression that there is an access to Highclere via Hernes Nest. This access was shown on some maps. It does not exist. The thoroughfare is blocked.</p> <p>10. In the current jargon, the Highclere site is clearly NOT a 'sustainable location' in terms of what I understand by the expression.</p> <p>Furthermore, when I visit Kidderminster, and see the dire state of commercial property in Worcester Street, now that shopping facilities have gravitated towards the new centre at Weavers Wharf, and then consider the vast area above and behind Worcester Street whose current use is merely for (often very sparse) car parking, I cannot understand why our planners are considering sites around Bewdley at all. Revitalise Kidderminster !!</p> <p>At the very least, the Highclere site should NOT be a core site. It should at the very least be an option, and, given the other options, nobody with any sense would want to build on the Highclere site at all!</p> <p>But you probably will!!!! And why? Out of expediency, and simply because the owner of the site happens to be willing to sell. So much for 'planning'.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02359</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accept the need for more housing in Wyre Forest, but access/increased traffic on narrow roads is a concern; there is no pavement in Park Lane</li> <li>Loss of a valuable recreational asset</li> <li>Would sloping land affect building?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02381</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beautiful area, well used by the local community</li> <li>No local shop/bus route so any building would increase car usage and impact on pedestrian safety; road access is poor and there is a lack of pavements.</li> <li>Negative impact on air pollution.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02405</a>	Object	<p>Any development to the rear of Highclere, Bewdley would increase traffic on Park Lane which is used by schoolchildren despite being narrow and steep with no footway in parts.</p> <p>Potential occupants of new 1 storey housing could be elderly and would have to use cars as there is no public transport causing more pollution. Opposed by BTC.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02431</a>	Object	<p>Specifically I object to the inclusion of the fields adjoining Highclere in Bewdley as a potential site for building.</p> <p>A major concern relating to this location must be the inadequacy of the road infrastructure in Bewdley to cope with further development west of the river. This is particularly relevant to this site, as both Park Lane and Wyre Hill are dangerous with the present levels of traffic, for motorists and especially for pedestrians, and will not allow for increased volumes. In my years as a Director of Bewdley Development Trust I held many meetings with Highways Planners from the County Council, and they made clear that Bewdley west of the river was their greatest problem area across the county, and posed intractable problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02447</a>	Object	<p>Highclere Fields should NOT be included in the draft local plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access would be via Highclere and Park Lane which are not suitable for more traffic.</li> <li>• Morning and afternoon local children walk up or down Park lane to school and it is a steep narrow twisting road with no footpath so not suitable for more traffic.</li> <li>• The fields are a local amenity.</li> <li>• Development on this side of the town is not a good idea as inevitably it would result in more traffic through the town</li> <li>• There are more suitable sites for development for local housing.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02459</a>	Object	<p>We strongly object to the neighbourhood plan as it applies to Highclere in Bewdley.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Park lane and Wyre Hill are unsuitable roads to sustain any further development in this area. Both roads are narrow, restricted and have poor visibility. As a non driver I frequently use Park Lane to walk into Bewdley and I have to manoeuvre traffic each time. Uncertain drivers already have difficulty with the</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>narrow, steep, unpaved section. Further congestion would only add to the problem. These two roads also form major walking routes for the pupils at the junior and high schools</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. There are no shopping facilities or transport routes to service this site. Residents would have to use their cars to go anywhere.</li> <li>3. This site raised serious objections the last time it was mooted and was rejected by the Government Inspector's report.</li> <li>4. This particular site can be seen right across the valley and any development would impinge greatly on the views.</li> </ol> <p>It is the main area for current residents to take exercise to allow their children to run and play in safe traffic free surroundings to walk their dogs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02485</a>	Object	<p>I very strongly disagree with the proposal to build housing on the fields adjoining Highclere, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All access routes to this area are via narrow, windy roads, in places without a pavement. If more housing was built, these roads would become even more dangerous for pedestrians, especially young children attending the nearby primary school.</li> <li>2. These fields considerably enhance the natural beauty of Bewdley and are enjoyed every day by many local people and visitors to Bewdley.</li> <li>3. Building on these fields would be visible over a wide area, thus spoiling the natural beauty of Bewdley.</li> <li>4. There are many public footpaths within and adjacent to this area and these are used and enjoyed by many local people and visitors to the town.</li> <li>5. These fields are a valuable area for a wide variety of wildlife. It is our duty to protect this habitat.</li> <li>6. Access to the area for emergency vehicles would be further impeded by the consequent increase in traffic.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP02492</a>	Object	<p>I wish to lodge my strong objection to the inclusion in the District New Local Plan of the land adjoining Highclere</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and Highclere Drive Bewdley on the following grounds.</p> <p>Anyone who has to travel up &amp; down either Park Lane or Wyre Hill, knows how difficult it can be .There are very few passing places for two cars &amp; the visibility particularly on Park Lane hill is very bad in places, thus at times leading to a few close shaves. Dangerous road access via Park Lane and/or Wyre Hill. Narrow roads with restricted access and poor visibility. Any development in this part of Bewdley will increase the traffic flow still further.</p> <p>Any additional traffic could also worsen the air quality problems in Bewdley.</p> <p>School children going down to the High School have to use the hills twice a day, there are no pavements for them or other pedestrians to walk on. If traffic is increased both walking into town or driving down will become a lot more dangerous. In bad weather, the hills become very icy thus adding to the problems. There are always big queues of traffic with people trying to get onto the bypass in these conditions. The residents living at the bottom of Highclere have to park their cars on the second hammerhead in order to get a run up the hill in Highclere in snowy conditions.</p> <p>The fields are well used by local residents &amp; the value to the community would be lost by development there. These fields can be seen easily from the bypass in winter, when the leaves are off the trees, thus increasing the beauty of Bewdley. There is no other area this side of Cleobury Road for people to use.</p> <p>We lost the only shop up here a good twenty years ago. So the only way to get anything you run out of is to either walk or use the car to get down the hills. No one would use the bypass to get to Bewdley town centre, people would just carry on &amp; go to Kidderminster or Stourport, so you would be harming the local shop keepers if this plan goes through. The other consideration re traffic is that all traffic going from this area to the bypass will have to go past St. Ann's Primary school.</p> <p>This attractive countryside site is crossed by well used public footpaths and is a valued piece of green land. Any development will be seen from a wide area and the natural beauty of these fields and their value for recreational purposes would be lost. The last Government Inspectors report totally rejected development of these fields. The</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>beauty of the fields and impact on the landscape surrounding Bewdley has not changed since that report.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the agreement of any development on this land would set a precedent for further developments in the future to the west of Bewdley. The nearby land adjacent to Park Dingle was rightly left out of the WFDC Plan after being quoted in the HELAA (Ref BR/BE/7) as 'The site is very open when viewed from the bypass and any development would potentially have an adverse impact on the landscape character' The Highclere site has the same characteristics .</p> <p>The site is not suitable for any development as it is steeply sloping down to the Golden Valley and is on top of a hill. It does not have easy access to facilities or services without using a car which will exacerbate the traffic problems as mentioned above. There is neither an immediate bus route nor any local shop. Water run off from the site may well put undue pressure on Snuff Mill Brook.</p> <p>The Bewdley Neighbourhood Plan has been in process for some time and the Steering Committee has taken the views of the people of Bewdley. Following this they have now taken the Highclere site out of the Neighbourhood Plan. In view of this and the adverse facts set out above I feel that the District Council should now follow suit and also take the Highclere site out of the District plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02538</a>	Object	<p>I am total against any further development west of the River Severn for all of the many reasons that have been aired publically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ &gt;Dangerous road access to all areas, particularly Park Lane and Wyre Hill</li> <li>➤ &gt;School children at risk</li> <li>➤ &gt;The Highclere site being unsuitable - as recorded in previous reviews going back many years.</li> <li>➤ &gt;Congestion and health and safety risks in the Welch Gate area - as pointed out and recorded by DOE research back as far as 1986</li> </ul> <p>So - to be clear, I wish to formally register my opposition to the inclusion of the Highclere Fields in the WFDC and urge you to remove this from your development plan, before it is finalised.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP02541</a>	Object	I formally register my opposition to the inclusion of the Highclere Fields in the WFDC plan and urge you to remove this from your development plan before it is finalised.
	<a href="#">LPP02580</a>	Object	<p>I am extremely concerned about access to the proposed site and consider that any increase in traffic flow will be dangerous to public safety especially pedestrians including children for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the proposed site via Highclere will mean more traffic via Bewdley Town using Park Lane where there is a steep narrow section with no footpath whatsoever.</li> <li>2. Access to the proposed site via Birch Tree Road will mean increased traffic flow past the school in Wyre Hill and the adjacent pinch point in the road.</li> <li>3. Access via Merricks Lane and Wyre Hill are both very steep and/or narrow.</li> </ol> <p>In addition these fields enhance the natural beauty of Bewdley and are visible over a wide area. Building on this land will destroy this valuable and irreplaceable feature.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02593</a>	Object	<p>Strongly object to the proposals at Highclere:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dangerous road access via Park Lane and/or Wyre Hill. Both roads are very narrow with restricted access and poor visibility. Any development in this part of Bewdley will increase traffic flow still further which is unacceptable. It will also impact on the air quality improvement zone in the Welch Gate part of Bewdley. In addition, the town centre frequently gridlocks and any further development in Bewdley west of the Severn will only exacerbate this problem.</li> <li>• Substantial numbers of school children and other pedestrians use Park Lane and Wyre Hill and are at risk because of the narrow roads, no pavements and volume of traffic. Any increase in traffic flow resulting from this proposed development will add to the danger.</li> <li>• This proposed site is not suitable or sustainable for retirement style bungalows or indeed any other type of development. It is a steep site sloping down to the Snuff Mill brook valley and is on top of a hill. It does not have easy access to facilities or services. There is neither a frequent bus route that serves the immediate area nor a local shop. Therefore increased car use will be encouraged.</li> <li>• The attractive countryside site is crossed by well used public footpaths and is a valued piece of urban</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>green land. The natural beauty of these fields and their value for recreational purposes will be lost. The last Government Inspector's report rejected development of these fields. Part of the inspector's comments were: "Development of this land would extend the urbanised area of Bewdley into an area of great landscape value and would adversely affect the setting of Bewdley and the attractive environment to the west of the town. Its development, therefore, would create a precedent for extending development of the town towards the by-pass, over land readily visible from a wide area would represent a considerable physical and psychological intrusion into the open landscape." The inspector also stated that development of this land should be a very last resort when all other alternatives had been exhausted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of this site would set a precedent for larger developments in the future to the west of Bewdley right up to Wharton Park. Retaining the Highclere site in the draft WFDC Local Plan could also strengthen the case for the Gladman planning application adjacent to Dry Mill Lane in any future appeal process.</li> <li>• The inclusion of the Highclere site also appears to contradict many other policies and objectives outlined in the draft Local Plan including safeguarding land of recreational and amenity use; improvement to the landscape; protection of watercourses; reduction in traffic levels; and air quality improvement.</li> <li>• It is not included in the Bewdley Town Council Neighbourhood Plan which has recently been consulted upon. The consultation undertaken in 2016 on the Bewdley Town Council Neighbourhood Plan strongly indicated that the people of Bewdley did not favour development in this area. The recently completed latest consultation exercise which gathered even more responses indicated even stronger opposition to building on the Highclere site.</li> </ul> <p>I do understand the need for more housing in Wyre Forest District but I do not consider the significant development of any land on the west bank of Bewdley to be sustainable. As most economic activity takes place to the east of Bewdley in Kidderminster or in the West Midlands conurbation I consider that any development in Bewdley would be more sustainably located east of the River Severn, closer to these areas of economic activity.</p> <p>A more suitable site could be the site already identified by the Council in its option B proposals opposite the Rising Sun public house in Kidderminster Road, Wribbenhall. This site is flat, more easily developable and not used for recreational purposes. It is on a main road with frequent bus services, good road access and close to a local</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>shop and other local community amenities. I also consider the other sites proposed for housing development in Bewdley east of the River Severn to be able to be far more sustainably developed than the Highclere site. These include both core proposals and option A and B proposals. All are closer to more frequent public transport services and other local facilities.</p> <p>Taking all these matters into account I request that the Council should not include the Highclere site for any development in the Local Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02605</a>	Object	<p>The route to town via Park Lane is already very narrow and quite dangerous for everyone.</p> <p>The children use this route to access their schools and facilities in town. More cars on this stretch of road would only make this situation even more hazardous.</p> <p>I would like to add that to build on such a prominent green field site, which is used by the local community as a recreational area for all to enjoy, would be very sad to witness.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02630</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road access is very bad via Park Lane which would be the favoured access. Parts of Park Lane are very narrow, steep and with a blind bend in an area where there is no pavement. It is substantially used by schoolchildren. Access via Wyre Hill is equally bad especially bearing in the mind the location of the Primary School.</li> <li>2. There have been applications turned down in the past to build on this site. The H M Government Inspector at the time had no hesitation in dismissing the appeal on the grounds that the land in question had high landscape value due to its natural beauty. The site is much valued by local residents for this reason and the well worn public footpaths over the land show that it is well used by many people.</li> <li>3. I understand from minutes made public that Bewdley Town Council is recommending to WFDC that the site is taken out of both its own Neighbourhood Plan and also the WFDC Local plan. I hope that WFDC will take note of what local people are saying.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPP02667</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is a Green Belt site of significant natural beauty and well used by local people.</li> <li>• Road infrastructure is constricted in this area. Used by school children, access via Park Lane would be</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>dangerous to pedestrians and drivers alike and would be opposed by local residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposals to include Highclere Fields in previous plans have been rejected by Government Planning Inspectors (on a number of grounds). There is no evidence to suggest that others would reach a different conclusion with the current proposal. Why alternative sites have not been examined in more detail shows a lack of creativity by local planning departments. The site would not be extendable and it is difficult to see why it would make much of a contribution to local housing needs. And the noise from the bypass since resurfacing could affect demand for property in such a poor location.</li> <li>The landscape value of the existing site is well appreciated and it is likely that this will be severely affected by the project which can be seen from the road.</li> </ul> <p>Please can we carry out an in-depth study of this very poor proposal to devise an alternative which is more suited to Bewdley's needs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2700</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposed development of housing on the land behind Highclere, Bewdley. This is currently a picturesque site enjoyed by many that provides recreation, environmental protection and local animal habitation. It is unsuited to housing development due to already struggling local roads and the absence of either a bus route to the area or a local shop.</p> <p>I trust that these considerations will be taken into account when determining the local plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ2701</a>	Object	<p>My objections come in 2 parts:</p> <p>Site factors: There are a number of issues related to this site that make any housing development unsuitable. I detail these later.</p> <p>The WFDC Planning Process: I believe that the WFDC Planning Process with regard to Highclere has many inconsistencies. The net result is that the validity of the reasons to include this site in the Local Plan is highly questionable. I spell out some of these inconsistencies later.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Site Factors</p> <p><b>Road access:</b> Being a Bewdley resident I know that most people will access this site via Park Lane. This is narrow, steep, with a blind bend and for most of its length there is no pavement. It is heavily used by school children and is an accident waiting to happen. Do you want to increase this risk? You could use Wyre Hill which is just as bad and would add to the pollution problems in Welch Gate. If you use the by-pass that would mean driving along Wyre Hill down a narrow congested road past a Primary School. In short, access is a nightmare, I dread to think about heavy construction vehicles trying to get onto the site. The landowner herself in a recent leaflet she distributed in the area stated they impact on traffic of housing on these fields would be chaotic.</p> <p><b>Suitability:</b> The latest idea, among many others, of the landowner is to build retirement bungalows. The site does not have easy access to buses or shops. The site is on top of a hill and there will be drainage problems that will affect the Golden Valley.</p> <p><b>Landscape:</b> These fields are a very attractive part of Wyre Forest visible for miles around. This is why a government inspector rejected plans to develop this site. They are used by people over a wide area for recreation. Furthermore, since these fields have not been touched for many years they are an important wild life corridor. Bats, lizards, slow worms, grass snakes, dormice and ground nesting birds use these fields as their habitat. We all know that any construction will cause long term damage to this ecosystem.</p> <p>The WFDC Planning Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I want a level playing field. WFDC has rightly objected to the Gladman development on the Dry Mill Lane site. One of the points put forward by WFDC was that the National Policy and Planning Framework in paragraph 80 make it clear that historic towns have a setting. Bewdley Conservation Area was granted heritage status in 1968. The 2015 appraisal stated:</li> </ul> <p>“It is important to conserve the rural setting of the town and Conservation Area and in doing recognise the interrelationships between the Area and the overall setting.”</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>“These hills rise to a significantly higher level than the town centre and provide it with a strong sense of natural containment.”</p> <p>These very points apply to the Highclere site. Any proposed development on the Highclere site will strengthen the case for Gladman.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bewdley Town Council went through a thorough consultation process to formulate its Neighbourhood Plan. Following this Bewdley Town Council decided that the Highclere site was not suitable for development. If WFDC keep the Highclere site in the local plan then the Independent Inspector would ask questions regarding the robustness of the WFDC Local Plan.</li> <li>• Under the HELAA “Call for Sites” exercise, the fields adjacent to Highclere, Park Dingle are noted. These fields are deemed unsuitable by WFDC because of their visibility. This is interesting. The Highclere fields are far more visible and if WFDC reject the Park Dingle land then in all fairness they should reject Highclere.</li> <li>• WFDC appointed a firm Amion Consultancy to analyse housing needs over the period 2016-2034. They produced a report in February 2017. Their report includes input from Edge Analytics and makes reference to Cambridge Econometrics and Oxford Economics. To produce this analysis it looks at a range of factors such as projected employment needs, potential economic growth, likely migration figures, commuting trends etc. The report is full of assumptions and suggestions, it is no more than a best guess. Even so if we take this report at face value it produces a number of housing requirements for WFDC over the period 2016-2034. The highest figure is based on PG-Long-Term-X model and requires 291 dwellings/annum which is 5238 dwellings. The lowest figure based on the SNPP-14 model is 199 dwellings/annum which is 3582 dwellings. My question is where does the oft quoted figure of “6000” houses are needed by WFDC?</li> <li>• In the Kidderminster Shuttle of July 20th 2017 there is an article referring to the rejection of planning on the Snipes site, Areley Common. John Baggott is quoted: “The development would result in a substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to enhance this valuable landscape.” I could not agree more as it applies equally to the Highclere site.</li> <li>• In WFDC appeal against the Gladman development off Dry Mill Lane, it states on page 68 of Agenda Item 5 of WFDC Planning Committee dated 20/06/2017 that:</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>“Other Green Field sites (off Highclere and Snuff Mill Walk) appear to be more closely integrated with the town and are probably sequentially preferable.”</p> <p>What is the justification for stating that the Highclere site is more closely integrated with the town? Any one who lives in Bewdley will know this is nonsense. In fact Gladman could argue that the Dry Mill Lane site is more closely integrated since it is on bus route and road access is easier. Furthermore, why mention the Snuff Mill Lane site when the WFDC HELAA states that this site is not deliverable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WFDC Local Plan states that development west of the River Severn is constrained by topography and the Air Quality Management Area at Welch Gate. However the Highclere site is still included. Furthermore the local plan says that all sites have easy access to services and facilities. This is clearly not correct with regard to the Highclere site. There is an alternative, namely the Catchem's End site. This is east of the River Severn and would provide an indicated number of 76 dwellings. The Bewdley Neighbourhood Plan consultation showed little or no objections to development in this area.</li> <li>• The WFDC Local Plan also states that the Highclere site is an area of “unimproved grassland.” Surely a more appropriate phrase would be “unspoilt grassland”. This is exactly why this site is an important wildlife habitat.</li> </ul> <p>I trust that the Planning Policy Team of WFDC will consider carefully the 3 site-specific issues I have mentioned and take on board what I feel are inconsistencies in the planning process.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2705</a>	Object	<p>The road access around Park Lane &amp; Wyre Hill is not suitable for additional traffic having restricted access and poor visibility.</p> <p>There are significant numbers of children using Wyre Hill and Park Lane. Increased traffic would increase the danger they experience due to narrow roads, no pavements and speeding traffic.</p> <p>The proposed site is unsuitable for retirement homes due to the steep sloping site and also the lack of facilities, services and bus routes that serves the immediate area.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			It has been home to colonies of locally kept bees which are of vital importance to the maintenance of the rural economy and ecological balance.
	<a href="#">LPPQ2736</a>	Object	<p>Object to development at Highclere for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The access via Park Lane and Wyre Hill is totally inadequate, and there is no solution to the road problem in these areas.</li> <li>• Welch Gate is polluted.</li> <li>• Wyre Hill, to the bypass is also congested.</li> <li>• There is no road crossing patrol person putting school children at risk.</li> <li>• The site slopes steeply with several springs.</li> <li>• No bus route either, therefore increased use of cars</li> </ul> <p>Need to use brownfield sites. Small, infill housing is a much better idea, I am sure the roads would cope better with this plus the fact that it would be more in keeping with the town</p> <p>Any development on the west of the river is doomed because of the roads, to which there is no answer.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPQ3339</a>	Object	<p>I believe proposals for Highclere is completely in the wrong place to build on and should be dropped. It is unstable for any development. There are many reasons for this:</p> <p>Wyre Hill and Park Lane used by student to walk to school. Both roads in parts have no pavements. Increasing traffic on these roads is not suitable for any pedestrians. The roads are narrow and give poor visibility for both driver and pedestrians. Highclere itself is bad in ice and snow for road and pavement users.</p> <p>There is no viable access to this site which is safe for everyone on the roads.</p> <p>There are many walks and public footpaths through the fields that are great for the community. The paths are well used and provide green open space for local people. Many groups use the public footpaths including dog walkers, the local walking group, tourists come to the area for walks here too. This land is valued and loved by the</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>community for been what it is now.</p> <p>The FAQ handout says sites have to be suitable and sustainable for houses. Well Highclere fields can not come under this category. A housing estate there is not sustainable because it will just means that the estate will be expanded over time which will ruin the landscape of Bewdley. The site also is not suitable as it slopes down to Snuff Mill Brook/ the Golden Valley. There are no bus routs this side of Wyre Hill and no facilities for the residents making them use cars more causing more traffic. Retirement bungalows are unsuitable because of the big walk to any service in Bewdley. Not flat area for walking disability. And if retired people cannot drive there is no bus route for them so would be housebound. There are many other reason why this development should not happen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• air pollution</li> <li>• road access</li> <li>• green space</li> <li>• safeguarding of land</li> <li>• landscape pollution</li> <li>• local service e.g. the bus service – there not enough to support the population at the moment not alone more people.</li> <li>• pollution from any building traffic</li> <li>• land access</li> <li>• loss of places where young kids can come and walk to grow there imagination and enjoy them self.</li> <li>• trees been cut down</li> </ul> <p>I hope you consider all of these issues before carrying on with this development and decide to drop from the plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3396</a>	Object	<p>Access via Park Lane and/or Wyre Hill is dangerous as both roads are very narrow with poor visibility and without pavements in parts. The inevitable increase in traffic will make walking very hazardous for both the large number of school children and other pedestrians who use these roads daily.</p> <p>The proposed site has neither a bus route that serves the immediate area nor a local shop therefore increased car</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>usage will result.</p> <p>Will also increase traffic through the already congested town centre and will have a huge impact on the air quality.</p> <p>I believe it is essential that we keep our green fields and countryside for our future generations. Once developed it will be lost forever.</p> <p>The proposed site has well used public footpaths and is valued for its natural beauty.</p> <p>It also has high landscape value which is what makes Bewdley an attractive town for locals and visitors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3401</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road access is very poor and the main ways in Park Lane and Wyre Hill are very narrow with poor visibility. This would add to the poor air quality in Welsh Gate.</li> <li>• Both the above roads mentioned above are main routes for the High School children going to and from school. They have limited pavements.</li> <li>• The whole site is currently used by many people from all over Bewdley as the town does not have a park as such and thus it is used by all for walking and getting fresh air.</li> <li>• The planner mentioned that they would like only 30 Bungalows, however once the land is sold the developer would quickly change this for many houses, well in excess of 100. The site is not commercially viable for bungalows as they use more land and do not command a high price.</li> <li>• The overall plan for the area is to keep country side where possible which is right. A development of this size in Bewdley will start to change the nature of this key tourist town for the area. The larger developments planned in Kidderminster on brown field sites would appear to be the better option.</li> </ul> <p>Please let's try to do use brown field sites first and very small infill developments.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3481</a>	Object	<p>The location of this site will create major issues in terms of access and road safety.</p> <p>Bewdley itself is gridlocked even now at certain times due to traffic congestion; this proposal would increase this</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>problem tenfold.</p> <p>I wish to object most strongly to these ill thought plans to develop what is a well used recreational area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03652</a>	Object	<p>These fields are used regularly by dog walkers. The views are very special and I feel that they should be maintained as a green area for everyone to enjoy.</p> <p><b>Pedestrian access:</b> Pedestrian access to this part of Bewdley is poor. I often walk through the fields and then into town. Park Lane does not have a foot path. The alternative is a gully that runs from Herne's Next to Snuff Mill Walk - this footpath is extremely steep, particularly at the bottom. It would not be accessible for anyone in a wheelchair or with a pushchair. Wyre Hill is also very steep and the more accessible alternative of Cleobury Road involves a long detour. There is no local shop on these estates and some residents might find it difficult to walk to any shops. This brings me to my next point, vehicle access.</p> <p><b>Vehicle access:</b> When comments are made about the narrow road at Welch Gate, and the congestion and pollution that arises, there is always the suggestion that all traffic uses the Bypass. I always use the Bypass if I am driving to Stourport or Kidderminster but it is a lot further if I want to go into Bewdley town centre so I do not use it when going to the town (as a member of Bewdley Rowing Club I regularly drive to this facility). The queuing traffic here at certain times indicates that others feel the same. When the Cleobury Road has been inaccessible there has also been congestion on the Bypass. For these reasons I feel that any developments should be to the East of the town, closer to the main roads to Kidderminster and Stourport.</p> <p>I hope that you will take note of the objections of local residents. These fields are a key reason for us living here, and for us enjoying living in this location.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03745</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. increased traffic to an already busy narrow road, often used as a 'cut threw' for commuters, adding to already poor traffic pollution and an increased risk to school children.</li> <li>2. reduction of the protection to watercourses and further reduction of landscape, contradicting local plans to protect land of recreational and amenity usage.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3996</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently the green fields are a buffer to heavy traffic on the bypass and consequent air pollution</li> <li>2. The fields provide a pleasing appearance to the entrance to Bewdley town as well as an important green space for wildlife</li> <li>3. The roads which approach the bypass allow no opportunity for overtaking which results in fast and dangerous traffic on the bypass itself. Introducing local slower traffic would be reckless</li> <li>4. The other access roads have stretches where there is no footpath as well as dangerous blind bends and stretches where there is only space for one vehicle at a time. It is likely that there would be more than one vehicle to each dwelling, a volume of traffic which is unsustainable for these roads</li> <li>5. The map which accompanied the proposal is inaccurate. It shows two means of direct access from Park Lane to the Highclere fields. In fact there is only one as there is no through route from Herne's Nest to the Highclere hammer head.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4003</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently the green fields are a buffer to heavy traffic on the bypass and consequent air pollution.</li> <li>2. The fields provide a pleasing appearance to the entrance to Bewdley town as well as an important green space for wildlife</li> <li>3. The roads which approach the bypass allow no opportunity for overtaking which results in fast and dangerous traffic on the bypass itself. Introducing local slower traffic would be reckless</li> <li>4. The other access roads have stretches where there is no footpath as well as dangerous blind bends and stretches where there is only space for one vehicle at a time. It is likely that there would be more than one vehicle to each dwelling, a volume of traffic which is unsustainable for these roads</li> <li>5. The map which accompanied the proposal is inaccurate. It shows two means of direct access from Park Lane to the Highclere fields. In fact there is only one as there is no through route from Herne's Nest to the Highclere hammer head.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3165</a>	Object	<p>Strongly object to the inclusion of this site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road access is very bad via Park Lane which would be the favoured access. Parts of Park Lane are very narrow, steep and with a blind bend in an area where there is no pavement. It is substantially used by</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>schoolchildren. Access via Wyre Hill is equally bad especially bearing in the mind the location of the Primary School.</p> <p>2. There have been applications turned down in the past to build on this site the most recent in 1989 when the application went to appeal. The H M Government Inspector at the time had no hesitation in dismissing the appeal on the grounds that the land in question had high landscape value due to its natural beauty. In the intervening period the situation has not changed. The site is much valued by local residents for this reason and the well worn public footpaths over the land show that it is well used by many people. Given that WFDC fought off these proposals most strongly in 1989 I am unable to understand why WFDC has seen fit to include the same site in its Local Plan</p> <p>3. I understand from minutes made public that Bewdley Town Council is recommending to WFDC that the site is taken out of both its own Neighbourhood Plan and also the WFDC Local plan. I hope that WFDC will take note of what local people are saying.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03190</a>	Object	<p>We enjoy the outdoors and often go walking around the local area, and would not like to see this beautiful natural area ruined by development.</p> <p>I find it very concerning. This proposed development could increase traffic around the school which is often already congested at peak times.</p> <p>There are also certain parts of the footpath around the area by the school are very narrow and the potential for increased traffic only increases the likelihood of accidents occurring.</p> <p>Does not obviously appear suitable for development as it slopes quite steeply.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04079</a>	Object	<p>Lack of safe traffic access, only means of access is via the Highclere/Park Lane junction, which leads traffic either down narrow steep Park Lane (no pedestrian footpath) or else, typically past St Anne's School on the way up to the bypass.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04101</a>	Object	<p>I wish to express my concerns about the inclusion of the Highclere site in the WFDC Local Plan.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has poor access</li> <li>• Is highly visible for miles around</li> <li>• Rich in wildlife</li> <li>• Very wet in places with a small stream draining into the Golden Valley</li> <li>• It will put additional strain on Load Street and worsen the air pollution in Welch Gate.</li> <li>• It has rightly been removed from the Bewdley Town Neighbourhood Plan after the consultation, why is it still in the WFDC Local Plan?</li> <li>• Park Lane and Wyre Hill already have traffic problems.</li> <li>• Park Lane is narrow, steep, no pavements in places and blind bends.</li> <li>• The exit onto Load Street is awkward. Wyre Hill is no better.</li> </ul> <p>What exactly are the landowners intentions? A Government inspector turned down development on the site once before because of the nature of the site and its high visibility. Now it is proposed for thirty retirement bungalows plus some split level houses on the steeper parts of the field. As the whole field is included in the plan will that be just the start?</p> <p>In you appeal against the Gladman development you state that The Highclere site appears more closely integrated with the town and is probably sequentially preferable. The Gladman site has superior access to the by-pass, a bus route to the town centre and a local shop, in which way is the Highclere site preferable? I would like to know and I would think in their appeal Gladman would like to know as well, if you object to one you must object to them both.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04616</a>	Object	I object strongly to the proposed housing development at Highclere. Any housing development in the west of Bewdley could not be supported by the roads and infrastructure available or possible. The only possible exception to this would be if WFDC used the powers available to it to effect the development of dilapidated listed buildings in the centre of Bewdley, e.g. the old workhouse, into housing units. While this would add small pressures on services, the restoration of these buildings would bring considerable benefits to residents, visitors and businesses.
	<a href="#">LPP04184</a>	Support	Any further development would be more appropriate on sites over the river, namely Highclere, if Bewdley has to be further developed.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/BE/6 – LAND AT HIGHCLERE

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3244</a>	Object	Objection to the redevelopment of Highclere fields for housing. Has lived at Hales Park for a long time, in that time I have used the fields almost every day to walk my dogs. It is a beautiful place in all seasons with easy access for all. I also believe that building on this site would be detrimental to the wellbeing of the residents in that there would be increased traffic on the narrow roads and more air and noise pollution.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1567</a>	Comment	<p>Catchem's End is a deliverable housing site which would bring positive social and economic effects and providing housing towards to Wyre Forest's shortfall in housing. The site is considered wholly deliverable within the plan period of the Local Plan, subject to removing the site from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Shortfall in housing must be addressed in order that the plan is found sound. Catchem's End should be included as a housing allocation. The site will provide much needed housing, open space and link in to transport routes.</p> <p>The site is available for development, and is also suitable for development. There are no constraints to prevent the delivery of the site.</p> <p>The site is in close walking distance to a number of local facilities including three public bus routes which run regular services to High Town, Tenbury Wells, Kidderminster and Stourport allowing sustainable transport to local centres for commuting or other services. This site itself is just over 400m away from the local shop and is also within close walking distance to a number of public houses, places of worship and takeaways with a primary school also located within the village. The location is a sustainable one which would not require a high dependency on private transport and compares well to other sites which are not in such close proximity to services or public transport routes.</p> <p>Very few other sites within the area can provide as many benefits to the wider community on top of site residents without major negative effects. However, Catchem's End certainly has the ability to be able to do this even with scoring in the Sustainability being harsh in areas such as historic landscape and biodiversity. Catchem's End provides the ideal opportunity for an additional sustainable housing development in order address the current district housing shortfall and the local need within Bewdley.</p>
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO811</a>	Object	<p>Bewdley allocations - 2 of the sites are within Green Belt (core sites). Thus the emerging plan is seeking to favour Green Belt land in lower order settlements over non-Green Belt sites in higher order settlements unless Option B is chosen.</p> <p>Site WA/Be/3 Catchems End is within Green Belt and makes significant contribution (see Green Belt review). Development would reduce openness and urbanise land. Western section of site adjoins Listed church and is</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			partly in flood zone 3. The allocation should therefore be removed.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO980</a>	Support	Bewdley bypass is suitable as new Green Belt boundary - strong landscape barrier. Hill at Maypole Piece should be retained as undeveloped land. Any floodable land should only be used as open space.
	<a href="#">LPPO177</a>	Comment	Would like Catchems end to be included in option A.
	<a href="#">LPPO304</a>	Comment	It is accepted that further housing is required in Wyre forest area and that Bewdley is not exempt, however, there needs to be a structured argument for the inclusion of any land for development without the destruction of the Landscape and creation of substantial pollution concentration. It seems inconceivable that the Catchems End site [WA/BE/3] was not included as a core site and only included in option B. This site would make a significant contribution to the housing need, would not have a significant detrimental effect on the landscape and have easy and safe access to main roads and pavement access to schools. _
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1562</a>	Comment	<p>Proposed development at Catchem's End is adjacent to a sustainable road system with is already being upgraded. The roundabout to the north east of the site is being upgraded to include an extra arm. This would enable the delivery of a sustainable transport system that would alleviate existing traffic problems on the road and be sufficient to deal with an increase in housing in the area.</p> <p>The site at Catchem's End would be able to provide appropriate contribution to support improvements to the local highways improvements, associated with the impacts of the development.</p>
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1564</a>	Comment	<p>The site at Catchem's End would provide significant green space in an area which is not allocated as such and would provide in an area where there is currently an under provision.</p> <p>The open space that could be provided on the eastern and western areas of the site would provide green space to the residents of the new development and provide local green areas for residents of the wider Bewdley area. This is particularly important in a settlement which current has an under provision of this type of space.</p> <p>The site can contribute 3.48 hectares of public open space to the community.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			There are no other sites within the area which could provide the equivalent in valuable open green space.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1600</a>	Comment	<p>Propose Catchem's End for further housing growth to meet Bewdley's need. The site needs to be reconsidered as a future growth site in the Local Plan, which will assist in addressing shortfalls in the Council's delivery and also deliver wider benefits to the Wyre Forest area, including public open space to be used by the wider community.</p> <p>Catchem's End is an appropriate location for future growth and is necessary to provide the Council with a greater cache of housing land, deliverable within the plan period of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2201</a>	Comment	Development at Catchems End will present a heavily built up area on the approach to Bewdley. Mature trees will be retained but a concentration of housing will create a wholly different street scene coming into the historic town and not reflect the character of existing dwellings. One must question how the traffic issues generated will be addressed with the existing congestion. In addition, it is questionable as to whether there sufficient local schools to accommodate additional family housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO4179</a>	Comment	Should be a core site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4089</a>	Comment	Whilst supporting option A, I would like to see the Land off Highclere BR/BE/6 removed from the core sites and replaced with part of the site in option B at Catchem's End. This would avoid the increase in traffic through Welch Gate that any development at Highclere would cause.
	<a href="#">LPPO176</a>	Comment	Catchem's end development would be more suitable than Highclere, as Catchems end gives direct access to the road network.
	<a href="#">LPPO686</a>	Comment	I suggest that Catchems End WA/BE/3 be changed to a core housing site.
	<a href="#">LPPO653</a>	Comment	<p>I both support and object to this policy as I believe it is two distinct sites.</p> <p>The land between the church and the track is a natural housing infill site, and should be released for that purpose to meet the heavy demand in this area.</p> <p>However, the triangle between Kidderminster Road and the by-pass is integrally part of the agricultural open</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			space along with the surrounding Green Belt that should be preserved.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0838</a>	Object	Northern site adjoining the By-pass. Strongly object to the development of this part of the site for housing. It will seriously diminish the openness of this narrow and highly sensitive part of the Green Belt between Kidderminster and Bewdley, an area that is to be seriously compromised by the development of the WMSP's development of a water park and hotel and conference centre alongside the by-pass and will compromise the area's ability to maintain its identity. The two developments together would significantly affect the openness and the visual gap between the two towns and being so close to Wribbenhall/Bewdley it will read as an extension of the built-up area. This proposal is seen to compromise the established Green Belt principles of preventing coalescence, sprawl and encroachment and the preservation of the setting and special character of the historic town Bewdley.
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPP01199</a>	Object	Concerned with proposed allocation of site WA/B/3 – Catchems End – Green Belt assessment identifies this as having a 'significant contribution' to the Green Belt. Important role in preventing encroachment and sprawl. Development would reduce openness in this area. The likely effects on openness are judged to be significant. Development would uncharacteristically urbanise the land. This allocation should be removed from the plan.
	<a href="#">LPP01577</a>	Object	Objects on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More dwellings on Kidderminster Road will cause more traffic on an already busy road - especially with WMSP adding more facilities causing more vehicles to be on the road already.</li> <li>• Would like space adjacent to Wribbenhall Church to remain as open space. If this was developed with access onto Kidderminster Road, the road will not cope with the extra traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01578</a>	Object	More pollution 221 houses in a small area. And the Safari Park new link to water park.
	<a href="#">LPP01787</a>	Object	Objects to proposed development at Catchems End due to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gridlocked roads between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>2. Entry and exit issues for new properties, cars and increased air pollution.</li> <li>3. Impact on tourism in Bewdley. Concerned that Bewdley needs to be careful not to morph into a community suburb. Impact on sense of community if more people commute from Bewdley.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Impact on local infrastructure - schools and local transport.</li> <li>5. Also concerned about rumours that predicted growth of population in the Wyre Forest are incorrect.</li> <li>6. States that the consultation period is in the summer holidays and consequently many people may be on holiday and not have the opportunity to respond.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2140</a>	Object	Opposes to the amount of affordable homes proposed in plans if this was to increase then he would have no objection as there is already a large amount of non affordable housing in the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO2350</a>	Object	<p>Having inspected the proposed new Local Plan for Wyre Forest and in particular the proposals for the area between the by-pass island and All Saints Church in Wribbenhall, Bewdley, we would like to make the following observations:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area to the rear of Lodge Close historically floods, this problem has not been alleviated by the construction of the bund above Queensway, or the Environment Agency clearing out the silt in the stream running into the old Spring Grove pool. This has been cleared within the last few months. The area behind 16, 17, 18 and 19 Lodge Close floods for at least half of the year, and in wet years for a lot longer. The gardens of some properties in Lodge Close are consistently under a considerable amount of water for most of the winter.</li> <li>2. The farmer who ploughs this field has on more than one occasion had to get his tractor towed out of this area, where it has got bogged down.</li> <li>3. Kidderminster Road from the by-pass island is already a bottleneck. This would be exacerbated by additional traffic joining this road, especially as the new WMSP Hotel will potentially join the by-pass island. There are considerable traffic congestion problems caused by the Fish and Chip Shop and the Waggon and Horses Public House, this specifically causes huge issues in Lodge Close which is regularly blocked to such a degree that emergency vehicles would not gain access.</li> <li>4. The lane down the side of Lodge Close leading towards the SVR is very narrow and runs very close to properties abutting it, and if this was a potential access to and egress from any development, would cause considerable noise pollution and inconvenience to the properties abutting it.</li> <li>5. Loss of amenities, views etc from properties presently overlooking the woods and fields, with possible</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			additional flooding being caused to the properties mentioned in Lodge Close by the increased hard landscaping.
	<a href="#">LPPO2948</a>	Object	<p>Object to the proposed development sites in Bewdley. In particular the Kidderminster Road sites, Option B. We have lived in Bewdley for over fifty years. During this time we have experienced a considerable increase in traffic flow and noise particularly as vehicles approach the by-pass island.</p> <p>This increased traffic problem makes departure from New Road onto the Kidderminster Road, difficult. There are already certain times when traffic is bumper to bumper, morning and evening plus weekends.</p> <p>Increased housing on the proposed site would only exacerbate the current traffic situation, making waiting times longer and causing more congestion.</p> <p>If the West Midland Safari Park continue with their development of a water park and hotel, this would add enormous pressure onto the current by-pass roundabout on Kidderminster Road, and access roads.</p> <p>The local Bewdley schools already have pupil capacity, and parental parking along Stourport Road is already a difficult situation and sometimes dangerous. Additional housing would only add to the problems already faced by local residents and families.</p> <p>Wribbenhall has had its fair share of housing development over the last ten years. The Queensway Estate has had at least three housing developments and on Kidderminster Road there have been two significant building projects which have resulted in additional dwellings.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4852</a>	Object	We object to any development of this site, we would not wish to see erosion of the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO4705</a>	Object	<p>Policy 6B notes the need to safeguard and enhance open countryside, maintain openness to Green Belt and the provision of infrastructure and Policy 25C allows development on Green Belt only for small scale affordable housing in special circumstances.</p> <p>The developments on site reference WA/BE/1, WA/BE/5 AND WA/BE/3 are contrary to the policies noted above.</p> <p>All of these sites are currently actively farmed/used land and so developing housing on this land is not safeguarding this Green Belt, in contradiction of policy 6B.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Site WA/BE/3 in option B currently incorporates the run off rain water from the Queensway estate and there are obvious environmental concerns of developing on this site</p> <p>Concerning infrastructure, all Wribbenhall sites will be affected by the bottleneck of the Bewdley bypass where it ends at the Kidderminster end and traffic connects with the Habberley Road. The addition of a potential Traveller site on the Habberley Road would further add to this congestion. Plus the development of the Safari Park and the increase in tourist traffic related to this. I cannot see where the plan addresses adequately the issues that the increased traffic would create.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4617</a>	Object	Object to the proposed developments south of the Habberley Road, the Stourport Road triangle and at Catchems End. Without extensive improvements to road, transport and other elements of infrastructure and services, none of these developments could be supported without damaging Bewdley and the amenities of its current residents. As these improvements are not proposed, the housing developments should not be allowed.
	<a href="#">LPPO4190</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The increase in parking and other highway issues this would bring.</li> <li>• How this will affect the schools, which are already over subscribed.</li> <li>• Waiting times and care at the dentist and doctors with an increase in the population.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4191</a>	Object	I feel the planned building of over 100 new houses in the area is far more than the area can stand. The extra strain on the roads in the area which are already at breaking point is unacceptable. The loss of Green Belt land should be avoided at all cost as once it has gone that is it.
	<a href="#">LPPO4177</a>	Object	<p>This relates to the overall plans for Bewdley as set out in the Wyre Forest Local Plan review: in particular section 33</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt land: I understand from the recent questionnaire completed by residents that one of the main concerns was the protection of Green Belt land. This proposal highlights a number of areas that are</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			protected as Green Belt.  The Green Belt is what makes Bewdley and the Severn Valley so desirable and a conservation area, any reduction at the main access points to the town will be out of character and a considerable visual impact
	<a href="#">LPPO4153</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affect on approach to town/sprawl effect of built up environments.</li> <li>• Whilst there is no “right to a view” in legal terms, is loss is not necessarily irrelevant when it comes to planning permission.</li> <li>• I am concerned about ongoing enforcement of use for the proposed sites.</li> <li>• There have been serious/near fatal road traffic incidents on the Habberley Road and an increase in traffic generated by large vehicles accessing the site would have an adverse affect on current highway safety</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4161</a>	Object	Wribbenhall - dangerous road that gets congested.
	<a href="#">LPPO3277</a>	Object	<p>Having read the proposals for the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, I am objecting to the proposal for the developments in Wribbenhall, Bewdley. (WA/BE/3 and WA/BE/5.</p> <p>Highways Problems - The A456 and B4129 in Wribbenhall are already very busy, and to build new homes in this area would cause even more congestion.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt - All this area is Green Belt land and previous planning inspectors have ruled there should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster. Planning history shows a site of historical interest on the Habberley Road.</p> <p>Services - To build more houses in this area at a time when services are stretched makes no sense. We are seeing cuts to Fire Services, Health Service and Schools.</p> <p>Environmental Issues - All of these plans raise many environmental issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4064</a>	Object	The gap between Bewdley and Kidderminster has already been jeopardised by the decision to allow hotel

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			expansion on the Safari Park with consequent traffic congestion which of course would be intensified if the additional development indicated in Option B along the road /by-pass at Catchems end were to materialise .
	<a href="#">LPPO3485</a>	Object	<p>Whenever there is heavy persistent rain, this can often be 6 months of the year and the water comes into the gardens and leaves the bottom half under a foot of water, any building work or even global warming could make this matter even worse.</p> <p>The section of Kidderminster Road from Catchems Chip Shop to the by-pass island is very congested most of the day.</p> <p>There will be noise pollution and inconvenience.</p> <p>The thought of losing some of the beautiful birds we get in our garden makes my heart sink.</p> <p>Would schools in our area be able to accommodate the new families new houses would bring?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3489</a>	Object	<p>The culvert in the field cannot cope with water coming through the Queensway estate from the hill to the rear.</p> <p>During really wet spells the wooded area in the lane marked red on the attached plan and adjacent to the cottage is like the everglades.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO411</a>	Object	<p>This proposal would bring a huge amount of extra traffic to the area at the Kidderminster Rd end of the Bewdley by-pass. This will be exacerbated by the proposals for future development at West Midlands Safari Park. Traffic at peak times in this area is almost back to pre by-pass days.</p> <p>The field next to All Saints Church is a 'green' landmark in Wribbenhall and needs to be protected as should be the wall bordering it. Both are part of the local heritage.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO840</a>	Support	A) Southern End adjoining All Saints Church. This proposal qualified support. The BCS would support a very modest number of houses on the southern end of this site but any development should provide housing, a cemetery extension, car parking for the church/town, and an area of public open space to mitigate its loss of



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/BA/3 – LAND AT CATCHEMS END

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			openness and take account of drainage issues.
	<a href="#">LPP01922</a>	Support	<p>Bewdley: OK to build on Catchem's End site WA/BE3 and Habberley Road providing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drainage pipes are installed (preventing flooding from brook by Queensway).</li> <li>2. Parking space is allowed (for vehicle using Lodge Close from pub).</li> <li>3. Green park/play area is installed.</li> <li>4. Bus stop provided</li> <li>5. Local store/newsagents.</li> </ol> <p>No building on other sites in Bewdley.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03095</a>	Support	I would prefer site WA/BE/3 Catchems End to be designated as a Core Site instead of site BR/BE/6 Land off Highclere.
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP04097</a>	Support	<p>The Council supports the following sites which are included in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and have the support of the local community:</p> <p>WA/BE/3 Catchems End (support removal from the Green Belt). Support for development only extends to the half of the site abutting the Safari Park roundabout. The half of the site adjacent to All Saint's church should be made available as public open space and is not suitable for development.</p> <p>Early negotiations with potential developers have been and should be undertaken which would include negotiations over infrastructure, water management and community facilities such as school places/physical extensions and road improvements</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO WA/UA/4 – ALLOTMENTS AT UPPER ARLEY

Company / Organisation	Response No	Type of Response	Summary of response
Upper Arley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1180</a>	Comment	<p>The allotments site in Upper Arley Village is listed as a site proposed for allocation, potentially 10 dwellings. The Parish Council has no issue at all with this proposal.</p> <p>However, the Parish Council would prefer that in the event of any development taking place, ALL the houses (not just some of them) should be affordable houses, of a smaller design, and for the people of the parish only and would request that this as a condition of any planning permission granted. Other than the site referred to the Parish Council would not wish to see any other development in the Parish.</p>
R & D Turner Charitable Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1178</a>	Support	<p>The landowners are in full support of the proposal and would look to create a housing mix suitable for the village with particular thought to younger persons, young families and a retirement element. The site is currently unutilised and could be deliverable upon short notice. The site is well screened and adjoins some of the more modern houses that form part of Upper Arley. We believe that all mains services are readily available and the site is well placed for village facilities to include the school, sports ground, hall, shop and pub.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1009</a>	Comment	<p>Upper Arley Allotments - acceptable if they are genuinely redundant. Site may be too large for such a small village. Relate numbers to local need.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2657</a>	Object	<p>I object to the land at Clows Top being used for housing or Travelling Showpeople. I wish to comment as follows, in particular for the Showpeople but has relevance in respect of the proposed housing site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Difficult vehicular access to and from the site from the A456. Access is on the brow of the hill. The site is not capable of safe, visible access from the A456 highway and will have an adverse impact on the safety of the highway network and its users.</li> <li>2. Turning into and out of the site will be difficult- A456 is not wide and there are houses opposite the access.</li> <li>3. Speed of vehicles and motor bikes through Clows Top. There is a disregard of the 30mph limit.</li> <li>4. The type of vehicles and trailers used can be large and extremely long. When they are entering or exiting the site, they will be slow therefore blocking the A456. This, coupled with 3 above, could be an accident waiting to happen.</li> <li>5. There could be numerous vehicles, trailers and caravans entering/exiting the site at all times of the year.</li> <li>6. There is no mains sewerage/drainage. How will the Showpeople's sewage be disposed of? This also applies to any housing development.</li> <li>7. The site is flat but is on the top of the hill. Therefore the sides along the perimeter form a bank. The land on the site is unstable and is falling away and is now close to a neighbour's field and also a public right of way. There is movement around the perimeter of the site, this before any heavy vehicles and trailers are using the area. Equally, this will be issue for house build.</li> <li>8. There is a lack of adequate access to services and utility infrastructure. Mains water supply and mains electricity services are currently working to capacity. There are Interruptions to these services during the</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>year.</p> <p>9. In respect of proposed houses, the number of houses proposed of 30 (I believe) could result in around 70 people (say 2 adults plus 1child per house) which will really stretch comment 8 above. It could also mean there would need to be parking for 70 motor vehicles on the site. Schooling could be an issue. Bus services are very limited.</p> <p>10. The cumulative impacts of the site would harm the character and appearance of the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4785</a>	Support	I would like to see houses built here for local families.
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPPO1248</a>	Comment	The housing allocation at Clows Top for 30 dwellings. needs to be considered in the context of the SWDP which allocates land adjacent to Highbrae for 17 dwellings and any proposals coming forward from Shropshire Council in order to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided and to avoid an over concentration of development within the village.
	<a href="#">LPPO1829</a>	Comment	<p>I would like to object to the site use for Travelling Showpeople on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access to the site from a very busy main road (A456) at the top of a very steep hill for large vehicles with trailers.</li> <li>• Sewage problems - there are no mains in the village. The properties sit on clay and we suffer from poor drainage within the village.</li> <li>• We would prefer new housing on the land. There is a need for new houses in the area.</li> <li>• We do not want the site to become an eyesore (more so than it is at present).</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3506</a>	Comment	I have to support the dual allocations for the land. Although it is of course preferred to become a small housing development and in-keeping.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>This housing development is indeed supported by the majority of all within the village parish.</p> <p>One individual from the company has made a personal representation against the site for Travelling Showpeople; and it can be understood; but commercial pressures lead us, as stated above.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3444</a>	Comment	I think it is affordable housing we need at Clows Top.
	<a href="#">LPPO3464</a>	Comment	<p>The yellow shading delineating the area in question at Clows Top is not entirely accurate.</p> <p>I think the housing option would be more beneficial to the local community.</p> <p>If travelling show people were to use the site their heavy vehicles would probably damage the road.</p> <p>There would be extra traffic, large vehicles turning in and out of the site onto as busy road/steep hill.</p> <p>Sewerage and water supply would be a problem.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5090</a>	Comment	<p>It is our impression that most people, like us, can under certain conditions get behind supporting housing development at the Clows Top site if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type of housing development is beneficial to the village and will strengthen the fabric of the local community in terms of maintaining and supporting local facilities.</li> <li>• If the access from and to a new housing estate is not disruptive to the road infrastructure in and out of the village and it is safe for the local community.</li> <li>• The type of housing development is deemed to be attractive to and reflecting the demographic makeup of the local community and wider area.</li> <li>• If there are sufficient facilities such as parking to support the local community including the new housing estate?</li> <li>• The housing development is of high quality and aesthetically blends in with the local village and the</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			rural make up of the wider area.
	<a href="#">LPPO332</a>	Object	<p>Land at Clows Top</p> <p>I object to the proposals identified in the plan for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultation has been inadequate. The identified site is on the border of WFD. No effort has been made to consult with communities in the immediate area that do not fall within WFD but will be affected by the proposals.</li> <li>2. The identified site occupies an elevated position in a scenic rural setting that is visible from some distance. WFDC policies declare that sites for travelling show people should be 'very strictly limited in rural areas'. It is therefore unsuitable for this purpose. There are four other sites identified in the plan for Travelling Showpeople all of which are more suited to this purpose.</li> <li>3. The infrastructure serving the Clows Top settlement is inadequate for the purpose. WFDC policies declare that sites for Travelling Showpeople should be adequately served with power water and waste services. To make the site compliant with this policy would require significant investment. During these times of austerity, other sites identified in the plan offer a more cost effective solution.</li> <li>4. As identified in the WFDC plan there are already proposals within the SWDP for additional housing in the Clows Top settlement. Housing development in the settlement needs to be sensitively managed in conjunction with MHDC to ensure sustainability.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO413</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The village is totally unsuitable to be considered as a prospective site for travelling/showground on the land that has been identified.</li> <li>• Access is poor due to the volume and speed of the traffic that uses the road in both directions. Large goods vehicles frequently experience problems in getting up the steep hill. These vehicles often have to swing wide to enter the yard and in doing so, mount the pavement.</li> <li>• The increased traffic noise would also be an issue that I would object to.</li> <li>• No stipulation has been made as to the number of vehicles using this yard, or indeed if the users</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>would also be residing on the premises. There would be an issue with connecting to mains drainage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clows Top is a small village and the proposal of this kind would totally alter the appearance and safety of the village.</li> <li>• I agree that at present the land is an eyesore - it would be put to far better use if a small housing site was proposed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1506</a>	Object	<p>Objecting to travelling show people or houses being developed at Clows Top for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage - Clows Top houses not connecting to mains sewer and relies on septic tanks so an influx of residents would not be suitable.</li> <li>• Road Safety - access to the site is at a very narrow point in the road and on the brow of the hill so has poor visibility. Issues with the current entrance being suitable for access, particularly for slow, heavy vehicles, which have potential to cause damage to vehicles opposite as well as mounting the pavement which is a safety issue for pedestrians. Drivers already break the 30mph speed limit on the road.</li> <li>• Inadequate Utilities - due to being a remote location and the local topography electricity and water supply are often disrupted which will be affected further if additional requirements are added to the systems.</li> <li>• Stability of the Land - site is in a poor state of repair; worried without major work to stabilise the ground it could fall away if used by heavy vehicles.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1901</a>	Object	<p>Objects to further development and traffic at Clows Top. It has become increasingly busy and the crossroads at the top can be quite a challenge to negotiate, further traffic near the junction is sure to make the situation even worse.</p> <p>Suggests the land under discussion would be better served to the community as it is i.e. a garage or similar which would offer a service which would benefit residents.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2126</a>	Object	<p>Object to Clows Top Travelling Showpeople site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mains sewage Clows Top and septic tanks controversial due to drainage.</li> <li>• Lack of schools, doctors, street lights, public transport, poor electricity supply</li> <li>• Poor access for large vehicles</li> <li>• Land unstable and likely to be cut off in winter</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2129</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and roads</li> <li>• Lack of facilities and amenities</li> <li>• Electricity &amp; mains water supply is insufficient/ mains sewerage.</li> <li>• Little public transport</li> <li>• No Drs, school, college, or employment.</li> <li>• Possible impact on village community.</li> <li>• Noise increase</li> <li>• Instability of land/drainage issues</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2288</a>	Object	<p>The proximity of the site the crossroads at Clows Top are quite dangerous and a lot of heavy vehicles using them.</p> <p>There are no services such as schools, doctors, dentists in the immediate vicinity and the winters can be hard.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2289</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to the crossroad junction and the 456 is well used by heavy traffic</li> <li>• No local police or hospital so there could be a wait for rescue services</li> <li>• Lack of employment schools medical requirements</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2135</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed site has insufficient amenities i.e. water/sewage (low water pressure).</li> <li>2. Clows Top area/crossroads has traffic congestion/very poor visibility at junctions.</li> <li>3. The site is well known for poor and instability due to its previous use for mining /disposal waste metal.</li> <li>4. The infrastructure for this and nearby villages (schools, doctors etc.) is full to capacity.</li> <li>5. Thus I consider the site is only suitable for a small business venture i.e. garage or similar to support local needs.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4546</a>	Support	<p>I have reservations which have been echoed by local people at their meetings in Far Forest and In Clows Top.</p> <p>These meetings were well attended by around 100 residents in each case. There was considerable concern and misunderstanding about the proposals and it is a shame that one of the District Councillors could not have attended to clarify the situation to those who had not been able to attend the DC presentations.</p> <p>My concerns and reservations, largely echo those of local residents and are as follows;</p> <p>Clows Top.</p> <p>Should be kept as a core housing site and not used for Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>There is a need to bring new people into the village to revitalise it and failure of previous plans to build new houses on the land around the Victory Hall is much regretted. This development would also have gone a long way towards improving the appearance of the area which is, at present, an eyesore.</p> <p>The exit from the old garage site is onto a very busy stretch of the A456 with traffic which is often fast moving, despite the speed limit in place. Movements of large articulated vehicles onto and from the site is potentially dangerous. It is also felt that such activity, in such a prominent position in the village, would do nothing to improve the appearance of the area.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The absence of adequate infrastructure, unreliable water and electricity supplies and, in particular, the sewerage system, has been the main stumbling block to development and was at the heart of the rejection of the site as a potential one for travellers/show people when the subject was last considered in 2012. Nothing has changed, and, since the DC's criteria for a suitable site hasn't changed either, this site must still be considered unsuitable.</p> <p>Since Malvern Hills have also given consent to a housing development at a site at Clows Top, which is also stalled because of infrastructure shortcomings, have WFDC and MHDC liaised to try and find a shared solution to these problems?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1466</a>	Object	<p>Objecting due to worries about suitable drainage options.</p> <p>Would like to see something for the community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1467</a>	Object	<p>My objections and comments regarding the proposals of the land at Clows Top are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly regarding the travellers use, there are major concerns on the traffic climbing the hill, especially in winter.</li> <li>• I believe that there are also issues regarding main sewage.</li> <li>• The services at Clows Top are far from adequate – water pressure, power failing, also would the land be stable enough with all the heavy vehicles that would be using the land?</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the housing proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mains sewers are an issue</li> <li>• 3 proposed sites/plots with around to houses, the increase of vehicles will make things even more difficult to cross at the top.</li> <li>• Small corner shop/butchers would not be adequate for the extra increase in residents.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SITE BR/RO/1 – LAND AT CLOWS TOP

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1559</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns of traffic climbing the hill and turning into the yard.</li> <li>• Concerns about drainage.</li> <li>• Services such as water, electricity etc. are inadequate.</li> <li>• Concerns about the land stability.</li> <li>• Village facilities (shop, butchers etc,) not adequate for more people.</li> <li>• Same concerns if housing was to be put on site rather than travelling show people.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1560</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about traffic climbing hill and turning into yard.</li> <li>• Concerns about drainage.</li> <li>• Services not adequate in the village i.e. water pressure, electricity.</li> <li>• Concerns about the stability of the ground.</li> <li>• More traffic on busy, dangerous crossroads.</li> <li>• Similar concerns with the housing proposal as well as the travelling show people.</li> <li>• Village hall will be surrounded/closed in - could cause conflicts with residents.</li> </ul> <p>Complaining about site plans as they are vague and not accurate.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2928</a>	Object	<p>The proposed development spoils a peaceful view.</p> <p>The damage to wildlife and natural habitats will be incalculable.</p> <p>The pressure on local road infrastructure will be intolerable and this in an area already very popular with walkers and dog walkers.</p> <p>The addition of this proposed development will again put an intolerable burden on local infrastructure and access for holiday makers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO255</a>	Comment	<p>In principle I have no objection to a development within the existing boundaries of Orchard House using the existing access to Orchard House. Houses would be on back land, in an existing residential location, the sewage would not impact the Sugars Lane pumping station, and the existing access could widened without impacting any other properties.</p> <p>I would object to the land on Plough Lane being used to access that land. however, I would not object to a single property, such as a bungalow on the land on Plough Lane sitting next to Tolland Bungalow, and that would be in keeping with the other properties in the lane, and would not require the lane to be upgraded, thus having a minimum impact on the locality.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2775</a>	Comment	<p>I would like to say that the plan for Far Forest has not been thought through in particular I would like to draw your attention to the following:</p> <p>1.) New Road is narrow and will not cope with the traffic. We have the School runs parking twice a day (I say parking but in some cases abandoned). We also have people from the Care Home on Cleobury Road now parking in New Road since their extension. People who live on the static caravans at the bottom of Sugar Lane also have to drive down New Road.</p> <p>2.) The School will not be able to cope especially if there is an influx of Children.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			3.) The sewerage system will certainly not be able to cope as it barely does now and we still have to have Tankers if we have adverse weather. I know that Severn Trent is doing more work in the near future but that is to solve the problem we have now.
	<a href="#">LPP02195</a>	Comment	No objection, it would not be inappropriate to also develop land to the east of Plough Lane.
	<a href="#">LPP03611</a>	Object	<p><b>Proposed Housing Development in Far Forest at Plough Lane.</b></p> <p>We write to register our objections to the two proposed sites for house building in the village of Far Forest. Our concerns are wide ranging and relate to the whole infrastructure of the village.</p> <p><b>Objections to the housing development on Plough Lane, Far Forest:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to the proposed site on Plough Lane is limited and predominantly single track. The current road, as it exists, is unfit for extra domestic traffic, being mostly used by farm and forestry vehicles and walkers. The potential junction onto the Cleobury Road, adjacent to the busy village shop, is poor and limited and further inhibited by the presence opposite of the very popular Plough pub and restaurant, which already brings extra traffic and congestion to this road. This potential junction onto the main road would have limited vision, is situated opposite the busy pub car park access point and on a section of road where drivers are accelerating out of the 30mph speed limit zone. It is also directly opposite the bus stop for Ludlow bound traffic, causing further limitations to vision and possible congestion. To create a busy junction here is potentially dangerous and a risk to the safety of both drivers and pedestrians.</li> </ol> <p><b>Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest. Transport/Roads Policy 13, Managing Travel</b></p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Demand Ai, ii, iii and B, see pg 85.</b></p> <p>2. Plough Lane is currently, and historically, an access point to Wyre Forest and the bungalows and low level small holdings which exist on the edge of the forest. To build multiple houses of bricks and mortar on this site would dramatically alter the character and landscape of this area, creating an infill estate. This development would destroy and distract from many of the reasons residents move to this small rural settlement, creating a large suburban spread, destroying the quiet rural scattered nature of this settlement.</p> <p><b>Desirable Place to Live, point i/iii, Section 8 – Policy 8C and Infill Policy – 18B A Desirable Place to Live pg 55-56; Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness – 27 pg 154-164; A Unique Place To Live (sub)11.29 Protecting and Enhancing Policy 11D pg 80-85</b></p> <p>3. The predominant land uses off Plough Lane are agricultural, forestry and rural. To build 20 houses on this site with all the landscaping, building traffic, noise and upheaval that this would bring, would severely impact on the habitats for local wildlife. The proposed site for development is natural habitat, grassland, ancient hedgerows and trees and, as such, is home to a diverse range of insects, reptiles and mammals, including deer, who use this route to access feeding grounds across the far side of the Oakleaf Rise development and New Road.</p> <p><b>A Unique Place (sub) 11.9. Protect; Protecting and Enhancing Policy 11D pg 80 &amp; 85; 11a Unique Place, Historic Environment B II, IX; Habitats Regulations (HRA) Screening Requirement 1.4 pg 77; Desirable Place to Live Point ii/iii Section 8 – Policy 8C pg 55/56; Infill Policy – 18B a Desirable Place to Live; Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness – 27 pg 154-164.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3468</a>	Object	Redevelopment of Far Forest.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Word in the village is that it is planned to build 50 homes in the village.</p> <p>We wish to register our objection to any such plan. On the basis that 50 additional houses would simply overwhelm the village (not to mention the ecology). The outcome would be that the character of the village would be lost to the detriment of the current residents.</p> <p>Such a plan would jeopardise an established thriving community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3239</a>	Object	<p>This site has become overgrown and dormant for many years however it has a host of wildlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Egress from Plough Lane onto Cleobury Road (A4117) is dangerous and at a steep incline with limited views in either direction. Would WFDC ensure that new road layouts are installed to accommodate addition traffic to and from the site?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2806</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the housing proposals in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a quiet community with quiet village roads and pleasant surroundings.</li> <li>• There will be noise pollution and traffic congestion, turning Far Forest to a local urban area</li> <li>• The nearby roads are busy enough. The village hall is let nearly every night of the week causing congestion at New Road. There is also traffic congestion near the school at the start and the end of the school day. Additional traffic from an adjacent housing estate would be a nightmare.</li> <li>• Think about the wildlife, conservation and open space that will be destroyed; Far Forest is a nice rural area and we don't want to see this ruined by more houses.</li> </ul> <p>You will be spoiling our local community which is perfectly fine as it is without an influx of people/houses/cars to which the local infrastructure and surrounding area is simply not suited. Please take your housing proposals elsewhere away from our beautiful village.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2722</a>	Object	<p>The junction of New Road and Cleobury Road is already a danger, in part because there are no parking restrictions in New Road. There is congestion at the start of the school day and at its end since the school entrance is also located at the upper end. The increase in traffic from extra housing will make the situation worse.</p> <p>Some consideration to making New Road/Church Road a one way system might help but the junction of New Road with Cleobury Road is dangerously situated with traffic often moving very quickly along Cleobury Road.</p> <p>Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties.</p> <p>Sewage facilities are believed to be inadequate already.</p> <p>Loss of Dark skies.</p> <p>Proposed development will mean approximately 100 extra vehicles in and out of village therefore increased pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2669</a>	Object	<p>The bungalow named “Lawn View, Cleobury Road” is not on mains sewerage and has a septic tank which is located in the garden of “Orchard House”, with drainage discharging into the surrounding land; additionally storm water also soaks away in the grounds of Orchard House.</p> <p>My objections to the proposed building of 20 additional houses on the land are that the existing sewerage system currently serving the Far Forest community is totally inadequate and already causes flooding of the back fields running into properties across the road. Adding further house to the system would only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>It is clearly contrary to above policy in that it would be an over development of the site; causing overlooking of the existing surrounding properties with potential disturbance to</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>those properties; and with the additional adverse affect on existing road safety.</p> <p>I fear there would be an increased risk to public safety. With little employment opportunities in the area mainly unskilled (minimum wages) and no doctor's surgery servicing the village - traffic on the local roads will increase as residents will need to travel out of the village for employment.</p> <p>With no late or Sunday service provided by the local bus company additional road traffic is inevitable.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1789</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposed development at Far Forest due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased population impact on wildlife.</li> <li>2. School capacity</li> <li>3. Noise and pollution.</li> <li>4. No positive benefit to current residents.</li> <li>5. Local utilities-inadequate sewerage systems now</li> <li>6. Poor bus service, increases would uplift carbon footprint.</li> <li>7. Very little local employment. People to go further afield, again increase of carbon footprint.</li> <li>8. Loss of grazing for farmers, jeopardising livelihoods.</li> <li>9. Light pollution affecting nocturnal animals and insects.</li> <li>10. Land and Hedgerows ripped out affects many other wildlife species.</li> <li>11. Character of village would change to bricks and mortar development.</li> <li>12. Nearest medical cover is Bewdley or Cleobury we believe to be full.</li> <li>13. Storm water currently a problem and would be heightened due to any development.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO95</a>	Object	I object very strongly to the proposed building of "affordable housing" on the two sites

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>outlined in Far Forest.</p> <p>If you actually live in Far Forest you would know that this beautiful quiet village does not need any more houses built, as you propose 40+. There are plenty of houses for sale in and around the area.</p> <p>I only found out about these future proposals through a page on social media.</p> <p>The A4117 barely copes with local traffic and thru traffic from Cleobury Mortimer and the other way from areas such as Callow Hill and Kidderminster.</p> <p>Do you have any idea the impact on a 30mph road this extra traffic and people will have on this area? It's bad enough with caravan sites and their owners who have no respect for the area, littering, noise and cars. We have one shop and one pub and one school within walking distance, how can these cope with the extra people.</p> <p>Major problem is New Road and The Orchard, where these houses will be built. New Road can barely cope with the traffic first thing and at rush hour, are you just trying to destroy OUR village. The A4117 is a dangerous road as it is, many a driver overtakes if anyone slows them down, bare in mind the stretch through Far Forest is 30mph, so how will an extra 20-40+ houses help with that situation, more cars, more pollution, more rubbish. Can you reassure local residents that this very busy road is going to be safe with the extra pressure of more cars and more people?</p> <p>I also object to toy box houses being built in areas that have some beautiful individual homes. These housing developers build nothing but eye sores. Two up two down with little gardens, ugly homes. There are plenty of beautiful homes up for sale. We moved into this area to be away from major developments and noise, and traffic. It just seems to be getting worse. This beautiful green area with great walks and the forest on our doorstep will be destroyed. You may think "Not on my doorstep".....well yes that's exactly what I'm saying. Far Forest in my opinion does not need redeveloping. You will destroy it.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01698</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current inadequate sewerage system needs frequent maintenance</li> <li>2. Dangerous junctions on narrow roads.</li> <li>3. No street lights as we are in the country</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>4. There are no jobs in Far Forest so people would have to commute and the state pay for people who are unable to find work.</p> <p>WE DO NOT WANT MORE HOUSES.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01699</a>	Object	<p>I object to housing development in New Road, Far Forest –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already high level of traffic congestions at peak times. Dangerous parking outside care home in New Road which is used by heavy machinery, caravans</li> <li>• Sewerage overflowing now</li> <li>• School full.</li> <li>• Poor bus service.</li> <li>• Natural habitats will be affected</li> <li>• We should protect countryside, there are plenty of brownfield sites available.</li> <li>• Please listen to the local people who cannot see any benefits to them</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP01700</a>	Object	<p>Questions need for a further 60 houses</p> <p>Present inadequacies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage (P.97 Rural Dev 28, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Local flooding (P.100 Rural Dev, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Storm water drainage (P.97-100 Sewage systems, Policy 15 water quality)</li> <li>• Public transport (P.56, P.85 Policy 13)</li> <li>• Plough Lane/Cleobury Road junction (P.97, Policy 15, 150)</li> </ul> <p>Impact on wildlife in the area.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.80-81 – A Unique place</li> <li>• P.77 – 11A Unique place</li> <li>• P.79 – 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• P.5 – 8 Rural Exception sites</li> <li>• P.94 – Strategic green infrastructure</li> <li>• P.112 – Infill Policy 188</li> <li>• P.113 – Infill Policy 188</li> </ul> <p>Little employment – local residents have to commute to work – increase car usage and cost. – P.166 Health 9.1-9.10</p> <p>Plough House building is largely of bungalow design, the introduction of house building would damage the character. The ultimate decision making would not be in the hands of the local residents. – P.55/56 section 8 Policy 80, Infill Policy 188.</p> <p>The dark skies are very much part of our village, important to its character. Dark skies are also of great importance to wildlife. – P.80 Policy 110 protecting and enhancing, 81 Biodiversity and geological conservation, 103 con, 79 Section 16.2 Policy landscape character.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1701</a>	Object	<p>After going to a planning proposal meeting in Bewdley it became clear plots of land were being considered on New Road and Plough Lane. A planning attempt was tried in 2010 and turned down, the reasons are a matter of record about New Road, and however, nothing has changed in this regard. After consulting and reading through the Wyre Forest District Plan I can see many flaws and reasons why building here is detrimental to the area. The so called village is dominated by a road network, New Road which is very narrow in places because of car parking by residents, during school term hold ups occur frequently near the school, the whole area can become grid locked. Pg. 85, Pg. 89-89, Pg. 103.</p> <p>To get the proposed sites this has to be negotiated. Adding to the problem. Plough Lane site</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>has a similar problem with many accesses onto the main road from the Plough Inn nearly opposite a shop entrance and car park, but when drivers slow down to turn down Plough Lane, drivers behind them think they are turning into the car park for the shop. This has some near misses.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the inadequate poor sewage and drainage taken 20 years after the problem occurred, tankers regularly having to pump excess storm water and sewage to be taken away, will this happen again with extra people putting strain on an overwhelmed system. Pg. 97, 98.</p> <p>The smell of sewage is terrible for cottage owners near the pumping station. This is also bad for tourism. The name of the cottage by the pump station is Coppice Gate and can be contacted. The proposed site in New Road has very valuable habitat. Hedgehogs in ancient meadows. Part of the area has old cherry orchards with national reptiles, adders, slow worms, grass bats hunt for insects. These need dark skies. Insects such as noble chaffer and many butterflies occur here. Pg. 79, 80, 81, 103. Cattle are also grazed. Pg. 79.</p> <p>The WFDP choice is based also on good bus service, but this service is poor sometimes 2 hours between buses. Pg 56 &amp; 85.</p> <p>People moving here will not find any local employment. I myself have to travel into Kidderminster, more car journeys and more congestion on New Road or Church Lane. Pg 66-68.</p> <p>Building so many houses near the church which does not have any parking except on Church Lane. New build houses will look awful near an old church, changing the character of our village. Pg 112/113 section 18.10.</p> <p>If the land is developed what plans are there making sure this is done properly to blend in</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>with existing properties? Pg. 154-164 section 27.</p> <p>Can you trust developers and builders? At Far Forest we have a very large undisclosed population living at caravan parks which is not monitored properly or taken into account. Building so many extra houses will destroy our community by turning our village into a housing estate. Pg. 55/56 Desirable place to live point.</p> <p>A brief summary, the road networking, the effect on ecology/ dark skies, the school is full, poor bus service, the sewage system, mobile phone signal poor. In conclusion I cannot see any benefit for Far Forest.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the future potential for Far Forest tourism, bad bricks and mortar developments ruin areas of outstanding beauty. I would not like this for our area, lots of campers and tourists use the campsite on Pound Bank next to the Plough Inn. This could affect the business. Pg. 81 – A Unique place 11B, Pg. 77 – 11C Landscape Character, Pg. 5 – 8 Rural Exception sites iii, Pg. 137 &amp; 144 – Sustainable Tourism 23.</p> <p>Brownfield sites provide less impact on Green Belt areas which WFDC seem to threaten constantly. 60 houses here is a massive impact which would be completely lost on properly developed Kidderminster town centric sites. I am completely at a loss over the WFD plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO392</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased flow of traffic</li> <li>• More congestion</li> <li>• No facility to widen road</li> <li>• More danger to pupils attending Far Forest school</li> <li>• Parking a big problem</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO666</a>	Object	Object to development in Far Forest - New Road very busy with school traffic, amenities cannot cope with existing housing, Plough Lane would need to be widened, increased

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			congestion and negative impact on countryside
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO1008</a>	Support	Far Forest - land at Tolland Bungalow and Orchard House - Plough Lane is more of a track. Site is appropriate infill site but may need to be limited to about 5 dwellings. Orchard House site - acceptable for infill but not to be accessed off A4117.
	<a href="#">LPPO712</a>	Object	<p><b>Land at Orchard House and adjacent to Tolland Bungalow, Far Forest</b></p> <p>Policy 15B Sewerage Systems and Water Quality: -2 bungalows adjacent Orchard House have septic tanks located in the orchard with drainage discharging into ground. If land at Orchard House is developed, then these bungalows should be connected to mains sewerage paid for by developer.</p> <p>Policy 18B Residential Infill Development:- Development would over shadow the adjacent bungalow. Site is landlocked with narrow entrance between the adjacent bungalow and Orchard House unless accessed over neighbouring land.</p> <p>Policy 13 Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest - managing travel demand:- A4117 is very busy road. Development of Orchard House land would have to be accessed off Plough Lane. Road is heavily used by lorries (especially from quarries) and residents of Cleobury Mortimer plus school traffic. Bus service is unreliable and infrequent.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO373</a>	Object	<p>The 2 developments proposed for New Road and one for Plough Lane total approximately six acres which is huge compared with the rest of the village and contrary to Policy 6F page 36 where you say you will only allow "small scale" development and contrary to the policy where you say only infill (policy 18B page 112) while this proposal is extending the village.</p> <p>The village has no public "green space" despite being out in the country and Policy 29B and policy 20C say there should be "green space" for developments greater than 11 houses.</p> <p>Section 27 page 162 talks about protecting "local distinctiveness" and the loss of a small</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>orchard and the loss of a hay meadow changes the character of Far Forest where many properties, even in the village centre, retain their small holder origins.</p> <p>Policy 13 page 85 talks about promoting walking and cycling while to build out at Far Forest will create car commuter traffic to Kidderminster and the West Midlands, as there is no extra employment in Far Forest.</p> <p>Section 23.2 (The Wyre Forest) says policy is to support the work done by the £4M Grow with Wyre Project and yet part of the New Road site is old orchard that Grow With Wyre and Worcester County policy is to retain.</p> <p>Policy 23A Tourism depends on the Landscape Character of this area (page 79 11c) and this will be negatively impacted by such a development; the area has many public footpaths linking with the Wyre Forest and the Wyre Forest Centre is only 100 yards away.</p> <p>Policy 18E page 114 talks about limiting the expansion of mobile homes, especially near Far Forest, and this development will be off New Road which is heavily used to service 3 large caravan sites further down Sugars Lane - 160 vans on one of those sites.</p> <p>Policy 13, page 85 talks about traffic and highway safety and yet New Road is already overloaded by school traffic, plus the traffic to the 3 caravan sites, plus the large farm vehicles to the farm yard in Sugars lane, plus previous developments in New Forest Close, and other residences down New Road. Even if a developer was willing to fund improvements there is no space to open the junction at the top of New Road because the properties there do not have any back garden and to remove part of their frontage just adds to the parking problem with their cars now having to park on the road. Alternative land is available on the main road, on the Kidderminster side of the village, that would avoid any extra load on New Road. The pub, the shop, the bus stop, the village hall, the Methodist church, are all up on the main road therefore the council should consider redefining it's boundary of the village.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>6.57 Alternatives, page 45.</p> <p>Page 97, Utilities; the sewage system cannot cope with current capacity, and Severn Trent tankers are up and down New Road every hour when it rains. Severn Trent have had policies to upgrade the pumping station in new Road for the 20 years I have lived in the village and it has not happened yet. Some existing properties that are on septic tanks that drain into the development area will have to be put on the mains resulting in greater load beyond that created by the development. The mains power fails regularly, for short periods, and Severn Trent took a week to fully restore fresh water supplies to the Rock area only a couple of months ago. Far Forest does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this scale.</p> <p>Page 80/81 11.29 of a Unique Place talks about wildlife conservation, hedges, trees and the need to protect and enhance 11D yet the 3 sites in Far Forest are all hedged with old trees and orchard, and have populations of bats, adders, deer and many other diverse plant and animal life being on the edge of the forest. Worcestershire Wildlife has found Noble Chafer beetles in my orchard that is only 100 yards from the proposed site. On my land they found 20 species of lichens and the proposed site would have more.</p> <p>Page 112/113 talks about skyline changes and the 2 developments down New Road will be visible from most of the roads and public footpaths. The development will contribute to light pollution and Far Forest is one of the few areas of the county that still has dark skies. (A unique Place to live 11.29 and Protecting and enhancing policy 11D).</p> <p>The more I read the policies on a unique place to live and change of character, and the European habitat directory, effect on beauty, I am further reminded what a wonderful place Far Forest is, and therefore think it should be marked as an area for restrained development rather than including a general development plan that negatively impacts on all the good things about Far Forest, and also would create new problems as a result of any development.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO369</a>	Object	<p>We object to the sites proposed at Far Forest on the following grounds:</p> <p>Infrastructure – Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Rd Far Forest is a narrow road, difficult to pass residents’ parked cars and at school times it causes major problems.</li> <li>• Used by farm machinery all through the day.</li> <li>• Junction to main road has limited visibility with bus stop also on the junction.</li> <li>• Cars parked at village hall kerbside also cause problems.</li> <li>• Traffic on main road travels fast regardless of speed restrictions especially morning evening and late at night a race track.</li> <li>• Church Lane junction with main Cleobury Road is narrow and has very poor visibility with blind corners. 2 school buses use it morning and afternoon.</li> <li>• Church Lane used by many dog walkers. An increase in traffic is dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Church used regularly for weddings and funerals, this blocks the lane.</li> <li>• Plough Lane is currently used by only residents and farm vehicles and walkers. Its junction with the main Cleobury Road is unmade, narrow and conflicts with the entrance to The Plough Inn and the Village Stores, there have been a few bad accidents at this junction over the years.</li> <li>• There has been an increase in car and large lorry traffic travelling along the Cleobury Road through Far Forest, partly due to the expansion of Cleobury Mortimer.</li> </ul> <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses will impact existing views of the Wyre Forest surrounding the village. This is not acceptable.</li> <li>• New development would affect the character of Far Forest. New road is already an assortment of buildings and building on Plough Lane is outrageous it is a peaceful</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>area with many types of wildlife living there</p> <p>Infrastructure - sewerage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing sewage system is inadequate although it has been worked on several times in recent years. It regularly smells very bad and leaks across Sugars Lane.</li> </ul> <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is an area with open fields, woodland hedges, trees and Wild flowers. It supports many species of wildlife which attract visitors to the area. This should be protected for the future. Noise pollution noise will destroy the quietness of Plough Lane and Church Lane.</li> </ul> <p>Agricultural Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of land to Farmers who are an integral part of Far Forest life, keeping the character and focus in country living.</li> </ul> <p>Employment and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little employment in Far Forest - many residents have to travel for work, bus service is poor.</li> </ul> <p>Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of dark sky at night is a very important concern. It is an important part of life in this area, for residents and wildlife. The neighbouring caravan park which was unused for 25 years now has 25 large caravan homes with street lights, no one</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			consulted the surrounding residents about this change.
	<a href="#">LPPO1748</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest is a village.</li> <li>• Other premises around to develop.</li> <li>• Far Forest residents already had enough impact from 'housing'.</li> <li>• Build houses somewhere else.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2239</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO: BR/RO/4 ADJ TOLLAND BUNGALOW, FAR FOREST BR/RO/6 LAND REAR OF ORCHARD HOUSE, FAR FOREST.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A4117 Far Forest. On road/pavement parking by cars/commercial vehicles notably outside Orchard House, Baptist Church and Londis Shop causes holdups and is dangerous to pedestrians. Speeding on this road is also a major and well-known problem. To have another vehicular access onto this road would only exacerbate an already serious situation. Do we have to wait for loss of life to stop this?</li> <li>2. Land rear of Orchard House and adj. Tolland Bungalow teems with wildlife including Muntjac and Fallow Deer. Several endangered species of moths, beetles and other insects would suffer greatly from development on these proposed sites. Please rethink allowing the introduction of housing and street lighting to destroy their natural habitat.</li> <li>3. There is a shop with a post office and a bus service. However, the post office has been threatened recently with closure and the Diamond bus service is intermittent.</li> <li>4. More traffic using New Road to access the school is highly dangerous to the children/parents and there is concern as to how the demand for additional school places will be met.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>5. The infrastructure at present cannot cope with more residents. GP surgeries, Fire and Ambulance services are all stretched. Sewerage and water has been a problem in the village for a long time; electricity can also be a problem with innumerable power cuts.</p> <p>6. The 2013 Planning Review was against development in Far Forest because it would be detrimental to the countryside. What has changed?</p> <p>7. People living in the village need to be able to work as there are very few opportunities for employment in Far Forest. Let's not make Far Forest another commuter belt.</p> <p>8. The population of Far Forest can almost double during the holiday season with tourists coming to enjoy the village and adjoining countryside bringing in much needed revenue for local pubs and restaurants etc.</p> <p>In general concern about the impact on traffic, services and the countryside that these planning proposals will make.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2392</a>	Object	<p>We object to the proposals:</p> <p>We are concerned about the increase in traffic on what are already very small and highly used roads. The additional traffic is also a concern with respect to our children walking to school.</p> <p>There are huge problems in Sugars Lane with a sewerage lake to wade through whenever we have rain, this is only going to get worse.</p> <p>A major concern is the placement of the properties especially those on Plough Lane, with social housing properties overlooking and backing on directly to the school playing fields.</p> <p>We are concerned about many more of the issues with the placement and size of the developments but these we feel are the 3 main circumstances that make us want to object.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2441</a>	Object	<p>We wish to raise our concerns about this land being used for housing development in Far Forest on the following grounds:</p> <p>Traffic – the main road through Far Forest is already extremely busy and any development that results in another road junction or increased use of Plough Lane would be a public safety concern particularly where there is already a lot of movement of people and vehicles on and off the road accessing the shop, pub, bus stop and local houses.</p> <p>Effect on the landscape and natural beauty of the area – Plough Lane is currently a single track access point into the forest and surrounding tracks and lanes that is very popular with walkers, cyclists and horse riders because it is both safe, being relatively free from traffic and associated noise and pollution, and beautiful. There are plans to submit a DMMO application at some point to upgrade Plough Lane to a bridleway to confirm its multi user status so we would appreciate consideration being given to equestrian access within the planning process.</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation – the fields behind the shop and along Plough Lane are unspoilt natural habitats with mature trees, hedges and grasslands supporting reptiles, birds and insects. They are part of the locally important Wyre Forest habitat.</p> <p>A development in this area so close to the edge of the Forest will change the character of the area and bring a significant skyline change to those who live on the fringe of the forest in single storey lodges and bungalows. It is also questionable as to whether existing sewerage systems are adequate as some properties are still on septic tanks.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2467</a>	Object	<p>Object option B, Far Forest:</p> <p>Well-being/Concerns over loss of dark skies/Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology/Effect on the beauty/Change of character to the area/There is little employment/Higher human population/Traffic</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2840</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 &amp; BR/RO/7:</p> <p>Policy 13 Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest - Managing Travel Demand A i,ii,iii B Page 85:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already traffic congestion and Tolland bungalow site has access issues</li> <li>• There is no support for additional families which doesn't satisfy policy 13 section</li> <li>• loss of wildlife</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2850</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to the A41 17 in Policy 13</li> <li>• Heavy traffic, some speeding, near houses, shop, pub/traffic congestion would increase</li> <li>• No local employment/limited public transport/no medical facilities.</li> <li>• Proposed sites are opposite school whose capacity could not be increased</li> <li>• Existing sewage provision inadequate</li> <li>• Loss of Grazing land/wildlife/loss of landscape</li> <li>• Earlier Planning applications refused due impact on landscape</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2856</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in New Road, Far Forest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic congestion</li> <li>2. Existing sewage system inadequate</li> <li>3. Effect on wildlife</li> <li>4. Loss of hay meadows/the area's natural beauty</li> </ol> <p>Regenerate Kidderminster instead</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2861</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Plough Lane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase on traffic volume/safety</li> <li>• Loss of natural habitat for wildlife</li> <li>• Existing properties will be overlooked</li> <li>• Sewage system is inadequate</li> <li>• No mainline gas</li> <li>• New build homes not in the character of the village</li> <li>• Increase in noise population.</li> <li>• Important route for visitors who enjoy the beauty of the area.</li> <li>• Far Forest is a rural community with no street lighting</li> <li>• Increase in population would not benefit existing villagers just increase current problems as above</li> <li>• Little employment in Far Forest, residents have to go outside area to find work</li> <li>• The village has nothing for young people to do.</li> <li>• No medical cover in the village; those close are full to capacity.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2864</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 and BR/RO/7 because of Impact on Biodiversity, policy 11C (policy 11D), on Landscape Character (policy 11C, policy 148) and amenity, and on traffic (policy 12/13).</p> <p>There is no indication of need for this level of housing locally, no prospect of new jobs and where protection of biodiversity, preservation of landscape character, importance of access to work and facilities, and reduction in car use, all factors specified in the District Plan, indicate its unsuitability. While the Plan hypothesises improved rural bus services and other mitigating factors, is this realistic within the next 15 years under foreseeable economic circumstances?</p> <p>Bungalows rather than houses could be built elsewhere in the village. A brown field site, part of the nursery further down A4117, has been put forward where it would not impact on the</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			side roads.
	<a href="#">LPPO2901</a>	Object	<p>Plough Lane - Is a Public Footpath and has no legal right of use for motorized vehicles except for long term established use by its 13 properties. It is single track being 2.8 metres wide, has a (mostly) rough broken metalled surface and a dangerous exit onto A4117.</p> <p>Plough Lane Entrance/Exit (Junction with A41 17) -is directly opposite a busy public house car park. Is adjacent to a busy shop car park. Is directly opposite the bus stop. Is not wide enough to allow 2 vehicles to enter/leave at the same time. Has poor visibility to the right because of bollards and parked vehicles (including HGVs) outside Forest Stores. Has poor visibility to the left due to the rise in the A4117 from the junction with Pound Bank. Vehicles frequently exceed the 30 mph speed limit at this point.</p> <p>Character of Plough Lane -Serves 13 properties with vehicular access established over many years. 10 (77%) of these are single storey. All are in substantial plots of a minimum of 0.20 hectares each. The proposed development would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than double Plough Lane traffic with an additional 20 (conservative estimate) vehicles.</li> <li>• Have an urbanized density of property (0.04 hectare each).</li> <li>• Increase air pollution with 20+ additional vehicles.</li> <li>• Increase light pollution from cars and homes.</li> <li>• Increase noise pollution from cars and homes.</li> <li>• Overlook existing properties which are single storey bungalows.</li> <li>• Have a negative and de-ruralising effect on Plough Lane and its skyline.</li> <li>• Destroy wildlife and trees in an area of untouched orchard.</li> <li>• Deny deer a refuge from intensive harvesting operations in the forest and adjacent Christmas tree fields</li> <li>• Force deer onto Plough Lane to pass to and fro with the resulting risk to themselves</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>and drivers using it. This risk being multiplied by the doubling of traffic.</p> <p>Distribution of Rural Development: Wyre Forest rural development is disproportionately centred on Far Forest with 60 of 105 (57%) of properties proposed here. This proportion increases to 71% if the Clows Top site is used as a Travellers site. In the last decade Far Forest saw a similar effect of new development with inadequate compensatory improvement in local services and facilities. This plan should target the development more equitably throughout the Rural West.</p> <p>Character/Nature: Far Forest is an open and widespread rural settlement. The proposed developments would urbanize the village. Density of housing proposed is more suitable to housing estates in urban areas. The urbanization could deter visitors to the village, its caravan site, Public House, shop and to the forest itself.</p> <p>Health/Environment: There would be significant increases in air, light and noise pollution in the settlement generally and specifically in the areas immediately surrounding the development sites, from both vehicles and homes. There is little employment in the village. There would be a consequent increase in vehicular traffic due to the inadequate and unreliable bus service.</p> <p>Sewage/Drainage: The village system is inadequate. There is frequent flooding of rainwater and sewerage in Sugars Lane due to run off from the sloping nature of the land across the village away from the A4117, including the proposed development sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2903</a>	Object	<p>These sites are completely unsuitable for development and our objections are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPRE highlights the need to reduce 'Night Blight' and protect Dark Skies. Far Forest comes alive at night with a multitude of species. The particular nature of small traditional meadows and orchards on the fringe of the forest needs to be preserved for these species. Development even without streetlights would lead to a scourge of</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>security lighting and a dramatic impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Currently the land adjacent to Tolland bungalow BR/RO/4/6 provides a safe haven to many different species of animal, insect, reptile and birds in the untouched old Orchard that sits undisturbed by human hand. Development of this area would have untold consequences on potentially rare and endangered species. This objection is not just to the loss of a few trees and hedges but to the loss of the habitat as a whole. Rather than desecrating this ground it should be protected to provide a rejuvenating habitat for decades to come. The old orchard serves as unique corridor to access neighbouring fields as is evident by the animal tracks to the school field, orchard and beyond. Plans to develop this area would destroy it.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if these sites should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land adjacent to Tolland Bungalow does not comprise of all built up frontages some properties are unseen behind old and newly re-established orchard. Consideration needs to be given to the neighbouring school playing fields ensuring protection and privacy for our children at play.</li> <li>• Development will not add to amenity value and will detract from existing character. Impact of overshadowing would be immense as the majority of dwellings are bungalows, daylight will be reduced.</li> <li>• Far Forest Primary school and The Bewdley School currently are oversubscribed and could not accommodate an increase in the proposed population.</li> <li>• No available NHS places at either dental practice of Cleobury or Bewdley.</li> <li>• The minimalistic Bus service is not fit for use and certainly not to be relied upon for dependable transport to work or appointments. This service is very intermittent even on the weekdays, on a Sunday it is non-existent.</li> <li>• No local Police, Fire or Ambulance service. Nearest Stations currently being - Kidderminster or Stourport.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are insufficient work opportunities in Far forest for 40 plus households; so this will result in additional commuters.</li> <li>• Access to the A4117 for the twenty proposed houses adjacent to the Tolland Bungalow would have to be made via Plough Lane or via the entrance currently used to service Orchard House. This section of road already contains several busy junctions including: The Plough Pub that serves 1200 plus meals per week; The bus stop outside the Plough Pub; Far Forest Stores that has its own parking facility but HGV's and tractors have to park on the road / pavement; • Far Forest Methodist Chapel that has parking for 2 cars with other congregation members parking on the road.; New road.</li> <li>• New Road services Oak Leaf Rise estate, the houses along the road, Far Forest School, Hill Crest Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Wyre Forest Holiday Village sites down Sugars lane. The caravan sites contains permanent and 11 month lease caravans, most are fully occupied for the 11 month period resulting in significantly more commuter traffic on Sugars Lane and New Road. Caravan sites have been developed extensively in the area recently, The Willows has increased Far Forest population considerably all be it that the majority of these dwellings only have 11month residence permits the presence of this extra population, along with numerous others must be taken into account. Although New Road is designed for traffic to travel in both directions some of the houses neighbouring the road have no parking facilities. Thus resulting in approximately half the length of New Road effectively being reduced to a single lane for traffic and almost 100% of the road is reduced at term time.</li> <li>• Plough Lane is a footpath, an increase in traffic would put walkers at risk. Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are common</li> <li>• At peak times traffic on the A4117 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution to the area. I would urge a full independent highways review prior to any decision making.</li> <li>• Plough lane has no provision for storm water drainage. Run off from the purposed</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>quantity of properties has the potential to cause flooding further down the lane. Some of the properties in Plough Lane were built prior to modern building techniques and exist without foundations, changes to ground conditions has the potential to result in subsidence. Currently with every downpour Severn Trent battles with a convoy of tankers to prevent the pumping station in Far Forest flooding, we cannot cope with the existing waste from the properties that we have. More properties would lead to land being contaminated with raw sewerage.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal for future development in Far Forest is unacceptable, the stable village population does not warrant this proposal, and less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brownfield sites. Applications made previously for the Far Forest sites have been declined with very good reason, these concerns not only still stand but have been exacerbated. Equal distribution of development across Wyre Forest has been grossly neglected in this instance. Far Forest currently a village will soon become a town. Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for all.</p> <p>With so many fundamental issues weighing so heavily against the proposal, we would request that the District Council rejects the proposition without hesitation.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2723</a>	Object	<p>We wish to object to the proposed development in Far Forest. Page 85 Reference number - policy 13 and 16 and Page 114 reference number – policy 18E</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>The farm on Sugars Lane uses heavy plant and farm machinery on a day to day basis using New Road and Church Lane as access roads. The access at the end of Church Lane onto the A4117 is a terrible blind spot in which the traffic does not adhere to the speed limit. The farm uses heavy machinery which has to pull out onto the road with an excess of 30ft of equipment behind, which is dangerous so New Road is used. This can be chaotic as the road</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>is already a busy area due to residents and school traffic, both of which park too far away from the curb meaning large vehicles can not pass easily with the machinery. New Road is frequently parked from top to bottom with cars and is even busier since the nearby residential home has expanded and their employees are using New Road to park too during the daytime. During school times i.e. drop off and collection, both New Road and Church Lane are both chaotic as drivers are coming from both ways. The traffic had increased even further with the added and expanding caravan site down Sugars Lane which people now live in rather than have as holiday homes.</p> <p>Both New Road and Church Lane can not manage any further traffic from the proposed development.</p> <p>Page 97 Reference number – Policy number 28B</p> <p>Our other objection to this proposal is the sewerage. I witness first hand what happens when we have a spell of bad weather and it rains. The sewerage station floods and raw sewerage runs all over the road and then the tankers turn up. I have witnessed two tankers removing water from the sewerage pit at the same time and once they have filled their tankers up and before they have removed their pipes the pit is full again and overflowing. Severn Trent has upgraded the system in recent years to no prevail.</p> <p>If you add more dwellings to the area you will add more sewerage and water which the pumping station will not handle therefore causing even more sewerage problems.</p> <p>Myself and my family have had to walk through raw sewerage on the road and endure the loud sound of the tankers reversing beepers and the tanker lorries working 24/7 for days on end when the weather is bad. By adding further dwellings to the area will only increase this problem</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3185</a>	Object	We would like to lodge our objections to this proposed development. As residents of Far

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Forest we are very concerned at the proposed plans to develop land in our village. We would like to draw your attention to the following issues.</p> <p>Transport &amp; Accessibility: The increase of traffic using both Plough Lane &amp; New Road will have a negative effect. Plough Lane will need to be made into a proper road junction as it is currently just a rough road. It is also nearby to a busy shop and public house and driveways to private houses therefore increasing the safety risk to pedestrians &amp; other road users. New Road is a narrow road and passing cars is already difficult, complicated by the school traffic which currently causes horrendous congestion during term time, the school bus already has problems trying to manoeuvre. Users of the church are increased for weddings &amp; funerals, especially as there are no areas to turn large vehicles so there is a need to drive all the way round New Road &amp; Church Lane. Sugars Lane is the main route down to a large caravan/ park home site, the narrow lane is in constant use by site users and also by lorries delivering &amp; collecting caravans, their only means of entrance/ exit being New Road. There are no footpaths along Church Lane, making walking along here more hazardous if the traffic increases any more. The Church Lane junction onto Lem Hill Bank is dangerous due to the blind spot and speed of traffic onto the A4117. These roads are also well used by a local farmer &amp; his tractor &amp; plant machinery trying to run his business. The A4117 is the main road in and out of the village and currently has a 30mph speed limit changing to 40mph part the way through. This limit is exceeded by many. The increase of traffic coming off side roads onto this busy road will see an increase in accidents. The increased traffic would have a negative effect on the health of local residents. The current bus service is totally unreliable due to continuous vehicle breakdowns and cannot be relied upon for journeys out of the area, especially to a workplace or school.</p> <p>A Unique Place: The land proposed is an untouched and natural habitat for many species of wildlife, there are very old damson and cherry trees in the fields on New Road. The ongoing forestry work in the Wyre Forest has displaced a number of wildlife out into the village especially many of the deer, these now reside in these fields. The fields have not been used for crops, only for grazing of local livestock and hay making for feed, this makes it a very rich</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>environment for wildlife including bats, moths, insects, reptiles &amp; birds as part of the outlying area of the Wyre Forest.</p> <p>We have concerns over the loss of dark skies. The number of houses proposed will have an impact on this. Dark skies are part of the village life and are important to the character of the village. People come to the area to visit and walk in the Wyre Forest as it is a place of beauty.</p> <p>The beautiful views of the Wyre Forest and fields in the area including across the Shropshire border which will be blanked out by a modern housing estate, this goes against the ethos of the village.</p> <p>More houses will increase noise pollution of both a human nature &amp; of vehicles.</p> <p>Water Management: The Severn Trent Water plant on Sugars Lane has regular tanker visits to empty them as they do not appear to be able to cope with the current demand. During heavy rainstorms, they have to run all night operations to keep the levels down. This creates more traffic and disturbance to the local residents and shows that the increase of housing will have a negative impact.</p> <p>Health: There is very little employment in the village, people would have to go further afield for work, increasing the travel costs, use of cars, traffic pollution and the carbon footprint, which surely, we should be trying to reduce.</p> <p>There are no Doctors in the village so people would have to use either Bewdley or Cleobury, both of which are full to capacity.</p> <p>Any changes to Far Forest will not have any positive benefit to those already residing here.</p> <p>The above reasons are why we are objecting to any development in Far Forest.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3590</a>	Object	<p>The Orchard House/Site next to Tolland (Plough Lane)</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation and ecology - Any development here will affect trees, ancient hedgerows and grassland which are known to support and sustain wildlife due to its location. With regards to the objections highlighted above for the New Road sites on Wildlife Conservation and ecology this remains the same for The Orchard House/Tolland site (Plough Lane).</p> <p>Change of character and landscape to the area - Any development to this site would mean a change in skyline, as all the buildings along this stretch are bungalows. Any new building would encroach on the current residents especially if houses are planned by any developer. As the developer will be unknown, then again the design and character of any buildings would be out of the control of the residents. The proposal from Wyre Forest District Councils Plan is not infill as the development is on the external area of the village and therefore not conducive with its own policy.</p> <p>Utilities - This site has exactly the same sewer system as New Road. It all flows to the same pumping station and I have already highlighted its inadequacy for the village.</p> <p>Traffic - Any exit from this area would mean coming out onto the A4117 (Cleobury Road) This is a busy and well used road. Any exit from either end of the site needs to negotiate The Plough which is across from the Plough lane exit. The current Bus Stop is at The Plough, the busy shop and its car park is between the 2 sites potential entrances and here cars regularly are exiting and turning into the car park. There is also a busy and well used Baptist church with only parking for 2 cars, plus numerous drives to residential buildings along that stretch of road. I anticipate that a junction would need to be undertaken here for safety reasons and on doing so this would greatly change the character of this part of the village.</p> <p>Other key points to make for both sites;</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Bus service - It is believed we have a good local bus service by Wyre Forest District. We have approximately 1 bus an hour. Other Villages such as Bliss gate and Rock Village have up to 3 buses an hour.</p> <p>Village School - The school has fairly recently had extensions to it to enable it to accommodate demand. An increase houses will mean an increase in children and it is not clear whether the school will be able to meet the demands of the children in the village.</p> <p>Employment - The village offers little in the terms of employment. People therefore have to go farther a field to find work. The ownership of a car is essential as the bus service is poor.</p> <p>Medical Cover - The village does not have its own practice and so we have to use either Bewdley Medical centre or Cleobury Mortimer. An increase in our village will have an impact on the respective medical practices and ensuring they have capacity to register individuals.</p> <p>Shropshire - With Shropshire just on the outskirts of the village it is not clear what impact this will have on their building plans and apparent needs. Over the years the increase in houses in Cleobury Mortimer has seen an increase in traffic along the A 4117.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty of our village - The Wyre Forest District Council advertise the district as a place of beauty and encourage tourism. How can building 60 houses in a small spears out village such as ours be sustaining the very heart of what the Wyre Forest stands for?</p> <p>The development will have substantial and devastating change to both the character and appearance of Far Forest and would certainly fail to enhance this valuable open space.</p> <p>Regenerating the town, to me, is the most obvious area to assign building too, not countryside or greenbelt. Much smaller plots around the rural district would be more palatable instead of large numbers of houses encroaching on a small community.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3591</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> <li>Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</li> </ul> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3945</a>	Object	<p>Development of this area would have untold consequences on potentially rare and endangered species.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if these sites should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <p>There are insufficient work opportunities in Far forest for 40 plus households; so, this will result in additional commuters.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are frequent. An increase in traffic would put walkers at risk.</p> <p>At peak times traffic on the A41 17 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution.</p> <p>Less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brown field sites.</p> <p>Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for future generations.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4243</a>	Object	Plough Lane would not be suitable for more traffic and the access to Cleobury Road would be very close to the New Road junction
	<a href="#">LPPO4547</a>	Object	<p>Far Forest</p> <p>The recent work done by Severn Trent in the New Road, Sugars Lane area of the village has improved but not cured the problem with overflow and flooding of the sewerage system. The existing system could not cope with the addition of more houses on land above this facility. There is land to the south of the A4117 which may be suitable for housing and from which, it may be possible to connect into the existing sewage main pipes along that road.</p> <p>The school in New Road is at capacity and has no potential for growth. Any additional housing anywhere in the Rock Parish will add to the pupil numbers at Far Forest School. Has any thought been given to the possibility of building a new school on the land off New Road, possibly with an entrance in Station Road? The existing school site could then be used for</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>housing, all with the proviso that the sewerage system is really sorted out.</p> <p>New Road is already a busy road being the main access road to the school and to properties and farm land beyond, and to the year-round residential caravan sites in Sugars Lane. At school drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic can be a major problem. A voluntary one way system, Station Road in and New Road out, has been suggested, tried before and abandoned because of non compliant drivers and the dangerous junction of Station Road with the A4117. ?Possible Peak time one way system and traffic lights</p> <p>New housing exiting onto New Road would exacerbate this problem. ?possible vehicle entrance/exit onto Station Road?</p> <p>There is little employment in Far Forest and, at present, little potential for its growth. A proportion of new residents would, inevitably, need to travel into surrounding townships for work, shopping, health care and for schooling. As mentioned at the outset, I feel new development should take into account the need to minimise travelling, for all the oft-voiced environmental reasons, and, with this in mind, I feel new rural housing should be kept to a minimum.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4601</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans to develop the sites in both Plough Lane and New Road, Far Forest for the following reasons:</p> <p>Transport and accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well known congestion hotspots, especially at start of, end of school.</li> <li>• Limited Parking.</li> <li>• Dangerous junction on to main road, with Bus Stop immediately at entrance to New Road, and popular Village Hall with own parking challenges.</li> <li>• No crossing and unenforced speed restrictions -Potential for accidents.</li> <li>• Inability or space to widen the road to accommodate increased traffic<sup>20</sup>.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plough Lane junction would need significant improvement as blind exit due to shop car park to one side, Christmas tree plantation to the other, and Public House car park entrance immediately opposite.</li> </ul> <p>A Unique Place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife Conservation -This is untouched and natural habitat which will be affected, such as Hedgerows/Trees and grasslands which is known to support insects, reptiles and birds as part of the local important Wyre Forest area.</li> <li>Sky line change -Overlooking existing properties.</li> <li>Utilities -Sewage is already inadequate for the village with some properties having septic tanks, and the facility at the bottom of New Road is prone to flooding.</li> <li>Change of Character -Modern buildings not in keeping with existing buildings.</li> <li>Increase in noise -Due to increased population and increased vehicles.</li> <li>Effect on Beauty -The current area is very popular with walkers, and promotes tourism to the local area.</li> </ul> <p>Biodiversity and Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Dark Skies, due to the number of proposed houses, and potential street lighting.</li> <li>Impact of increased lighting on resident wildlife -Bats, Deer, Moths, Owls etc..)</li> </ul> <p>Community Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Village school is at maximum capacity and would not be able to increase intake.</li> <li>Poor and very limited Bus Service</li> </ul> <p>We purposely chose to move to Far Forest to ensure a better quality of life for our family. If the plans were to be agreed, I am sure that it would lead us to reconsider our residency, and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			force us to move away from the community we feel and enjoy being apart of.
	<a href="#">LPP04521</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the site proposals in Far Forest, that of Plough Lane and New Road.</p> <p>I site the following points:</p> <p>Traffic: It is only the main road that is adequately wide for regular two way traffic: Plough Lane, Church Lane and New Road are all narrow and this poses a particular problem in the case of Church Lane and New Road during peak school traffic times. Also it should be noted that due to the recent expansion of Casa Mia their over flow traffic now park on New Road all days of the week at any time of day.</p> <p>Further more, problems often occur when static caravans are being transported to the caravan park located at the bottom of Sugars Lane due to them becoming stuck attempting to negotiate parked cars and traffic. This is also an issue for farm vehicles.</p> <p>The main road is a popular thoroughfare, one which even existing junctions are inadequate and unsafe for especially due to the 30mph speed limit not being adhered to. Using local amenities such as the village shop, village hall, pub and bus stop all require crossing and walking alongside this very busy and fast flowing road.</p> <p>Utilities: Sewage is still processed at the sewage pump work on Sugars Lane and some village properties still use septic tanks.</p> <p>There is existing poor drainage of surface water that causes issues, the drainage of storm water is poor on New road with existing drains being neglected and blocked.</p> <p>We regularly experience power and water disruption with the slightest high winds or water leak causing reduction or total loss.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Village school: Far Forest Primary School were not consulted or informed of the proposed developments. The school is already operating at full capacity. They have not been given the opportunity to voice their concerns or requirements to accommodate any additional pupil numbers.</p> <p>Poor bus service: The bus service is very limited and is located on the already busy main road where speed limits are not adhered to. School children who use the public bus as school transport are regularly in danger crossing the road. It is known to us that at least one child has been 'clipped by a vehicle' whilst attempting to cross the road. It is important to note there are no pedestrian crossings in place in the village.</p> <p>Our relatives who have attempted to use the local bus to travel from Bewdley to visit have very limited choice due to the poor provision of buses to Far Forest.</p> <p>Well-being: When attending the consultation at St George's Hall, Bewdley I spoke to a former local councillor. It was suggested that a certain option was favourable because 'it wouldn't be the big boy developers' so they would only build a small number of larger properties. A smaller number of houses on a plot would mean larger house sizes and higher house prices. This does not have benefit to the local residents and these houses would not be affordable as suggested by the proposed development plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, if these new houses are inhabited with families who cannot get places for their children at the Village primary school then they are unable to be involved in the local community.</p> <p>Wildlife conservation: Existing habitats in the village such as hedgerows, trees and grasslands have remained untouched or developed for a sustained period of time making them invaluable to the local wildlife. Redevelopment would jeopardise the established wildlife that rely on such habitats.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Skyline Change: Any developments undertaken on Plough Lane or New Road sites would make dramatic changes to the sky line and overlook existing properties. Many of the properties are bungalows and were designed as such to have low level impact on the sky line.</p> <p>Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology: Far Forest is described as 'a small village' and has historically been of a rural community. The character of the village includes not having street lighting, it's abundance of old orchards and woodlands, fields for deer to graze in and fields used not only as farm land but also as habitat to support the Wyre Forest wildlife. All of these features will be threatened, compromised and almost certainly destroyed by the proposed developments. Past generations have sought to protect, and develop afore mentioned landscapes in and around Far Forest to enable wildlife to thrive and prosper, some of which will have been displaced by other developments in the near locality.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty: Far Forest is a village that is part of the Wyre Forest area and is actively advertised as a place of natural beauty. Tourists visit and explore the woodlands, footpaths and bridleways to observe the abundance of trees, insects, wildlife and undeveloped areas of natural beauty. Local residents have grown up enjoying and preserving the environment and those that have moved to the village have done so with the knowledge that they have the existing environment to enjoy and nurture for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>Medical cover: Within the village there is no provision for a doctors surgery or medical centre. As a family of 5 we are patients of Bewdley medical centre which by all accounts is stretched to capacity already. When attempting to make medical appointments for ourselves as adults or indeed our young children we find that an appointment is not easy to get due to the already high existing demand.</p> <p>I trust that our comments will be considered when assessing the proposed developments in Far Forest.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO364</a>	Object	<p>Far Forest is the 'best served village' - by what? Not the bus service for sure, or broadband, nor water supply, nor continuity of electricity supply. General comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus service is sporadic and has been downgraded by the current provider to the point where it is practically useless and therefore, passenger numbers are in freefall.</li> <li>2. Broadband - most people (different providers) get around 2-3 MBps at best.</li> <li>3. Low water pressure is a constant problem.</li> <li>4. Power outages are frequent - many people, self-included, have generators.</li> <li>5. Sewerage - an ongoing issue which will be made much, much worse by new housing. The sewer pipe in Plough Lane I believe to be 150mm, after discussion with Severn Trent workers - as it is presently, it should be 300mm in my opinion (as a former water board employee). There are frequent overflows of sewage in Sugars Lane, presenting a health hazard - this is a matter of fact, not just my public health opinion. After heavy rain, there is a significant occurrence of 'storm sewage run-off' - I am informed that the houses in the New Forest Close area have a combined connection of surface run-off and sewerage: this should not be the case.</li> <li>6. Traffic: the A4117 is a busy road, as many goods vehicles choose to ignore the recommended route via the A456. The poor public transport will have the effect of forcing people to use cars - and additional 40 houses could be up to 80 cars, perhaps twice a day or more.</li> <li>7. Far Forest is integrated into the forest. As noted in this document, there are several SSSIs and reserves, many of which would be impacted by even a few extra dwellings (and, by extension, people). I don't see any 'local need' for dwellings at all, with the village population showing no net growth. There are several species found in the Wyre Forest which are either rare, or not found anywhere else (see: 'The Natural History of an English Forest' by Norman Hickin for details). Bats, moths and other wildlife are adversely affected by extraneous light in particular.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land behind Tolland bungalow/school fields:</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The issues here are several:</li> <li>2. Firstly, Plough Lane (unadopted) is highly unsuitable for additional traffic, being single track. Furthermore, the egress onto Cleobury Road is quite dangerous, with very restricted visual splays.</li> <li>3. Secondly - note my comments above on the sewerage system.</li> <li>4. Thirdly, from a biological angle, I understand there may be adders on the site adjoining Plough Lane, plus a badger sett and the presence of deer (the latter I see myself regularly and have photographs) and slow-worms - slow worms are a protected species under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orchard House 'infill':</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please note my prior comments on the sewerage/water system in Far Forest as applying here.</li> <li>2. Egress onto Cleobury Road: I think Highways would be alarmed by this. Not only is the proposed roadway very close to 2 existing junctions (Plough Lane, New Road), but very close to the Forest Stores car park - from my home office, which overlooks the shop, there is not a day goes by without more than one 'near miss': sometimes this is due to parked vehicles and sometimes due to the speed of traffic through the village.</li> <li>3. Overlighting/street lighting - there are no street lights in Far Forest apart from in the New Forest Close area and the absence of street lights is preferred by residents. The 'dark skies' view should be respected and fears about crime are largely unfounded, studies have shown where street lights have been switched off or do not exist in the first place.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed New Road development:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic - although not single-track, there are roads connected (which may be used as</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>a through route) such as Church Lane and Sugars Lane which are effectively single-track in parts. The school, I understand, is full to capacity and there is a lot of traffic and parked cars at certain times of the day. Factor in rural traffic (tractors) and occasional static caravan movements and it's a potential problem. The egress from New Road onto Cleobury Road has poor visibility and that from Church Lane (the other end to the proposed development) has dangerously poor visibility.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Please note my prior comments about the poor capacity of the sewerage system and low water pressure in Far Forest.</li> <li>3. Please note my comments on street lighting for the Orchard House proposal as also applying here.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3266</a>	Comment	<p>Adjacent Tolland Bungalow BR/RO/4/6</p> <p>My Objections to the proposal of house's at the sites quoted are as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage Page 97 Policy 15 Sewage systems and water quality.</li> <li>• Page 98 Policy 15C Flood Risk Management</li> <li>• Page 100 Policy 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems</li> </ul> <p>It is well known that when Oak Leaf Rise and New Forest Close were built, the storm water and sewage waste share the same pipe work. The result is flooding on a grand scale in Sugars Lane. This has been on going for the last 20 years. The discharge from another 20 houses would be joined to this system should this go ahead. The attached picture is after about 20 minute's rain. That is not only dirty water, but sewage too. Tankers are dispatched by Severn Trent Water on a regular basis to pump out the overflow. A totally unacceptable situation from a health and environmental point of view. In Plough Lane we have an inadequate waste system, also we have residents on septic tanks, it is imperative they are looked after.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 85 Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Policy 13 Managing Travel Demands Ai,ii,iii and B</li> <li>• Page 88-89 Highway Network - 13.12</li> </ul> <p>Increasing any traffic into Plough Lane, the entrance/exit out is opposite to one of the busiest restaurants in the county. The entrance/exit is obscured by the shop car park. Near misses are a daily occurrence. HGV'S, large lorries park on road (A4117) to use the shop. The Baptist church only has two parking spaces, they too park on the road. Between New Road and Plough Lane there are 16 driveways, both side's of the road all on to a very busy A4117.</p> <p>Bus Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 56 Section 8</li> <li>• Page 85 Section13</li> </ul> <p>A two hourly service is all that passes through Far Forest. The last bus from Kidderminster is 6.15 pm so is of no use for a social life or ways to work.</p> <p>Other local villages have a much better service up to three services pass through.</p> <p>Village School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 116 Community Facilities Section 20</li> </ul> <p>Our village school is full, September 17 intake is already up to capacity. This primary school covers places wider than the village and it has been known that very local children were</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>unable to attend the school. Other local villages have a choice of more than one school.</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80/81 and 85 A Unique Place to Live sub. 11.29 11B 11.3 section 3</li> <li>• Protecting and enhancing policy 11D</li> <li>• Page 79 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• Page 94 Strategic Green Infrastructure B</li> <li>• Page 112 Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i,ii</li> <li>• Page 113 18.8, 18.9, 18.10</li> <li>• Page 137-144 Sustainable Tourism 23</li> <li>• Page 79 Section 11.c Landscape Charter</li> </ul> <p>We sit on the very edge of The Wyre Forest and provide a corridor for wildlife. Habitat will be affected, if hedges, trees, grassland are taken away. They support insects, birds reptiles local to this area. Grazing land would be lost for the local farmer along with a hay meadow. Our bats, deer, owls, moths would be displaced from an area where they are renowned. Any development would have a detrimental affect on all forms of wildlife at both sites.</p> <p>Loss of Dark Skies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80 Protecting and enhancing</li> <li>• Page 81 Biodiversity and geological</li> <li>• Page 103 Conservation Policy 11D</li> </ul> <p>Dark skies are part of the village life and important to its character. I believe any new development would have to include street lighting something in Far Forest that was always fought against.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/4/6 – LAND ADJACENT TO TOLLAND, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Skyline Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 112 Section 18.10</li> <li>• Page 113</li> </ul> <p>Residents around the Plough Lane plan mostly consist of bungalows so they will be overlooked should houses make there way there. An invasion of their privacy. Extra houses means extra noise, more people. This would impact on peoples well being and have no positive benefit to them.</p> <p>We have no medical cover in the village, nearest, we believe Bewdley Medical Centre is full. Cleobury Mortimer has had very large housing developments, to which impacts on their new medical centre. Worcestershire hospital is full to breaking before all the projected housing. There is very little employment in the village so people have to travel, so more cars, more emissions, more pollution to the woodland.</p> <p>I don't believe that this proposed plan is good for this village for the reasons I have tried to explain. Traffic, sewage, school, medical, public transport, are all an issue in this village. Therefore I object to both option A and B proposed developments on both sites.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4263</a>	Comment	<p>The 2 developments proposed for New Road and one for Plough Lane total approximately six acres which is huge compared with the rest of the village and contrary to Policy 6F page 36 where you say you will only allow "small scale" development and contrary to the policy where you say only infill (policy 18B page 112) while this proposal is extending the village.</p> <p>The village has no public "green space" despite being out in the country and Policy 29B and policy 20C say there should be "green space" for developments greater than 11 houses.</p> <p>Section 27 page 162 talks about protecting "local distinctiveness" and the loss of a small orchard and the loss of a hay meadow changes the character of Far Forest where many properties, even in the village centre, retain their small holder origins.</p> <p>Policy 13 page 85 talks about promoting walking and cycling while to build out at Far Forest will create car commuter traffic to Kidderminster and the West Midlands, as there is no extra employment in Far Forest.</p> <p>Section 23.2 (The Wyre Forest) says policy is to support the work done by the £4M Grow with Wyre Project and yet part of the New Road site is old orchard that Grow With Wyre and Worcester County policy is to retain.</p> <p>Policy 23A Tourism depends on the Landscape Character of this area (page 79 11c) and this will be negatively impacted by such a development; the area has many public footpaths linking with the Wyre Forest and the Wyre Forest Centre is only 100 yards away.</p> <p>Policy 18E page 114 talks about limiting the expansion of mobile homes, especially near Far Forest, and this development will be off New Road which is heavily used to service 3 large caravan sites further down Sugars Lane - 160 vans on one of those sites.</p> <p>Policy 13, page 85 talks about traffic and highway safety and yet New Road is already overloaded by school traffic, plus the traffic to the 3 caravan sites, plus the large farm vehicles to the farm yard in Sugars lane, plus previous developments in New Forest Close, and other residences down New Road. Even if a developer was willing to fund improvements there is no space to open the junction at the top of New Road because the</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>properties there do not have any back garden and to remove part of their frontage just adds to the parking problem with their cars now having to park on the road. Alternative land is available on the main road, on the Kidderminster side of the village, that would avoid any extra load on New Road. The pub, shop, bus stop, village hall, and Methodist church, are all up on the main road therefore the council should consider redefining it's boundary of the village. 6.57 Alternatives, page 45.</p> <p>Page 97, Utilities; the sewage system cannot cope with current capacity, and Severn Trent tankers are up and down New Road every hour when it rains. Severn Trent have had polices to upgrade the pumping station in new Road for the 20 years I have lived in the village, and it has not happened yet. Some existing properties that are on septic tanks that drain into the development area will have to be put on the mains resulting in greater load beyond that created by the development. The mains power fails regularly, for short periods, and Severn Trent took a week to fully restore fresh water supplies to the Rock area only a couple of months ago. Far Forest does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this scale.</p> <p>Page 80/81 11.29 of a Unique Place talks about wildlife conservation, hedges, trees and the need to protect and enhance 11D yet the 3 sites in Far Forest are all hedged with old trees and orchard, and have populations of bats, adders, deer and many other diverse plant and animal life being on the edge of the forest. Worcestershire Wildlife has found Noble Chafer beetles in my orchard that is only 100 yards from the proposed site. On my land they found 20 species of lichens and the proposed site would have more.</p> <p>Page 112/113 talks about skyline changes and the 2 developments down New Road will be visible from most of the roads and public footpaths. The development will contribute to light pollution and Far Forest is one of the few areas of the county that still has dark skies. (A unique Place to live 11.29 and Protecting and enhancing policy 11D).</p> <p>The more I read the policies on a unique place to live and change of character, and the European habitat directory, effect on beauty, I am further reminded what a wonderful place Far Forest is, and therefore think it should be marked as an area for restrained development rather than including a general development plan that negatively impacts on all the good things about Far Forest, and also would create new problems as a result of any development.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4264</a>	Comment	<p>I would like to say that the plan for Far Forest has not been thought through in Particular I would like to draw your attention to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) New Road is narrow and will not cope with the traffic. We have the School runs parking twice a day (I say parking but in some cases abandoned). We also have people from the Care Home on Cleobury Road now parking in New Road since their extension. People who live on the static caravans at the bottom of Sugar Lane also have to drive down New Road.</li> <li>2.) The School will not be able to cope especially if there is an influx of Children.</li> <li>3.) The sewerage system will certainly not be able to cope as it barely does now and we still have to have Tankers if we have adverse weather. I know that Severn Trent is doing more work in the near future but that is to solve the problem we have now.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4277</a>	Object	<p>I object very strongly to the proposed building of "affordable housing" on the two sites outlined in Far Forest.</p> <p>If you actually live in Far Forest you would know that this beautiful quiet village does not need any more houses built, as you propose 40+. There are plenty of houses for sale in and around the area.</p> <p>I only found out about these future proposals through a page on social media.</p> <p>The A4117 barely copes with local traffic and thru traffic from Cleobury Mortimer and the other way from areas such as Callow Hill and Kidderminster.</p> <p>Do you have any idea the impact on a 30mph road this extra traffic and people will have on this area. It's bad enough with caravan sites and their owners who have no respect for the area, littering, noise and cars. We have one shop and one pub and one school within walking distance, how can these cope with the extra people.</p> <p>Major problem is New Road and The Orchard, where these houses will be built. New Road can barely cope with the traffic first thing and at rush hour, are you just trying to destroy OUR village. The A4117 is a dangerous road as it is, many a driver overtakes if anyone slows them down, bare in mind the stretch through Far Forest is 30mph, so how will an extra 20-40+ houses help with that situation, more cars, more pollution, more rubbish.</p> <p>My son was knocked over on his way to school 2 years ago, yet nothing was done, no pedestrian crossing, no traffic lights. Can you reassure local residents that this very busy road is going to be safe with the extra pressure of more cars and more people.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			I also object to toy box houses being built in areas that have some beautiful individual homes. These housing developers build nothing but eye sores. Two up two down with little gardens, ugly homes. There are plenty of beautiful homes up for sale. We moved into this area to be away from major developments and noise our, and traffic. It just seems to be getting worse. This beautiful green area with great walks and the forest on doorstep will be destroyed. You may think "Not on my doorstep" .....well yes that's exactly what I'm saying. Far Forest in my opinion does not need redeveloping. You will destroy it.
	<a href="#">LPPO4278</a>	Object	<p>We write to register our objections to the two proposed sites for house building in the village of Far Forest. Our concerns are wide ranging and relate to the whole infrastructure of the village.</p> <p><b>Objections to the housing development on New Road, Far Forest:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As it currently exists, New Road struggles to deal with the volume and size of traffic using it regularly. It is the only access route to the properties down New Road, New Forest Close and Oakleaf Rise and the properties in Wyre Forest and the mobile home development at the bottom of Sugars Lane. This caravan park necessitates "Oversized" vehicles regularly carrying mobile homes along New Road. It is narrow and congested and compounded by the cars down New Road parking in the lane, causing cars to stop and wait to allow traffic to pass. This situation is exacerbated by the large agricultural vehicles, which need to access the farms and fields, traffic to and from the church in Church Lane, specifically weddings, funerals and church services and, most significantly, the traffic that appears twice daily transporting children to Far Forest Lea Primary School. The congestion caused through parents parking in New Road, directly opposite the proposed new building site, is significant and impossible to pass. The current voluntary one way system around Church Lane is unenforceable and problematic, involving turning off Cleobury Road into Church Lane on a blind bend, with vehicles from two other lanes entering the main road at the same point. The proposed development in New Road would significantly impact on an already difficult situation, causing further congestion and risk to life for the parents and children walking to school along New Road. Children already have to navigate around cars parked on the footpath and the school and Police frequently contact parents about this situation. We personally worry for the safety of our children who walk to and from this school.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p><b>Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest. Transport/Roads Policy 13 Managing Travel Demand A i, ii, iii and B pg 85; Highway Network -13.12 pg 88-89; Policy 16- pollution and land instability pg103; Policy 13 pg 13; Rural Development 28 – Policy 28B pg 169; Policy 18E pg 114 &amp; 169</b></p> <p>2. The proposed housing development of 40 houses on New Road would have a significant impact on other elements of social infrastructure. The local village school is already supporting pupils from out of area, some with Specific Educational Needs. To increase the numbers in this small village school would impact on the nature and class sizes, affecting the ethos of the school and the quality of education. This would also impact the local Secondary Schools in Bewdley and Cleobury, again with implications for class size, buildings and, significantly, transport to and from these schools.</p> <p><b>Community Facilities – 20 pg 116</b></p> <p>3. To build 40 houses on New Road would further impact on the village atmosphere and affect the aesthetics of an area where visitors and tourists come to experience a place of beauty and village environment. The construction of these properties would involve the destruction of ancient hedgerows, which host a variety of plants and slow growing trees and an abundance of wildlife. This field too is also one where deer regularly graze at night and during the winter months. To build here would cause destruction of a valuable and significant natural habitat, home to numerous species including badgers, which are regularly seen in the vicinity of this meadow. The additional house and street lighting would also impact the local bat population, attracting the bats prey items and disorienting the bats and affecting their natural flight paths and commuting routes.</p> <p><b>A Unique Place 11B 11.3 Section 3 i, ii, iii, iv, v pg 80/81; Historic Environment B ii, ix pg 77; 11C Landscape Character pg 79; 8 Rural Exception Sites iii pg 5; Strategic Green Infrastructure B iii pg 94.</b></p> <p>We hope you take our concerns seriously and choose not to destroy this rural piece of Worcestershire. We would also suggest that the Council examine existing Brown Field sites that exist in and around Kidderminster and Stourport, which are numerous and significantly better positioned in terms of local amenities and transport</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			links, before destroying the countryside for which Wyre Forest is famous for and synonymous with.
	<a href="#">LPPO4279</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the housing proposals in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a quiet community with quiet village roads and pleasant surroundings.</li> <li>• There will be noise pollution and traffic congestion, turning Far Forest to a local urban area</li> <li>• The nearby roads are busy enough. The village hall is let nearly every night of the week causing congestion at New Road. There is also traffic congestion near the school at the start and the end of the school day. Additional traffic from an adjacent housing estate would be a nightmare.</li> <li>• Think about the wildlife, conservation and open space that will be destroyed; Far Forest is a nice rural area and we don't want to see this ruined by more houses.</li> </ul> <p>You will be spoiling our local community which is perfectly fine as it is without an influx of people/houses/cars to which the local infrastructure and surrounding area is simply not suited. Please take your housing proposals elsewhere away from our beautiful village.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4280</a>	Object	<p>Far Forest is the 'best served village' - by what? Not the bus service for sure, or broadband, nor water supply, nor continuity of electricity supply.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bus service is sporadic and has been downgraded by the current provider to the point where it is practically useless and therefore, passenger numbers are in freefall.</li> <li>2. Broadband - most people (different providers) get around 2-3 MBps at best.</li> <li>3. Low water pressure is a constant problem.</li> <li>4. Power outages are frequent - many people, self-included, have generators.</li> <li>5. Sewerage - an ongoing issue which will be made much, much worse by new housing. The sewer pipe in Plough Lane I believe to be 150mm, after discussion with Severn Trent workers - as it is presently, it should be 300mm in my opinion (as a former water board employee). There are frequent overflows of sewage in Sugars Lane, presenting a health hazard - this is a matter of fact, not just my public health opinion. After heavy rain, there is a significant occurrence of 'storm sewage run-off' - I am informed that the houses in the New Forest Close area have a combined connection of surface run-off and sewerage:</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>this should not be the case.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic: the A4117 is a busy road, as many goods vehicles choose to ignore the recommended route via the A456. The poor public transport will have the effect of forcing people to use cars - and additional 40 houses could be up to 80 cars, perhaps twice a day or more.</li> <li>Far Forest is integrated into the forest. As noted in this document, there are several SSSIs and reserves, many of which would be impacted by even a few extra dwellings (and, by extension, people). I don't see any 'local need' for dwellings at all, with the village population showing no net growth. There are several species found in the Wyre Forest which are either rare or not found anywhere else (see: 'The Natural History of an English Forest' by Norman Hickin for details). Bats, moths and other wildlife are adversely affected by extraneous light in particular.</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Land behind Tolland bungalow/school fields:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The issues here are several:</li> <li>Firstly, Plough Lane (unadopted) is highly unsuitable for additional traffic, being single track. Furthermore, the egress onto Cleobury Road is quite dangerous, with very restricted visual splays.</li> <li>Secondly - note my comments above on the sewerage system.</li> <li>Thirdly, from a biological angle, I understand there may be adders on the site adjoining Plough Lane, plus a badger sett and the presence of deer (the latter I see myself regularly and have photographs) and slow-worms - slow worms are a protected species under the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside Act.</li> </ol> </li> <li><u>Orchard House 'infill':</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please note my prior comments on the sewerage/water system in Far Forest as applying here.</li> <li>Egress onto Cleobury Road: I think Highways would be alarmed by this. Not only is the proposed roadway very close to 2 existing junctions (Plough Lane, New Road), but very close to the Forest Stores car park - from my home office, which overlooks the shop, there is not a day goes by without more than one 'near miss': sometimes this is due to parked vehicles and sometimes due to the speed of traffic through the village.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>3. Over lighting/street lighting - there are no street lights in Far Forest apart from in the New Forest Close area and the absence of street lights is preferred by residents. The 'dark skies' view should be respected and fears about crime are largely unfounded, studies have shown where street lights have been switched off or do not exist in the first place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Proposed New Road development:</u></li> </ul> <p>1. Traffic - although not single-track, there are roads connected (which may be used as a through route) such as Church Lane and Sugars Lane which are effectively single-track in parts. The school, I understand, is full to capacity and there is a lot of traffic and parked cars at certain times of the day. Factor in rural traffic (tractors) and occasional static caravan movements and it's a potential problem. The egress from New Road onto Cleobury Road has poor visibility and that from Church Lane (the other end to the proposed development) has dangerously poor visibility.</p> <p>2. Please note my prior comments about the poor capacity of the sewerage system and low water pressure in Far Forest.</p> <p>3. Please note my comments on street lighting for the Orchard House proposal as also applying here.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4281</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased flow of traffic</li> <li>• More congestion</li> <li>• No facility to widen road</li> <li>• More danger to pupils attending Far Forest school</li> <li>• Parking a big problem</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4282</a>	Object	<p>Objects to proposed development at Far Forest due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased population impact on wildlife.</li> <li>2. School capacity</li> <li>3. Noise and pollution.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. No positive benefit to current residents.</li> <li>5. Local utilities-inadequate sewerage systems now</li> <li>6. Poor bus service, increases would uplift carbon footprint.</li> <li>7. Very little local employment. People to go further afield, again increase of carbon footprint.</li> <li>8. Loss of grazing for farmers, jeopardising livelihoods.</li> <li>9. Light pollution affecting nocturnal animals and insects.</li> <li>10. Land and Hedgerows ripped out affects many other wildlife species.</li> <li>11. Character of village would change to bricks and mortar development.</li> <li>12. Nearest medical cover is Bewdley or Cleobury we believe to be full.</li> <li>13. Storm water currently a problem and would be heightened due to any development.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4283</a>	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My main concern is the sewerage. It is now vey inadequate not being dealt with for 7 years. When it rains it floods over the road and land, lorries have to come and pump it out at a high cost that W.F.D.C cannot afford (people in the W.F.D.C area)</li> <li>2. Would be very bad entries and exits on narrow roads.</li> <li>3. Should be no street lights because we are in the country NOT town.</li> <li>4. There are no jobs in Far Forest so people would have to commute so money would come from people who work in town with the state paying for people who do NOT want to live without opportunity of working.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4274</a>	Object	Object to development in Far Forest - New Road very busy with school traffic, amenities cannot cope with existing housing, Plough Lane would need to be widened, increased congestion and negative impact on countryside
	<a href="#">LPPO3040</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road- Congestion along road at school times and parked cars. Road used by heavy machinery, main way in and out of the village.</li> <li>• Plough Lane- Increase of traffic on lane where local amenities are.</li> <li>• Sewerage system is inadequate at the moment.</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus service limited</li> <li>• Loss of farm land</li> <li>• Little employment in the village and services are currently stretched.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3064</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased noise pollution</li> <li>• Damage and effect on the environment</li> <li>• Change in perception of area</li> <li>• Increase in traffic on narrow and already congested roads</li> <li>• Stress on utilities, localised flooding and poor sewerage system, no mains gas currently in village and drs already over subscribed.</li> <li>• Negative impact on the village, currently a small rural village, will become a housing estate.</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land and wildlife.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3083</a>	Object	This site has extremely dangerous traffic passing. There are no schools, doctors, dentists or facilities of any kind at Clows Top. The cross roads are treacherous in bad weather and the main road is very busy.
	<a href="#">LPPO3084</a>	Object	Small community that has no services or facilities. The cross roads are dangerous currently A456 is a very busy road.
	<a href="#">LPPO2194</a>	Object	<p>Inappropriate to have additional development in New Road. The road is already dangerously congested. It serves properties on New Road itself, New Forest Close, Church Lane, Rectory Lane, Sugars Lane and Lynells Lane. These include a school, three farms and three extensive residential caravan parks and numerous private residences. It is too narrow in places for two lorries to pass and there are always numerous cars and vans parked on the highway. Some parked vehicles relate to people working at and visiting premises on the main A4117 Tenbury Road, and also to people catching busses to Bewdley and Kidderminster.</p> <p>The main problem is, however, the actual junction where New Road joins the A4117. This is an acute turn and has no sight lines at all, making it difficult to see approaching traffic. This situation is made worse by the location</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			of a bus stop immediately adjacent to it. Additionally, ever since the development of New Forest Close, surface water has been getting into the foul sewer and causing flooding in Sugars Lane. A solution to this problem has been suggested, but to date there is no action and it is folly to propose any additional burden on this overloaded sewer pumping station.
	<a href="#">LPPO2133</a>	Object	<p>Object to proposed development at Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic/Sewage/Light pollution/land availability</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1605</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic is already horrendous will be made worse with more dwellings.</li> <li>Lack of services locally (doctors etc.) - leading to pollution as people would have to travel to appointments by car.</li> <li>Bus service is unreliable and route is awful; takes over an hour to get to Kidderminster.</li> <li>No place for commuting i.e. train station.</li> <li>No jobs locally - again causing more pollution as they will have to travel.</li> <li>If fire station moves from Bewdley, people's lives will be at risk.</li> <li>Countryside and natural habitats will be lost.</li> <li>Habitat of rare species.</li> <li>Beautiful ancient orchards will be replaced by houses.</li> <li>Village too small - not enough facilities.</li> <li>Children at risk due to traffic increase.</li> <li>Views will be spoilt.</li> <li>Brownfield sites in Kidderminster could be used.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1606</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion at peak times already - constant flow of traffic for caravan sites/development on New Forest Close.</li> <li>Tractors and caravans some of the regular users of the narrow road.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parked vehicles cause traffic to a halt due to the road being narrow - no area for this to be widened.</li> <li>• Concerns for wildlife, especially rare species.</li> <li>• Drainage issues.</li> <li>• Landscape will be affected - don't want to look at houses.</li> <li>• Land not suitable for development (see SHLAA report).</li> <li>• Other site better suited.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1607</a>	Object	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already struggle with volume of traffic.</li> <li>• Drainage issues.</li> <li>• School will struggle to cope with influx of new pupils.</li> <li>• Few local employment opportunities - therefore people will have to travel to work by car which isn't good for the environment.</li> <li>• Bus service is poor.</li> <li>• Lack of doctors - nearest ones near capacity.</li> <li>• Wildlife.</li> <li>• People enjoy the current countryside - local people would not have any benefit from the proposals.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1608</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic already bad.</li> <li>• Additional traffic will make accident inevitable.</li> <li>• Lack of jobs locally.</li> <li>• Lack of local services.</li> <li>• Use brownfield sites with services already in place.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1670</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic congestion is already bad on New Road - especially at peak times - this makes it difficult for larger vehicles to pass which frequently use the road. More development will make this worse.</li> <li>• Bus service is poor for people who do not drive.</li> <li>• Facilities in Far Forest are not suitable for an increase in population as it will cause more traffic and pollution.</li> <li>• More development could deter residents and tourists to the rural village as it will lose its natural aesthetic.</li> <li>• No positive affects for the residents in the area - will just cause problems for them.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1688</a>	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic increase/highway safety. The road is used by large vehicles.</li> <li>• Wildlife conservation - natural habitat will be greatly affected.</li> <li>• Change in skyline - will overlook existing properties.</li> <li>• Utilities - sewerage is inadequate - some properties still have septic tank. Has flooded in the past; should be sorted for the current situation but not taking into account new housing.</li> <li>• Change of character to the area.</li> <li>• Public services are inadequate.</li> <li>• No employment opportunities locally.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4288</a>	Object	<p>Redevelopment of Far Forest. Word in the village is that it is planned to build 50 homes in the village.</p> <p>We wish to register our objection to any such plan. On the basis that 50 additional houses would simply overwhelm the village (not to mention the ecology). The outcome would be that the character of the village would be lost to the detriment of the current residents.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Such a plan would jeopardise an established thriving community.
	<a href="#">LPPO4289</a>	Object	<p>Objections and major considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic ref p.85 and p.88-89 of plan; the junction of New Road and Cleobury Road is already a danger, in part because there are no parking restrictions in New Road. There is congestion at the start of the school day and at its end since the school entrance is also located at the upper end of New Road. The increase in traffic from extra housing will make the situation worse especially taking into account traffic associated with caravan parks for which New Road is the only access.</li> <li>• Some consideration to making New Road/Church Road a one way system might help but the junction of New Road with Cleobury Road is dangerously situated with traffic often moving very quickly along Cleobury Road.</li> <li>• Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties because of high water table and increased run off due to development (p98). Flood risk management.</li> <li>• Sewage facilities are believed to be inadequate already, more houses will mean sewage system may need to be upgraded considerably.pg97 rural development policy 28.</li> <li>• Loss of Dark skies. pg80-81, 103. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation policy 11D If street lighting is introduced this will have a marked effect on the nature of the locality with loss of dark skies and detrimental impact on flora and fauna.</li> <li>• Proposed development will mean approximately 100 extra vehicles in and out of village therefore increased pollution. pg103. Pollution and land instability Policy 16.</li> </ul> <p>I hope serious consideration will be given to these points and further consultation with local residents before any firm decisions are made.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4284</a>	Object	<p>I object to housing development in New Road, Far Forest –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already high level of traffic congestions at peak times. Dangerous parking outside care home in New Road which is used by heavy machinery, caravans</li> <li>• Sewerage overflowing now</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School full.</li> <li>• Poor bus service.</li> <li>• Natural habitats will be affected</li> <li>• We should protect countryside, there are plenty of brownfield sites available.</li> <li>• Please listen to the local people who cannot see any benefits to them</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04285</a>	Object	<p>Questions need for a further 60 houses</p> <p>Present inadequacies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sewage (P.97 Rural Dev 28, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Local flooding (P.100 Rural Dev, Policy 288)</li> <li>• Storm water drainage (P.97-100 Sewage systems, Policy 15 water quality)</li> <li>• Public transport (P.56, P.85 Policy 13)</li> <li>• Plough Lane/Cleobury Road junction (P.97, Policy 15, 150)</li> </ul> <p>Impact on wildlife in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P.80-81 – A Unique place</li> <li>• P.77 – 11A Unique place</li> <li>• P.79 – 11C Landscape character</li> <li>• P.5 – 8 Rural Exception sites</li> <li>• P.94 – Strategic green infrastructure</li> <li>• P.112 – Infill Policy 188</li> <li>• P.113 – Infill Policy 188</li> </ul> <p>Little employment – local residents have to commute to work – increase car usage and cost. – P.166 Health 9.1-</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>9.10</p> <p>Plough House building is largely of bungalow design, the introduction of house building would damage the character. The ultimate decision making would not be in the hands of the local residents. – P.55/56 section 8 Policy 80, Infill Policy 188.</p> <p>The dark skies are very much part of our village, important to its character. Dark skies are also of great importance to wildlife. – P.80 Policy 110 protecting and enhancing, 81 Biodiversity and geological conservation, 103 con, 79 Section 16.2 Policy landscape character.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4286</a>	Object	<p>After going to a planning proposal meeting in Bewdley it became clear plots of land were being considered on New Road and Plough Lane. A planning attempt was tried in 2010 and turned down, the reasons are a matter of record about New Road, however, nothing has changed in this regard. After consulting and reading through the Wyre Forest District Plan I can see many flaws and reason's why building here is detrimental to the area. The so called village is dominated by a road network, New Road which is very narrow in places because of car parking by residents, during school term hold ups occur frequently near the school, the whole area can become grid locked. Pg. 85, Pg. 89-89, Pg. 103.</p> <p>To get the proposed sites this has to be negotiated. Adding to the problem. Plough Lane site has a similar problem with many accesses onto the main road from the Plough Inn nearly opposite a shop entrance and car park, bus when drivers slow down to turn down Plough Lane, drivers behind them think they are turning into the car park for the shop. This has some near misses.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the inadequate poor sewage and drainage taken 20 years after the problem occurred, tankers regularly having to pump excess storm water and sewage to be taken away, will this happen again with extra people putting strain on an overwhelmed system. Pg. 97, 98.</p> <p>The smell of sewage is terrible for cottage owners near the pumping station. This is also bad for tourism. The name of the cottage by the pump station is Coppice Gate and can be contacted. The proposed site in New Road has very valuable habitat. Hedgehogs in ancient meadows. Part of the area has old cherry orchards with national</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>reptiles, adders, slow worms, grass bats hunt for insects. These need dark skies. Insects such as noble chaffer and many butterflies occur here. Pg. 79, 80, 81, 103. Cattle are also grazed. Pg. 79.</p> <p>The WFDP choice is based also on good bus service, but this service is poor sometimes 2 hours between buses. Pg 56 &amp; 85.</p> <p>People moving here will not find any local employment. I myself have to travel into Kidderminster, more car journeys and more congestion on New Road or Church Lane. Pg 66-68.</p> <p>Building so many houses near the church which does not have any parking except on Church Lane. New build houses will look awful near an old church, changing the character of our village. Pg 112/113 section 18.10.</p> <p>If the land is developed what plans are there making sure this is done properly to blend in with existing properties? Pg. 154-164 section 27.</p> <p>Can you trust developers and builders? At Far Forest we have a very large undisclosed population living at caravan parks which is not monitored properly or taken into account. Building so many extra houses will destroy our community by turning our village into a housing estate. Pg. 55/56 Desirable place to live point.</p> <p>A brief summary, the road networking, the effect on ecology/ dark skies, the school is full, poor bus service, the sewage system, mobile phone signal poor. In conclusion I cannot see any benefit for Far Forest.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the future potential for Far Forest tourism, bad bricks and mortar developments ruin areas of outstanding beauty. I would not like this for our area, lots of campers and tourists use the campsite on Pound Bank next to the Plough Inn. This could affect the business. Pg. 81 – A Unique place 11B, Pg. 77 – 11C Landscape Character, Pg. 5 – 8 Rural Exception sites iii, Pg. 137 &amp; 144 – Sustainable Tourism 23.</p> <p>Brownfield sites provide less impact on greenbelt areas which WFDC seem to threaten constantly. 60 houses</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response																		
			here is a massive impact which would be completely lost on properly developed Kidderminster town centric sites. I am completely at a loss over the WFD plan.																		
	<a href="#">LPPO2223</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed developments in the Far Forest area. Namely Plough Lane/The Orchard House - 20 houses in total and New Road Development proposal - 40 houses in total. My reasons are as follows:-</p> <p><u>Page No. On Ref. No.</u> <u>WFDP</u></p> <table><tr><td>97</td><td>28</td><td>Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.</td></tr><tr><td>98</td><td>15</td><td>Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.</td></tr><tr><td>85</td><td>13</td><td>Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.</td></tr><tr><td>88-89</td><td>13</td><td>New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.</td></tr><tr><td>103</td><td>16</td><td>Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.</td></tr><tr><td>80, 85</td><td>11</td><td>Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old</td></tr></table>	97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.	98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.	85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.	88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.	103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.	80, 85	11	Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old
97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.																			
98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.																			
85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.																			
88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.																			
103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.																			
80, 85	11	Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old																			

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>trees support wildlife such as reptiles, (adders, newts etc.)Insects (moths, butterflies, beetles etc) and birds, some of these are protected, and will be endangered by these developments.</p> <p>94 18 Deer graze in the fields and seek refuge there from the very busy Wyre Forest, they are already under pressure as they have already lost some of their natural woodland habitat. Local farmers use the fields for grazing.</p> <p>5 8 The Plough Lane site includes an ancient orchard of damson and cherry trees, which supports much wildlife.</p> <p>80, 81, 77 11D Far Forest is a village and as such has very little street lighting. This is how we like our village. More housing would mean the loss of our dark skies, we like to see the stars at night, its part of the character of the village.</p> <p>79 16 Street lighting will also affect wildlife mentioned above.</p> <p>66-68 9 The village offers very few job prospects, therefore occupants of the proposed housing would have to commute by car as public transport is poor, causing more car usage and more pollution.</p> <p>55-56 8 1 Far Forest is a unique village, the proposed developments will significantly change its character. As I understand the proposal the developer will be responsible for the design, and will therefore consider cost to be the most important factor, not preserving the character of the village.</p> <p>80/81 77, 11 Effect on the Natural Beauty of the area. This area is a place of tourism where people come to enjoy the woodland the surrounding areas and the wildlife. Who will want to visit a housing estate?</p> <p>79, 5, 94, 112/113 8</p> <p>137-144</p> <p>Finally I would like to ask why choose an area so rich in wildlife, supporting tourism and a unique, historic village much loved by its inhabitants, when there are brown field sites within the Wyre Forest that could be developed</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			instead?
	<a href="#">LPP03592</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> <li>Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</li> </ul> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0254</a>	Object	<p>Objections - I object to the development on New Road due to lack of infrastructure, a good proportion of the housing allocation is already filled by those living permanently on caravan sites, where the caravan is their sole residency.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure:</p> <p>New Road itself. Development of the site on New Road will have a negative effect on the village because of parking for the residents, parking for the staff at the extended Casa Mia care home, and parking for parents dropping off and picking up from the school or village hall, means that for the majority of the time the road is reduced to a single lane with passing places, at peak hours the road frequently comes to a halt, as cars are trying to enter and leave New Road at the same time, and if the one side is taken up with parked cars, no-one can pass</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>each other, resulting in reversing, or having to turn around. The proposed houses are likely to each have two cars, leaving for work at peak times some potentially adding up to an additional 40 cars trying to get out of New Road in the morning.</p> <p>The site line and splay where New Road meets the main road opposite the village hall is insufficient, difficulty in seeing other traffic and no room to safely move out of and into New Road, especially when negotiating other vehicles trying to do the same. I have often hit the curb pulling out to avoid swinging too far into the middle of the main road and traffic on the far side. Cars coming into New Road from the main road often cut the corner, as the road at that point does not get them a great area to turn into. Plus residents park very close to the junction. Any new development on New Road would require an update of the splay, but there is nowhere for it to go as buildings lie either side.</p> <p>Sewage</p> <p>The Sugars Lane pumping station is currently inadequate to handle any additional sewage, and there are proposals for an extension which may or may not be sufficient. The housing development around Forest Close discharges both foul and storm water to the pumping station, when they were supposed to have soakaways, which puts a huge strain on the station, resulting in flooding outside our gate at times of heavy rainfall. You should also be aware that the caravan site referred to above is also connected to this pumping station, with increasing residents over the last couple of years, is also putting a strain on the station.</p> <p>Shouldn't the allocation be reduced to reflect the homes provided by caravan sites?</p> <p>Wyre Forest Caravan Site at the end of Sugars Lane has expanded exponentially since a change of ownership a couple of years ago. New caravans for the site pass our house on a regular basis. Although a "holiday" park, the site has an 11 months license, and it well known that a large proportion of these caravans are the main residence of the occupants and are consequently banded for Council Tax. These "households", which they effectively are, should be considered in the allocation for Far Forest as they are already providing homes that the District is lacking, and we the residents are already affected from the additional traffic their occupancy brings, in particular their impact on the traffic to New Road. Similarly, The Willows on the Cleobury Road, Far Forest has</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			permanent occupants.
	<a href="#">LPPO1775</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objecting to New Road/Plough Lane development at Far Forest (BR/RO/7)</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2042</a>	Object	<p>I object to housing development in New Road, Far Forest as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic in New Road is already a daily problem and Plough Lane would not cope with more traffic.</li> <li>SLILLAA committee report of July 2010 states this land is not suitable for housing development due to adverse impact on landscape.</li> <li>Sugars Lane sewage treatment works does not cope with current demand.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2213</a>	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the proposed development on Plough Lane/Orchard House and New Road, Far Forest, Worcestershire due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disturbance to the natural beauty and conservation of the area (Far Forest is an area with extensive wildlife and natural habitats - building works themselves would damage hedgerows and green fields).</li> <li>Insufficient infrastructure to accommodate the developments. On New Road there is very limited and poor access. There is regular vehicle access to the caravan sites along Sugars Lane at the bottom of New Road which already causes extensive disruption and traffic, particularly during peak holiday times and weekends (pg114 &amp; 169 WFDP). The added pollution and noise that this brings is unpleasant and has a significant detrimental impact on the local environment</li> <li>The junction of New Road onto the Cleobury Road is dangerous with a limited view at the best of times. An increased amount of traffic, and large construction vehicles during the development, would cause an increased danger to the residents and children attending Far Forest Primary School.</li> <li>An added complexity to the difficult traffic conditions is the lack of a sufficient bus service to Far Forest. An infrequent service of one per hour, with poorly maintained buses which are often seen broken down (or on fire), is not sustainable for a village such as Far Forest.</li> <li>The sewage system already in place is hardly fit for the current properties which it serves, let alone with</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>the extra 40 houses that are proposed on New Road and the 20 houses that are proposed on Plough Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been a known issue with phone signal and internet accessibility for a while in Far Forest. There is not sufficient infrastructure in the village to support another 60 properties without further, invasive works taking place.</li> </ul> <p>Suggest that alternative sites are considered for development such as Bliss Gate or Cleobury Mortimer.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2301</a>	Object	<p>I object to them for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Traffic Congestion: Road Safety.</b> These sites are on narrow, already heavily used lanes. In New Road with the school in use, it is virtually no-go at times and totally not suitable to even more traffic. The recent heavily expanded "caravan site" in Sugars Lane, now open all year round, with even more static homes arriving weekly, is bringing more service vehicles/delivery vans as well as the people living on the sit, so that it is impossible to walk the lane and New Road/ Church Lane without running a risk of vehicle danger bearing in mind no footpaths for most of the way. The thought of even more traffic anywhere in and around the village is unacceptable. Ref: WFDP Pages Nos. 85, 114,169,88-89,103.</li> <li><b>Local Wildlife:</b> The small patches of land under consideration are oasis for local wildlife, which includes many protected species the hedgerows trees and grassland, support insects, reptiles and birds-simply paying lip service to the wildlife and conservation acts is not good enough. Once these areas are gone-they are gone forever.</li> <li><b>The necessity:</b> Why choose to build in villages such a Far Forest? There is little employment around the village, meaning people have to travel further to find work, increases costs and adding to pollution and carbon footprint. Many areas in and around Kidderminster have been identified as "brown-field" sites, surely these must be considered before small rural villages. We suspect it is easier and more profitable to simply use greenfield sites, not actual Government policy by the way. It seems yet again profit before people, if this goes ahead.</li> </ol> <p>Ref: WFPD Page Nos. 154-164, 56,85,66-68,185</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			Utilities: The sewerage system in the village area is marginal or best, with water run-off constantly a problem in the New Road, Sugars Lane area whenever heavy rain occurs.
	<a href="#">LPPO2362</a>	Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed plans to develop the sites in both Plough Lane and New Road, Far Forest for the following reasons:</p> <p>Transport and accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well known congestion hotspots, especially at start of, end of school.</li> <li>• Limited Parking.</li> <li>• Dangerous junction on to main road, with Bus Stop immediately at entrance to New Road, and popular Village Hall with own parking challenges.</li> <li>• No crossing and unenforced speed restrictions -Potential for accidents.</li> <li>• Inability or space to widen the road to accommodate increased traffic20.</li> <li>• Plough Lane junction would need significant improvement as blind exit due to shop car park to one side, Christmas Tree Plantation to the other, and Public House car park entrance immediately opposite.</li> </ul> <p>A Unique Place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation -This is untouched and natural habitat which will be affected, such as Hedgerows/Trees and grasslands which is known to support insects, reptiles and birds as part of the local important Wyre Forest area.</li> <li>• Sky line change -Overlooking existing properties.</li> <li>• Utilities -Sewage is already inadequate for the village with some properties having septic tanks, and the facility at the bottom of New Road is prone to flooding.</li> <li>• Change of Character -Modern buildings not in keeping with existing buildings.</li> <li>• Increase in noise -Due to increased population and increased vehicles.</li> <li>• Effect on Beauty -The current area is very popular with walkers, and promotes tourism to the local area.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Biodiversity and Landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Dark Skies, due to the number of proposed houses, and potential street lighting.</li> <li>• Impact of increased lighting on resident wildlife -Bats, Deer, Moths, Owls etc..)</li> </ul> <p>Community Services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village School is at maximum capacity and would not be able to increase intake.</li> <li>• Poor and very limited Bus Service</li> </ul> <p>We purposely chose to move to Far Forest to ensure a better quality of life for our family. If the plans were to be agreed, I am sure that it would lead us to reconsider our residency, and force us to move away from the community we feel and enjoy being apart of.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2391</a>	Object	<p>We object to the proposals:</p> <p>We are concerned about the increase in traffic on what are already very small and highly used roads. The additional traffic is also a concern with respect to our children walking to school.</p> <p>There are huge problems in Sugars Lane with a sewerage lake to wade through whenever we have rain, this is only going to get worse.</p> <p>A major concern is the placement of the properties especially those on Plough Lane, with social housing properties overlooking and backing on directly to the school playing fields.</p> <p>We are concerned about many more of the issues with the placement and size of the developments but these we feel are the 3 main circumstances that make us want to object.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2476</a>	Object	<p>Objection to the site proposals in Far Forest, that of Plough Lane and New Road.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>I site the following points:</p> <p>Traffic: It is only the main road that is adequately wide for regular two way traffic: Plough Lane, Church Lane and New Road are all narrow and this poses a particular problem in the case of Church Lane and New Road during peak school traffic times. Also it should be noted that due to the recent expansion of Casa Mia their over flow traffic now park on New Road all days of the week at any time of day.</p> <p>Further more, problems often occur when static caravans are being transported to the caravan park located at the bottom of Sugars Lane due to them becoming stuck attempting to negotiate parked cars and traffic. This is also an issue for farm vehicles.</p> <p>The main road is a popular thoroughfare, one which even existing junctions are inadequate and unsafe for especially due to the 30mph speed limit not being adhered to. Using local amenities such as the village shop, village hall, pub and bus stop all require crossing and walking alongside this very busy and fast flowing road.</p> <p>Utilities: Sewage is still processed at the sewage pump work on Sugars Lane and some village properties still use septic tanks.</p> <p>There is existing poor drainage of surface water that causes issues, the drainage of storm water is poor on New road with existing drains being neglected and blocked.</p> <p>We regularly experience power and water disruption with the slightest high winds or water leak causing reduction or total loss.</p> <p>Village school: Far Forest Primary School were not consulted or informed of the proposed developments. The school is already operating at full capacity. They have not been given the opportunity to voice their concerns or requirements to accommodate any additional pupil numbers.</p> <p>Poor bus service: The bus service is very limited and is located on the already busy main road where speed limits</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>are not adhered to. School children who use the public bus as school transport are regularly in danger crossing the road. It is known to us that at least one child has been 'clipped by a vehicle' whilst attempting to cross the road. It is important to note there are no pedestrian crossing in place in the village.</p> <p>Our relatives who have attempted to use the local bus to travel from Bewdley to visit have very limited choice due to the poor provision of buses to Far Forest.</p> <p>Well-being: When attending the consultation at St George's Hall, Bewdley I spoke to a former local councillor. It was suggested that a certain option was favourable because 'it wouldn't be the big boy developers' so they would only build a small number of larger properties. A smaller number of houses on a plot would mean larger house sizes and higher house prices. This does not have benefit to the local residents and these houses would not be affordable as suggested by the proposed development plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, if these new houses are inhabited with families who cannot get places for their children at the Village primary school then they are unable to be involved in the local community.</p> <p>Wildlife conservation: Existing habitats in the village such as hedgerows, trees and grasslands have remained untouched or developed for a sustained period of time making them invaluable to the local wildlife. Redevelopment would jeopardise the established wildlife that rely on such habitats.</p> <p>Skyline Change: Any developments undertaken on Plough Lane or New Road sites would make dramatic changes to the sky line and overlook existing properties. Many of the properties are bungalows and were designed as such to have low level impact on the sky line.</p> <p>Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology: Far Forest is described as 'a small village' and has historically been of a rural community. The character of the village includes not having street lighting, it's abundance of old orchards and woodlands, fields for deer to graze in and fields used not only as farm land but also as habitat to support the Wyre Forest wildlife. All of these features will be threatened, compromised and almost certainly destroyed by the proposed developments. Past generations have sought to protect, and develop afore mentioned landscapes in and around Far Forest to enable wildlife to thrive and prosper, some of</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>which will have been displaced by other developments in the near locality.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty: Far Forest is a village that is part of the Wyre Forest area and is actively advertised as a place of natural beauty. Tourists visit and explore the woodlands, footpaths and bridleways to observe the abundance of trees, insects, wildlife and undeveloped areas of natural beauty. Local residents have grown up enjoying and preserving the environment and those that have moved to the village have done so with the knowledge that they have the existing environment to enjoy and nurture for the benefit of future generations.</p> <p>Medical cover: Within the village there is no provision for a doctors surgery or medical centre. As a family of 5 we are patients of Bewdley medical centre which by all accounts is stretched to capacity already. When attempting to make medical appointments for ourselves as adults or indeed our young children we find that an appointment is not easy to get due to the already high existing demand.</p> <p>I trust that our comments will be considered when assessing the proposed developments in Far Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2539</a>	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the proposed building site on New Road Far Forest. My reasons are :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The effect on the beauty of the village. Lots of people come to Far Forest to walk down into the forest &amp; surrounding area.</li> <li>2. Change the character of the area. It is a village, not a housing estate.</li> <li>3. New Road is a nightmare, traffic can barely move at school hours, it is grid locked. I've witnessed the school bus getting stuck, trying to reverse to manoeuvre around parked cars (parents dropping off children &amp; residents' cars). New static caravans are taken down this road, to a very busy caravan park (signs are left out so people don't park their cars outside their homes) because Church Lane is too narrow to be used. There are several farms down the lane so lots of farm vehicles are a regular thing, again having problems passing residents parked cars. Delivery lorries have such a problem, often causing damage because the lane is so narrow. It would be impossible to widen the road, other than removing the only pavement. New Road does loop around to Church Lane but it is far narrower, 2 cars cannot pass in areas, also the junction onto Cleobury Road is extremely dangerous, an accident waiting to happen. Moreover Sunday service or a wedding at the church on Church Lane can cause vehicles to have</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>to reverse back up the road and turn because getting through is impossible. The narrowness of this country road / lane and children being dropped off at school, the fact that it is already congested, it is an accident waiting to happen.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The village school is already full to capacity, fairly recent extensions were made to accommodate demand and there are local children who still cannot secure a place.</li> <li>5. There is a problem with the sewage, we have continued issues with it even though it has been addressed many times over the years, it causes localized flooding at the end of the road which will only worsen if there are more houses built.</li> <li>6. The European Habitats Directory requires an assessment to be made of possible effects of certain plans on the integrity of European sites before a plan is adopted.</li> </ol> <p>Far Forest is a village, a beautiful one, with lots of wildlife in the proposed sites. There is not the infrastructure, places in the already over subscribed village school and regular buses to accommodate the amount of people that would come to live here.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2721</a>	Object	<p>We wish to object to the proposed development in Far Forest. Page 85 Reference number - policy 13 and 16 and Page 114 reference number – policy 18E</p> <p>We strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>The farm on Sugars Lane uses heavy plant and farm machinery on a day to day basis using New Road and Church Lane as access roads. The access at the end of Church Lane onto the A4117 is a terrible blind spot in which the traffic does not adhere to the speed limit. The farm uses heavy machinery which has to pull out onto the road with an excess of 30ft of equipment behind, which is dangerous so New Road is used. This can be chaotic as the road is already a busy area due to residents and school traffic, both of which park too far away from the curb meaning large vehicles can not pass easily with the machinery. New Road is frequently parked from top to bottom with cars and is even busier since the nearby residential home has expanded and their employees are using New Road to park too during the daytime. During school times i.e. drop off and collection, both New Road and Church Lane are both chaotic as drivers are coming from both ways. The traffic had increased even further with the added and expanding caravan site down Sugars Lane which people now live in rather than have as</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>holiday homes.</p> <p>Both New Road and Church Lane can not manage any further traffic from the proposed development.</p> <p>Page 97 Reference number – Policy number 28B</p> <p>Our other objection to this proposal is the sewerage. I witness first hand what happens when we have a spell of bad weather and it rains. The sewerage station floods and raw sewerage runs all over the road and then the tankers turn up. I have witnessed two tankers removing water from the sewerage pit at the same time and once they have filled their tankers up and before they have removed their pipes the pit is full again and overflowing. Severn Trent has upgraded the system in recent years to no prevail.</p> <p>If you add more dwellings to the area you will add more sewerage and water which the pumping station will not handle therefore causing even more sewerage problems.</p> <p>Myself and my family have had to walk through raw sewerage on the road and endure the loud sound of the tankers reversing beepers and the tanker lorries working 24/7 for days on end when the weather is bad. By adding further dwellings to the area will only increase this problem</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2994</a>	Object	<p>The recent work done by Severn Trent in the New Road, Sugars Lane area of the village has improved but not cured the problem with overflow and flooding of the sewerage system. The existing system could not cope with the addition of more houses on land above this facility. There is land to the south of the A4117 which may be suitable for housing and from which, it may be possible to connect into the existing sewage main pipes along that road.</p> <p>The school in New Road is at capacity and has no potential for growth. Any additional housing anywhere in the Rock Parish will add to the pupil numbers at Far Forest School. Has any thought been given to the possibility of building a new school on the land off New Road, possibly with an entrance in Station Road. The existing school site could then be used for housing, all with the proviso that the sewerage system is really sorted out.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>New Road is already a busy road being the main access road to the school and to properties and farm land beyond, and to the year-round residential caravan sites in Sugars Lane. At school drop-off and pick-up times, the traffic can be a major problem. A voluntary one way system, Station Road in and New Road out, has been suggested, tried before and abandoned because of non compliant drivers and the dangerous junction of Station Road with the A4117. ?Possible Peak time one way system and traffic lights</p> <p>New housing exiting onto New Road would exacerbate this problem? Possible vehicle entrance/exit onto Station Road?</p> <p>There is little employment in Far Forest and, at present, little potential for its growth. A proportion of new residents would, inevitably, need to travel into surrounding townships for work, shopping, health care and for schooling. As mentioned at the outset, I feel new development should take into account the need to minimise travelling, for all the oft-voiced environmental reasons, and, with this in mind, I feel new rural housing should be kept to a minimum.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3480</a>	Object	<p>Land adjacent to New Road, Far Forest</p> <p>This road access is very restricted especially at school times. The road is too narrow for the traffic using it now. If twenty more houses are built they will bring forty more cars or more.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3492</a>	Object	<p>We have noticed a marked increase in traffic along and around New Road/Church Road whilst I understand the Primary School will generate some traffic at certain times its the constant use of lorry's large mobile homes up and down to Sugars Lane caravan/mobile home site that really does concern me.</p> <p>The view from our house across the surrounding orchard and land is a real bonus to us, in fact we feel it enhances our well being and brings us lots of happiness.</p> <p>We have noticed more traffic, more problems with the sewerage plant (pump station) and speeding vehicles.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3303</a>	Object	<p>The proposed Far Forest development concerns me for the following reasons:</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Plough Lane Development: This is an un-adopted dirt lane. Should the development take place, it would need to be adopted, widened and tarmacked into a proper road. The A4117 is a busy road and access to the lane is directly opposite The Plough Inn, an extremely busy pub. Also the local shop and car park are directly by access into the A4117. A touring caravan site is also nearby and is fully occupied most weekends. All this would mean that access onto the A4117 would have to be extremely altered.</li> <li>2. New Road Development: Access to this site would have to be directly opposite Far Forest Lea Memorial School. Chaos already exists morning and afternoon when the school is in session. With the parking problem already in existence, the extra population would only make the problem worse. New Road would need to be widened or made one way. Speed limits would need to be vigorously enforced.</li> </ol> <p>Can the local school accommodate the extra children? There is a main sewerage but is it capable of taking the extra population? The same argument goes with other facilities.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3250</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road cannot take the traffic it now has, let alone that following another twenty houses.</li> <li>• The present school cannot take more children.</li> <li>• Have you seen the standard of Plough Lane and its access from Cleobury Road?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4265</a>	Object	<p>OBJECTION TO: BR/RO/4 ADJ TOLLAND BUNGALOW, FAR FOREST BR/RO/6 LAND REAR OF ORCHARD HOUSE, FAR FOREST.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A4117 Far Forest. On road/pavement parking by cars/commercial vehicles notably outside Orchard House, Baptist Church and Londis Shop causes holdups and is dangerous to pedestrians. Speeding on this road is also a major and well-known problem. To have another vehicular access onto this road would only exacerbate an already serious situation. Do we have to wait for loss of life to stop this?</li> <li>2. Land rear of Orchard House and adj. Tollard Bungalow teems with wildlife including Muntjac and Fallow</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Deer. Several endangered species of moths, beetles and other insects would suffer greatly from development on these proposed sites. Please rethink allowing the introduction of housing and street lighting to destroy their natural habitat.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a shop with a post office and a bus service. However, the post office has been threatened recently with closure and the Diamond bus service is intermittent.</li> <li>More traffic using New Road to access the school is highly dangerous to the children/parents and there is concern as to how the demand for additional school places will be met.</li> <li>The infrastructure at present cannot cope with more residents. GP surgeries, Fire and Ambulance services are all stretched. Sewerage and water has been a problem in the village for a long time; electricity can also be a problem with innumerable power cuts.</li> <li>The 2013 Planning Review was against development in Far Forest because it would be detrimental to the countryside. What has changed?</li> <li>People living in the village need to be able to work as there are very few opportunities for employment in Far Forest. Let's not make Far Forest another commuter belt.</li> <li>The population of Far Forest can almost double during the holiday season with tourists coming to enjoy the village and adjoining countryside bringing in much needed revenue for local pubs and restaurants etc.</li> </ol> <p>In general concern about the impact on traffic, services and the countryside that these planning proposals will make.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4266</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of "protected" birds in this area/nationally.</li> <li>Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li> <li>The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</p> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4267</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in New Road Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road is narrow and already congested with added traffic from local caravan sites</li> <li>• More places in the local school increases traffic. Inadequate sewerage/flooding an ongoing problem</li> <li>• Poor bus service</li> <li>• Loss of dark skies/wildlife</li> <li>• Loss of grazing land</li> <li>• Far Forest is a rural community with no street lighting</li> <li>• Increase in population would not benefit existing villagers just increase current problems as above</li> <li>• Little employment in Far Forest, residents have to work outside area</li> <li>• Nothing for young people to do.</li> <li>• No medical cover in the village; those close are full to capacity</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4268</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 &amp; BR/RO/7:</p> <p>Policy 13 Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest - Managing Travel Demand A i,ii,iii B Page 85:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already traffic congestion and Tolland bungalow site has access issues</li> <li>• There is no support for additional families which doesn't satisfy policy 13 section</li> <li>• loss of wildlife</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4269</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in Far Forest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reference is made to the A4117 in Policy 13</li> <li>• Heavy traffic, some speeding, near houses, shop, pub/traffic congestion would increase</li> <li>• No local employment/limited public transport/no medical facilities.</li> <li>• Proposed sites are opposite school whose capacity could not be increased</li> <li>• Existing sewage provision inadequate</li> <li>• Loss of Grazing land/wildlife/loss of landscape</li> <li>• Earlier Planning applications refused due impact on landscape</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4270</a>	Object	<p>Object to development in New Road, Far Forest:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic congestion</li> <li>2. Existing sewage system inadequate</li> <li>3. Effect on wildlife</li> <li>4. Loss of hay meadows/the area's natural beauty</li> </ol> <p>Regenerate Kidderminster instead</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4271</a>	Object	<p>Object to BR/RO/4/6 and BR/RO/7 because of Impact on Biodiversity Biodiversity, policy 11C (policy 11D), on Landscape Character (policy 11C, policy 148) and amenity, and on traffic (policy 12/13).</p> <p>There is no indication of need for this level of housing locally, no prospect of new jobs and where protection of biodiversity, preservation of landscape character, importance of access to work and facilities, and reduction in car use, all factors specified in the District Plan, indicate its unsuitability. While the Plan hypothesises improved rural bus services and other mitigating factors, is this realistic within the next 15 years under foreseeable economic circumstances?</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Bungalows rather than houses could be built elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>A brown field site, part of the nursery further down A4117, has been put forward where it would not impact on the side roads.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4272</a>	Object	<p>Distribution of Rural Development: Wyre Forest rural development is disproportionately centred on Far Forest with 60 of 105 (57%) of properties proposed here. This proportion increases to 71% if the Clows Top site is used as a Travellers site. In the last decade Far Forest saw a similar effect of new development with inadequate compensatory improvement in local services and facilities. This plan should target the development more equitably throughout the Rural West.</p> <p>Character/Nature: Far Forest is an open and widespread rural settlement. The proposed developments would urbanize the village. Density of housing proposed is more suitable to housing estates in urban areas. The urbanization could deter visitors to the village, its caravan site, Public House, shop and to the forest itself.</p> <p>Health/Environment: There would be significant increases in air, light and noise pollution in the settlement generally and specifically in the areas immediately surrounding the development sites, from both vehicles and homes. There is little employment in the village. There would be a consequent increase in vehicular traffic due to the inadequate and unreliable bus service.</p> <p>Sewage/Drainage: The village system is inadequate. There is frequent flooding of rainwater and sewerage in Sugars Lane due to run off from the sloping nature of the land across the village away from the A4117, including the proposed development sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4273</a>	Object	<p>This site is completely unsuitable for development and our objections are set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPRE highlights the need to reduce 'Night Blight' and protect Dark Skies. Far Forest comes alive at night with a multitude of species. The particular nature of small traditional meadows and orchards on the fringe of the forest needs to be preserved for these species. Development even without streetlights would lead to a scourge of security lighting and a dramatic impact on wildlife.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>This land is also of particular interest as it has been farmed in a traditional manor and not suffered from intensive farming methods, its native hedgerows are species rich, meadows being cut for hay with a wealth of flora and fauna.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if this site should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Far Forest Primary school and The Bewdley School currently are oversubscribed and could not accommodate an increase in the proposed population.</li> <li>• No available NHS places at either dental practice of Cleobury or Bewdley.</li> <li>• The minimalistic Bus service is not fit for use and certainly not to be relied upon for dependable transport to work or appointments. This service is very intermittent even on the weekdays, on a Sunday it is non-existent.</li> <li>• No local Police, Fire or Ambulance service. Nearest Stations currently being - Kidderminster or Stourport.</li> <li>• There are insufficient work opportunities in Far Forest for 40 plus households; so this will result in additional commuters.</li> <li>• Access to the A4117 for the twenty proposed houses adjacent to the Tolland Bungalow would have to be made via Plough Lane or via the entrance currently used to service Orchard House. This section of road already contains several busy junctions including: The Plough Pub that serves 1200 plus meals per week; The bus stop outside the Plough Pub; Far Forest Stores that has its own parking facility but HGV's and tractors have to park on the road / pavement; • Far Forest Methodist Chapel that has parking for 2 cars with other congregation members parking on the road.; New road.</li> <li>• New Road services Oak Leaf Rise estate, the houses along the road, Far Forest School, Hill Crest Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Wyre Forest Holiday Village sites down Sugars lane. The caravan sites contains permanent and 11 month lease caravans, most are fully occupied for the 11 month period resulting in significantly more commuter traffic on Sugars Lane and New Road. Caravan sites have been developed extensively in the area recently, The Willows has increased Far Forest population considerably all be it that the majority of these dwellings only have 11month residence permits the presence of this extra population, along with numerous others must be taken into account. Although New Road is designed for traffic to travel in both directions some of the houses neighbouring the road have no parking facilities.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Thus resulting in approximately half the length of New Road effectively being reduced to a single lane for traffic and almost 100% of the road is reduced at term time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plough Lane is a footpath, an increase in traffic would put walkers at risk. Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are common</li> <li>• At peak times traffic on the A4117 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution to the area. I would urge a full independent highways review prior to any decision making.</li> <li>• Plough Lane has no provision for storm water drainage. Run off from the purposed quantity of properties has the potential to cause flooding further down the lane. Some of the properties in Plough Lane were built prior to modern building techniques and exist without foundations, changes to ground conditions has the potential to result in subsidence. Currently with every downpour Severn Trent battles with a convoy of tankers to prevent the pumping station in Far Forest flooding, we cannot cope with the existing waste from the properties that we have. More properties would lead to land being contaminated with raw sewerage.</li> </ul> <p>In summary, the proposal for future development in Far Forest is unacceptable, the stable village population does not warrant this proposal, and less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brownfield sites. Applications made previously for the Far Forest sites have been declined with very good reason, these concerns not only still stand but have been exacerbated. Equal distribution of development across Wyre Forest has been grossly neglected in this instance. Far Forest currently a village will soon become a town. Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for all.</p> <p>With so many fundamental issues weighing so heavily against the proposal, we would request that the District Council rejects the proposition without hesitation.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04275</a>	Object	<p>We would like to lodge our objections to this proposed development. As residents of Far Forest we are very concerned at the proposed plans to develop land in our village. We would like to draw your attention to the following issues.</p> <p>Transport &amp; Accessibility: The increase of traffic using both Plough Lane &amp; New Road will have a negative effect.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Plough Lane will need to be made into a proper road junction as it is currently just a rough road. It is also nearby to a busy shop and public house and driveways to private houses therefore increasing the safety risk to pedestrians &amp; other road users. New Road is a narrow road and passing cars is already difficult, complicated by the school traffic which currently causes horrendous congestion during term time, the school bus already has problems trying to manoeuvre. Users of the church are increased for weddings &amp; funerals, especially as there are no areas to turn large vehicles so there is a need to drive all the way round New Road &amp; Church Lane. Sugars Lane is the main route down to a large caravan/ park home site, the narrow lane is in constant use by site users and also by lorries delivering &amp; collecting caravans, their only means of entrance/ exit being New Road. There are no footpaths along Church Lane, making walking along here more hazardous if the traffic increases any more. The Church Lane junction onto Lem Hill Bank is dangerous due to the blind spot and speed of traffic onto the A4117. These roads are also well used by a local farmer &amp; his tractor &amp; plant machinery trying to run his business. The A4117 is the main road in and out of the village and currently has a 30mph speed limit changing to 40mph part the way through. This limit is exceeded by many. The increase of traffic coming off side roads onto this busy road will see an increase in accidents. The increased traffic would have a negative effect on the health of local residents. The current bus service is totally unreliable due to continuous vehicle breakdowns and cannot be relied upon for journeys out of the area, especially to a workplace or school.</p> <p>A Unique Place: The land proposed is an untouched and natural habitat for many species of wildlife, there are very old damson and cherry trees in the fields on New Road. The ongoing forestry work in the Wyre Forest has displaced a number of wildlife out into the village especially many of the deer, these now reside in these fields. The fields have not been used for crops, only for grazing of local livestock and hay making for feed, this makes it a very rich environment for wildlife including bats, moths, insects, reptiles &amp; birds as part of the outlying area of the Wyre Forest.</p> <p>We have concerns over the loss of dark skies. The number of houses proposed will have an impact on this. Dark skies are part of the village life and are important to the character of the village. People come to the area to visit and walk in the Wyre Forest as it is a place of beauty.</p> <p>The beautiful views of the Wyre Forest and fields in the area including across the Shropshire border which will</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>be blanked out by a modern housing estate, this goes against the ethos of the village.</p> <p>More houses will increase noise pollution of both a human nature &amp; of vehicles.</p> <p>Water Management: The Severn Trent Water plant on Sugars Lane has regular tanker visits to empty them as they do not appear to be able to cope with the current demand. During heavy rainstorms, they have to run all night operations to keep the levels down. This creates more traffic and disturbance to the local residents and shows that the increase of housing will have a negative impact.</p> <p>Health: There is very little employment in the village, people would have to go further afield for work, increasing the travel costs, use of cars, traffic pollution and the carbon footprint, which surely, we should be trying to reduce.</p> <p>There are no Doctors in the village so people would have to use either Bewdley or Cleobury, both of which are full to capacity.</p> <p>Any changes to Far Forest will not have any positive benefit to those already residing here.</p> <p>The above reasons are why we are objecting to any development in Far Forest.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4276</a>	Object	<p>I write this letter as evidence for my objection of building on the following 2 sites in Far Forest.</p> <p>New Road - Objection reasons;</p> <p>This land was rejected for building in 2010. The reasons for rejection have not changed in anyway and in fact some elements of the village have negatively increased as I trust my rationales for rejecting the proposal state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation and Ecology - pg. 80/81 A Unique place to live</li> <li>• 11.29/Protecting and enhancing 11D pg. 85, Biodiversity and Geological</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation i,ii. Landscape Character - a Unique place pg. 79.</li> <li>• 11A Unique place - Historic Environment B 11,1x pg. 77</li> <li>• Habitats regulations(HRA) Screening Environment 1.4</li> <li>• 8 Rural Exception Sites iii pg.5</li> <li>• Strategic Green Infrastructure B ii pg.94</li> <li>• Infill Policy 18B i,ii 18.8 18.9 18.10 pg.112, pg. 113.</li> </ul> <p>The 2 meadows that have been identified on the Wyre Forest District Plan indicated as option A and B are currently used by a local farmer. These have never been used for arable farming and have only been used for grazing and haymaking which is traditional to the area. The one Meadow has an old orchard within in it.</p> <p>These lands are valuable to the richness of the Wyre Forest and the support they provide to its wildlife and natural flora and fauna. They also provide employment to the farmer.</p> <p>It is important to note that there have been adders spotted in this vicinity which is a protected species.</p> <p>There is also a strong possibility that a rare beetle called the 'Noble Chaffer' resides in the old orchard in the option B site. As a resident adjacent to this Meadow has had it confirmed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust that this beetle can be found in his orchard and therefore it is reasonable to believe they will be found there too.</p> <p>The European Habitats Directory requires an assessment to be made of the possible effects of certain plans on the integrity of the site before a plan can be adopted. This is taken to mean, that it would be expected that any plan to develop this land would not progress at all and be seen as unfounded/not possible if protected and important species were found and /or the ecology of the land would be damaged.</p> <p>The area has a wide range of animals and birds regularly seen in the village which includes these 2 meadow sites. Examples are Owls, Bats, Buzzard, Goshawk, numerous butterflies and moths, native deer, Field voles and field mice, bees and insect life The food chain being important for these animals and birds etc in turn to thrive and survive. Any loss to these 2 areas would have a negative impact on the conservation and supportive role to the</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Forest itself which is well known for its rich wildlife.</p> <p>The 2 meadow sites it is important to point out have ancient hedgerows and is something the Wyre Forest District council has supported the protection of along with old orchards and dead wood. So effecting these in anyway would I believe go against the councils own policies.</p> <p>The hedgerows themselves support an abundance of insect, reptiles and birdlife which is an important element to the ecology and conservation of the Wyre Forest Area.</p> <p>Dark skies - Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geological Conservation policy 11D pg.80/81 pg. 103, Policy C - Landscape Character pg. 79</p> <p>We are very lucky in this village to be able to stand in our gardens and see the stars. Light pollution in this village is very low. This is important to the area due to its significant moth and bat populations for which the area is renowned. It also assists other night time animals/birds. The dark skies have always been part of our village life and important to its character. The development of 20 or 40 houses on the New Road site would threaten this significantly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities - Sewage Systems and water Quality Policy 15B - section iii and</li> <li>• section 15 pg. 97</li> <li>• 15C - Flood Risk Management pg. 98</li> <li>• 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems pg.100.</li> <li>• A desirable place to live - section 8 policy 8C point ii-iii pg. 55-56</li> <li>• Rural Development 28 Policy 28B pg.97 and pg. 100.</li> </ul> <p>The sewage on New Road is well known by its residents as not being adequate for the number of houses in situ to date. The pumping station is not able to cope with demand, especially in conjunction with storm water. When it has rained it is known that in the dip on Sugars lane outside Coppice Gate Cottage, a ford of storm water and sewage can be seen like a river across the road. Following heavy rain it is not unusual to have tankers coming to</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>take the excess water away as the pumping station is not able to cope at these times. Additional houses would only exacerbate this known issue and increase the pressure on an weak system impacting on health including he seeping of foul water into the small brook that runs accent across the road from the 'sewage ford' and into an SSSI site.</p> <p>I also have concerns regarding land drainage down New Road if houses are built on both or either of the sites, as there is a natural runoff down the backs of the fields and gardens, down the meadows to the bottom of New Road and Church Lane. This is a long standing and natural occurrence. If houses are built this will potentially increase the surface water and volume, which will not able to be absorbed and dissipated as it travels down the fields to the road and onto the orchards and fields below the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest pg. 85</li> <li>• Transport/Roads policy 13 managing travel demand Ai,ii,ii and B, Highways Network 13.12 pg. 88-89,</li> <li>• Policy 16 - pollution and land instability 16.2 Policy 18 E pg.114, Rural Development 28- policy 28B pg. 169</li> </ul> <p>Any increase in housing will naturally increase the vehicle use of the road.</p> <p>New Road in particular is a well used and busy road. It is the safest route for many, as the alternative road out of the village along Church Lane is much narrower and the junction onto the Cleobury road (A4117) is fast This includes a junction and blind spot as cars come up Lem Hill from the Cleobury direction. It is only natural to enter and exit the village from New Road.</p> <p>During school term the road is well known for its congestion and gridlock as people try to enter and exit New Road. This includes school bus, council vehicles and other road users.</p> <p>New Road is not particularly wide and parked cars on the road side can make passing difficult. There are Agricultural vehicles regularly using New Road as well as Plant machinery as there is a family business from</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Lynalls Lane.</p> <p>We have a number of caravan/chalet sites in the locality where individuals may reside for up to 11 months of the year. The Willows on Cleobury Road and Acre Farm Caravan site at the bottom of Ranter's Bank. Down Sugars Lane we have 2 sites - Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Goodmore Farm. These alone house a high population of residents to the area and who are often unseen residents.</p> <p>The 2 caravan parks on Sugars lane heighten the use of cars impacting on New Road. This includes the removal and deliveries of new caravans. Church lane is not suitable for as previously stated due to its narrow nature and with regards to caravan movement way too narrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wellbeing - Health 9.1 - 9.10 pg.68-88</li> </ul> <p>Any change to Far Forest in respect of these proposals will have no positive benefit to those individuals like myself living there. Any development will only increase the issues already highlighted i.e. traffic/sewage/light pollution</p> <p>Change of Character and landscape to the area -</p> <p>Desirable place to live ii,iii Section 8- policy 8C pg. 55-56. Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live, Quality Design and Local distinctiveness 27 pg. 154-164.</p> <p>Any new development in the area will be at the hands of the developer, these may not be at a design in keeping with the local area. Additional houses will create the feel of a housing estate which is not in keeping with the village character or ethos.</p> <p>It is my belief that the proposal from Wyre Forest District Councils Plan is not infill as the development is on the external area of the village and therefore not conducive with its own policy.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The village is open and well scattered in parts, which is important to the village character and to the wildlife that shares this space with its inhabitants.</p> <p>I feel strongly that this remains the case for the future of the Wyre Forest itself and the village for the next generations to come. By developing the land here this will be lost and not regained to the detriment of the landscape and its wonderful character.</p> <p>Other key points to make for both sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus service - Section 8 pg.56, Policy 3 pg. 85</li> </ul> <p>It is believed we have a good local bus service by Wyre Forest District. We have approximately 1 bus an hour. Other Villages such as Bliss gate and Rock Village have up to 3 buses an hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village School - Community Facilities 20 pg.116</li> </ul> <p>The school serves not just the village, but Rock, Heightington, Bliss Gate, Bewdley and children as far as Kidderminster. The school has fairly recently had extensions to it to enable it to accommodate demand. An increase houses will mean an increase in children and it is not clear whether the school will be able to meet the demands of the children in the village as this has not always been the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment - Health 9.1- 9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul> <p>The village offers little in the terms of employment. Those who work mainly travel towards Kidderminster, Stourport, Worcester or Birmingham. People therefore have to go farther a field to find work. The ownership of a car is essential as the bus service is poor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical Cover - Health 9.1-9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>The village does not have its own practice and so we have to use either Bewdley Medical centre or Cleobury Mortimer. An increase in our village will have an impact on the respective medical practices and ensuring they have capacity to register individuals.</p> <p>Shropshire -</p> <p>With Shropshire just on the outskirts of the village it is not clear what impact this will have on their building plans and apparent needs. Over the years the increase in houses in Cleobury Mortimer has seen an increase in traffic along the A 4117.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty of our village - A unique place to live 11B pg.80/81, 11.3 Section 3 i,ii,iii,iv,v., Historic Environment B ii, ix pg.77, 11C Landscape and character pg.79, 8 Rural Exception sites iii pg.5, Strategic Green Infrastructure B iii pg.94, Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i ii pg.112, 18.8, 18.9.18.10 pg.113, Sustainable Tourism 23 pg.137-144</p> <p>This is currently an area for which people come to enjoy and come to visit, walk and experience the rural areas of the Wyre Forest. Far Forest is popular due to its access to the forest itself and surrounding countywide, its public house and the touring caravan site on Pound Bank for example. The Wyre Forest District Council advertises the district as a place of beauty and encourages tourism. How can building 60 houses in a small spears out village such as ours be sustaining the very heart of what the Wyre Forest stands for?</p> <p>The development will have substantial and devastating change to both the character and appearance of Far Forest and would certainly fail to enhance this valuable open space. This is valuable landscape not only for the village but for the future of the area and its wildlife and for which both the inhabitants of the district and visitors enjoy at their leisure.</p> <p>So I implore the Wyre Forest District Council to reconsider the all sites identified at Far Forest. The inhabitants at Clows Top for example are wanting houses on their brownfield site identified on the Wyre Forest Districts Plan. Kidderminster has many brownfield sites and to regenerate the town this to me is the most obvious area to assign building too, not countryside or greenbelt which are the easiest/cheapest to build new properties on.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Much smaller plots around the rural district would be more palatable instead of large numbers of houses encroaching on a small community as in the case of New Road and The Orchard House.</p> <p>I also feel that the proposed number of houses in our district is over estimated with the models used to do so, this has been published in the Local papers as the case.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3961</a>	Object	<p>Development of this area would have untold consequences on potentially rare and endangered species.</p> <p>A full independent wildlife study and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) needs to be carried out to determine if these sites should have special status as there are endangered species local to this area. This ground is a text book example of landscape and habitat that should be protected under the Wildlife Conservation Act 2006.</p> <p>There are insufficient work opportunities in Far Forest for 40 plus households; so, this will result in additional commuters.</p> <p>Visibility out of Plough Lane is often restricted, accidents and near misses are frequent. An increase in traffic would put walkers at risk.</p> <p>At peak times traffic on the A41 17 is at a standstill at the junction with the A456, this is a recognised accident black spot, a further rise in vehicles will no doubt jeopardise safety and increase noise and pollution.</p> <p>Less valuable sites should be prioritised for small scale settlements, in particular on brown field sites.</p> <p>Development would create an unacceptable increase in traffic on already difficult to use roads, destroy wildlife habitat, agricultural land and jeopardise village life for future generations.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4287</a>	Object	<p>We object to the sites proposed at Far Forest on the following grounds:</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Infrastructure – Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Rd Far Forest is a narrow road, difficult to pass residents' parked cars and at school times it causes major problems.</li> <li>• Used by farm machinery all through the day.</li> <li>• Junction to main road has limited visibility with bus stop also on the junction.</li> <li>• Cars parked at village hall kerbside also causes problems.</li> <li>• Traffic on main road travels fast regardless of speed restrictions especially morning evening and late at night a race track.</li> <li>• Church Lane junction with main Cleobury Road is narrow and has very poor visibility with blind corners. 2 school buses use it morning and afternoon.</li> <li>• Church Lane used by many dog walkers. An increase in traffic is dangerous for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Church used regularly for weddings and funerals, this blocks the lane.</li> <li>• Plough Lane is currently used by only residents and farm vehicles and walkers. Its junction with the main Cleobury Road is unmade, narrow and conflicts with the entrance to The Plough Inn and The Village Stores, there have been a few bad accidents at this junction over the years.</li> <li>• There has been an increase in car and large lorry traffic travelling along the Cleobury Road through Far Forest, partly due to the expansion of Cleobury Mortimer.</li> </ul> <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses will impact existing views of the Wyre Forest surrounding the village. This is not acceptable.</li> <li>• New development would affect the character of Far Forest. New road is already an assortment of buildings and building on Plough Lane is outrageous it is a peaceful area with many types of wildlife living there</li> </ul> <p>Infrastructure - sewerage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing sewage system is inadequate although it has been worked on several times in recent years.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>It regularly smells very bad and leaks across Sugars Lane.</p> <p>Wildlife</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is an area with open fields, woodland hedges, trees and Wild flowers. It supports many species of wildlife which attract visitors to the area. This should be protected for the future. Noise pollution noise will destroy the quietness of Plough Lane and Church Lane.</li> </ul> <p>Agricultural Land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of land to Farmers who are an integral part of Far Forest life, keeping the character and focus in country living.</li> </ul> <p>Employment and access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is little employment in Far Forest - many residents have to travel for work, bus service is poor.</li> </ul> <p>Light Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of dark sky at night is a very important concern. It is an important part of life in this area, for residents and wildlife. The neighbouring caravan park which was unused for 25 years now has 25 large caravan homes with street lights, no one consulted the surrounding residents about this change.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3594</a>	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposed building at Far Forest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Far Forest is a unique place to live with natural habitats and wildlife that are at significant danger of decline/damage. Hedge Rows are important in this area as there are a large number of hedgehogs /reptiles etc who live/hibernate in there. Bird life would be damaged and we believe to the detriment of “protected” birds in this area/nationally.</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response															
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Skyline changes would have an adverse effect upon those already in residence as the very basis of living in rural areas is to observe the natural surroundings.</li><li>• The Character of the area would be adversely affected to the detriment of exiting residents. The whole point of living in a rural area is the lack of buildings, low noise levels, reduced population and low pollution levels.</li></ul> <p>These are just a few of our objections in respect to the proposed build.</p> <p>We feel that by imposing new housing (which we presume would have to include an element of social housing) would make a beautiful, peaceful area into an urbanised shambles and spoil an area of natural beauty.</p>															
	<a href="#">LPPO2224</a>	Object	<p>I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed developments in the Far Forest area. Namely Plough Lane/The Orchard House - 20 houses in total and New Road Development proposal - 40 houses in total. My reasons are as follows:-</p> <p><u>Page No. On Ref. No.</u> <u>WFDP</u></p> <table><tr><td>97</td><td>28</td><td>Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.</td></tr><tr><td>98</td><td>15</td><td>Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.</td></tr><tr><td>85</td><td>13</td><td>Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.</td></tr><tr><td>88-89</td><td>13</td><td>New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.</td></tr><tr><td>103</td><td>16</td><td>Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and</td></tr></table>	97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.	98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.	85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.	88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.	103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and
97	28	Local Utilities i.e. Sewage System is already inadequate and currently flooding occurs in Sugars Lane every time we get rain, sewage is lying on the road, obviously this system cannot cope with any more houses.																
98	15	Flooding already occurs after significant rainfall in the areas proposed for development, causing significant run off Construction of more properties will aggravate the problem.																
85	13	Traffic - Plough Lane an unadopted single track lane is already a dangerous junction, due to its proximity to the Plough pub and the local shop and chapel. There is a speed limit of 30mph through the village but it is regularly ignored.																
88-89	13	New Road is a narrow typical village road and gets very congested.																
103	16	Especially at certain times of day. As it is a rural area large tractors and																

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>other farm machinery need to use this road, parked cars make this very difficult for local farmers. The junction of New Road with the main Cleobury Road is also a known danger zone. More traffic can only make this worse. The alternative route via Sugars Lane is even narrower and has an even more dangerous junction with the Cleobury Road.</p> <p>80, 85      11      Far Forest sits on the edge of the Wyre Forest, a wildlife conservation area. Many of the local fields and hedgerows and very old trees support wildlife such as reptiles, (adders, newts etc.)Insects (moths, butterflies, beetles etc) and birds, some of these are protected, and will be endangered by these developments.</p> <p>94      18      Deer graze in the fields and seek refuge there from the very busy Wyre Forest, they are already under pressure as they have already lost some of their natural woodland habitat. Local farmers use the fields for grazing.</p> <p>5      8      The Plough Lane site includes an ancient orchard of damson and cherry trees, which supports much wildlife.</p> <p>80, 81, 77      11D      Far Forest is a village and as such has very little street lighting. This is how we like our village. More housing would mean the loss of our dark skies, we like to see the stars at night, its part of the character of the village.</p> <p>79      16      Street lighting will also affect wildlife mentioned above.</p> <p>66-68      9      The village offers very few job prospects, therefore occupants of the proposed housing would have to commute by car as public transport is poor, causing more car usage and more pollution.</p> <p>55-56      8 1      Far Forest is a unique village, the proposed developments will significantly change its character. As I understand the proposal the developer will be responsible for the design, and will therefore consider cost to be the most important factor, not preserving the character of the village.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>80/81 77, 11 Effect on the Natural Beauty of the area. This area is a place of tourism 79, 5, 94, where people come to enjoy the woodland the surrounding areas and the 112/113 8 wildlife. Who will want to visit a housing estate? 137-144</p> <p>Finally I would like to ask why choose an area so rich in wildlife, supporting tourism and a unique, historic village much loved by its inhabitants, when there are brown field sites within the Wyre Forest that could be developed instead?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2602</a>	Object	<p>Traffic Congestion, road safety, roads are narrow already heavily used lanes.</p> <p>Local Wildlife, land under consideration is an oasis for local wildlife.</p> <p>The Necessity, Why chose to build in villages where there are little employment opportunities. There are many brownfield sites in Kidderminster.</p> <p>Utilities, Sewerage system is marginal, many properties have septic tanks which are susceptible to flooding.</p> <p>Change of character to the area, currently a beauty spot for visitors, the effect on the area will all contribute to Far Forest becoming just another housing estate.</p> <p>Other considerations, the road network.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2469</a>	Object	<p>Object option B, Far Forest:</p> <p>Well-being/Concerns over loss of dark skies/Negative impact on the character of the village and its ecology/Effect on the beauty/Change of character to the area/There is little employment/Higher human population/Traffic</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1728</a>	Object	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can the school cope with more pupils.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3252</a>	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Road cannot take the traffic it now has, let alone that following another twenty houses.</li> <li>• The present school cannot take more children.</li> <li>• Have you seen the standard of Plough Lane and its access from Cleobury Road?</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5146</a>	Object	<p>New Road -Objection reasons;</p> <p>New Road; This land was rejected for building in 2010. The reasons for rejection have not changed in anyway and in fact some elements of the village have negatively increased as I trust my rationales for rejecting the proposal state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife Conservation and Ecology - pg.80/81 A Unique place to live</li> <li>• 11.29/Protecting and enhancing 11D pg.85, Biodiversity and Geological</li> <li>• Conservation i,ii. Landscape Character - a Unique place pg.79.</li> <li>• 11A Unique place - Historic Environment B 11,1x pg.77</li> <li>• Habitats regulations(HRA) Screening Environment 1.4</li> <li>• 8 Rural Exception Sites iii pg.5</li> <li>• Strategic Green Infrastructure B ii pg.94</li> <li>• Infill Policy 18B i,ii 18.8 18.9 18.10 pg.112, pg.113.</li> </ul> <p>The 2 meadows that have been identified on the Wyre Forest District Plan indicated as option A and B are currently used by a local farmer. These have never been used for arable farming and have only been used for grazing and haymaking which is traditional to the area. The one Meadow has an old orchard within it.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>These lands are valuable to the richness of the Wyre Forest and the support they provide to its wildlife and natural flora and fauna. They also provide employment to the farmer.</p> <p>It is important to note that there have been adders spotted in this vicinity which is a protected species.</p> <p>There is also a strong possibility that a rare beetle called the ‘Noble Chaffer’ resides in the old orchard in the option B site. As a resident adjacent to this Meadow has had it confirmed by the Worcestershire Wildlife Trust that this beetle can be found in his orchard and therefore it is reasonable to believe they will be found there too.</p> <p>The European Habitats Directory requires an assessment to be made of the possible effects of certain plans on the integrity of the site before a plan can be adopted. This is taken to mean, that it would be expected that any plan to develop this land would not progress at all and be seen as unfounded/not possible if protected and important species were found and /or the ecology of the land would be damaged.</p> <p>The area has a wide range of animals and birds regularly seen in the village which includes these 2 meadow sites. Examples are Owls, Bats, Buzzard, Goshawk, numerous butterflies and moths, native deer, Field voles and field mice, bees and insect life The food chain being important for these animals and birds etc in turn to thrive and survive. Any loss to these 2 areas would have a negative impact on the conservation and supportive role to the Forest itself which is well known for its rich wildlife.</p> <p>The 2 meadow sites it is important to point out have ancient hedgerows and is something the Wyre Forest District council has supported the protection of along with old orchards and dead wood. So effecting these in anyway would I believe go against the councils own policies.</p> <p>The hedgerows themselves support an abundance of insect, reptiles and birdlife which is an important element to the ecology and conservation of the Wyre Forest Area.</p> <p>Dark skies - Protecting and Enhancing Biodiversity and Geological Conservation policy 11D pg.80/81 pg.103,</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Policy C - Landscape Character pg.79</p> <p>We are very lucky in this village to be able to stand in our gardens and see the stars. Light pollution in this village is very low. This is important to the area due to its significant moth and bat populations for which the area is renowned. It also assists other night time animals/birds. The dark skies have always been part of our village life and important to its character. The development of 20 or 40 houses on the New Road site would threaten this significantly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilities - Sewage Systems and water Quality Policy 15B - section iii and section 15 pg.97</li> <li>• 15C - Flood Risk Management pg.98</li> <li>• 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems pg.100.</li> <li>• A desirable place to live - section 8 policy 8C point ii-iii pg.55-56</li> <li>• Rural Development 28 Policy 28B pg.97 and pg.100.</li> </ul> <p>The sewage on New Road is well known by its residents as not being adequate for the number of houses in situ to date. The pumping station is not able to cope with demand, especially in conjunction with storm water. When it has rained it is known that in the dip on Sugars lane outside Coppice Gate Cottage, a ford of storm water and sewage can be seen like a river across the road. Following heavy rain it is not unusual to have tankers coming to take the excess water away as the pumping station is not able to cope at these times. Additional houses would only exacerbate this known issue and increase the pressure on an weak system impacting on health including he seeping of foul water into the small brook that runs accent across the road from the 'sewage ford' and into an SSSI site.</p> <p>I also have concerns regarding land drainage down New Road if houses are built on both or either of the sites, as there is a natural runoff down the backs of the fields and gardens, down the meadows to the bottom of New Road and Church Lane. This is a long standing and natural occurrence. If houses are built this will potentially increase the surface water and volume, which will not able to be absorbed and dissipated as it travels down the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>fields to the road and onto the orchards and fields below the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic - Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest pg.85</li> <li>• Transport/Roads policy 13 managing travel demand Ai,ii,ii and B, Highways Network 13.12 pg.88-89,</li> <li>• Policy 16 - pollution and land instability 16.2 Policy 18 E pg.114, Rural Development 28- policy 28B pg.169</li> </ul> <p>Any increase in housing will naturally increase the vehicle use of the road.</p> <p>New Road in particular is a well used and busy road. It is the safest route for many, as the alternative road out of the village along Church Lane is much narrower and the junction onto the Cleobury road (A4117) is fast This includes a junction and blind spot as cars come up Lem Hill from the Cleobury direction. It is only natural to enter and exit the village from New Road.</p> <p>During school term the road is well known for its congestion and gridlock as people try to enter and exit New Road. This includes school bus, council vehicles and other road users.</p> <p>New Road is not particularly wide and parked cars on the road side can make passing difficult. There are Agricultural vehicles regularly using New Road as well as Plant machinery as there is a family business from Lynalls Lane.</p> <p>We have a number of caravan/chalet sites in the locality where individuals may reside for up to 11 months of the year. The Willows on Cleobury Road and Acre Farm Caravan site at the bottom of Ranter's Bank. Down Sugars Lane we have 2 sites - Wyre Forest Caravan Park and Goodmore Farm. These alone house a high population of residents to the area and who are often unseen residents.</p> <p>The 2 caravan parks on Sugars lane heighten the use of cars impacting on New Road. This includes the removal and deliveries of new caravans. Church lane is not suitable for as previously stated due to its narrow nature and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>with regards to caravan movement way too narrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wellbeing - Health 9.1 - 9.10 pg.68-88</li> </ul> <p>Any change to Far Forest in respect of these proposals will have no positive benefit to those individuals like myself living there. Any development will only increase the issues already highlighted i.e. traffic/sewage/light pollution</p> <p>Change of Character and landscape to the area -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desirable place to live ii,iii Section 8- policy 8C pg.55-56. Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live, Quality Design and Local distinctiveness 27 pg.154-164.</li> </ul> <p>Any new development in the area will be at the hands of the developer, these may not be at a design in keeping with the local area. Additional houses will create the feel of a housing estate which is not in keeping with the village character or ethos.</p> <p>It is my belief that the proposal from Wyre Forest District Councils Plan is not infill as the development is on the external area of the village and therefore not conducive with its own policy.</p> <p>The village is open and well scattered in parts, which is important to the village character and to the wildlife that shares this space with its inhabitants.</p> <p>I feel strongly that this remains the case for the future of the Wyre Forest itself and the village for the next generations to come. By developing the land here this will be lost and not regained to the detriment of the landscape and its wonderful character.</p> <p>Other key points to make for both sites;</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus service - Section 8 pg.56, Policy 3 pg.85</li> </ul> <p>It is believed we have a good local bus service by Wyre Forest District. We have approximately 1 bus an hour. Other Villages such as Bliss gate and Rock Village have up to 3 buses an hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Village School - Community Facilities 20 pg.116</li> </ul> <p>The school serves not just the village, but Rock, Heightington, Bliss Gate, Bewdley and children as far as Kidderminster. The school has fairly recently had extensions to it to enable it to accommodate demand. An increase houses will mean an increase in children and it is not clear whether the school will be able to meet the demands of the children in the village as this has not always been the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment - Health 9.1- 9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul> <p>The village offers little in the terms of employment. Those who work mainly travel towards Kidderminster, Stourport, Worcester or Birmingham. People therefore have to go farther a field to find work. The ownership of a car is essential as the bus service is poor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical Cover - Health 9.1-9.10 pg.66-68</li> </ul> <p>The village does not have its own practice and so we have to use either Bewdley Medical centre or Cleobury Mortimer. An increase in our village will have an impact on the respective medical practices and ensuring they have capacity to register individuals.</p> <p>Shropshire -</p> <p>With Shropshire just on the outskirts of the village it is not clear what impact this will have on their building plans and apparent needs. Over the years the increase in houses in Cleobury Mortimer has seen an increase in</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>traffic along the A 4117.</p> <p>Effect on the beauty of our village - A unique place to live 11B pg.80/81, 11.3 Section 3 i,ii,iii,iv,v., Historic Environment B ii, ix pg.77, 11C Landscape and character pg.79, 8 Rural Exception sites iii pg.5, Strategic Green Infrastructure B iii pg.94, Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i ii pg.112, 18.8, 18.9.18.10 pg.113, Sustainable Tourism 23 pg.137-144</p> <p>This is currently an area for which people come to enjoy and come to visit, walk and experience the rural areas of the Wyre Forest. Far Forest is popular due to its access to the forest itself and surrounding countywide, its public house and the touring caravan site on Pound Bank for example. The Wyre Forest District Council advertises the district as a place of beauty and encourages tourism. How can building 60 houses in a small spears out village such as ours be sustaining the very heart of what the Wyre Forest stands for?</p> <p>The development will have substantial and devastating change to both the character and appearance of Far Forest and would certainly fail to enhance this valuable open space. This is valuable landscape not only for the village but for the future of the area and its wildlife and for which both the inhabitants of the district and visitors enjoy at their leisure.</p> <p>So I implore the Wyre Forest District Council to reconsider the all sites identified at Far Forest. The inhabitants at Clows Top for example are wanting houses on their brownfield site identified on the Wyre Forest Districts Plan. Kidderminster has many brownfield sites and to regenerate the town this to me is the most obvious area to assign building too, not countryside or greenbelt which are the easiest/cheapest to build new properties on. Much smaller plots around the rural district would be more palatable instead of large numbers of houses encroaching on a small community as in the case of New Road and The Orchard House.</p> <p>I also feel that the proposed number of houses in our district is over estimated with the models used to do so, this has been published in the Local papers as the case.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5147</a>	Object	Far Forest - New Road and Plough Lane proposals

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Objections and major considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic ref p85 and pp88-89 of plan; the junction of New Road and Cleobury Road is already a danger, in part because there are no parking restrictions in New Road. There is congestion at the start of the school day and at its end since the school entrance is also located at the upper end of New Road. The increase in traffic from extra housing will make the situation worse especially taking into account traffic associated with caravan parks for which New Road is the only access.</li> <li>Some consideration to making New Road/Church Road a one way system might help but the junction of New Road with Cleobury Road is dangerously situated with traffic often moving very quickly along Cleobury Road.</li> <li>Risk of flooding to proposed properties and existing properties because of high water table and increased run off due to development (p98). Flood risk management.</li> <li>Sewage facilities are believed to be inadequate already, more houses will mean sewage system may need to be upgraded considerably.pg.97 rural development policy 28.</li> <li>Loss of Dark skies. pg.80-81, 103. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and geological conservation policy 11D If street lighting is introduced this will have a marked effect on the nature of the locality with loss of dark skies and detrimental impact on flora and fauna.</li> <li>Proposed development will mean approximately 100 extra vehicles in and out of village therefore increased pollution. pg103. Pollution and land instability Policy 16.</li> </ul> <p>I hope serious consideration will be given to these points and further consultation with local residents before any firm decisions are made.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4254</a>	Comment	<p>Map Reference New Road Far Forest (South) BR/RO/7</p> <p>My Objections to the proposal of house's at the sites quoted are as follows:-</p> <p>Sewage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 97 Policy 15 Sewage systems and water quality.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 98 Policy 15C Flood Risk Management</li> <li>• Page 100 Policy 15D Sustainable Drainage Systems</li> </ul> <p>It is well known that when Oak Leaf Rise and New Forest Close were built, the storm water and sewage waste share the same pipe work. The result is flooding on a grand scale in Sugars Lane. This has been on going for the last 20 years. The discharge from another 20 houses would be joined to this system should this go ahead. The attached picture is after about 20 minutes rain. That is not only dirty water, but sewage too. Tankers are dispatched by Severn Trent Water on a regular basis to pump out the overflow. A totally unacceptable situation from a health and environmental point of view.</p> <p>Traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 85 Transport and accessibility in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Policy 13 Managing Travel Demands Ai,ii,iii and B</li> <li>• Page 88-89 Highway Network - 13.12</li> </ul> <p>Between New Road and Plough Lane there are 16 driveways, both side's of the road all on to a very busy A4117.</p> <p>New Road is already far too congested. Many houses do not have off road parking leaving them on the road. It is a road of choice for the movement of caravans and motor homes to the three caravan parks we have in Sugars Lane. There are two farming families in Sugars lane and Church Lane, regular tractor and trailer journeys are made on New Road. Brays Plant yard is on Sugars Lane, again heavy plant is on this very narrow road on a daily basis. During term time (appreciate at every school) the village primary school causes chaos on New Road.</p> <p>Bus Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 56 Section 8</li> <li>• Page 85 Section13</li> </ul> <p>A two hourly service is all that passes through Far Forest. The last bus from Kidderminster is 6.15 pm so is of no</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>use for a social life or ways to work.</p> <p>Other local villages have a much better service up to three services pass through.</p> <p>Village School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 116 Community Facilities Section 20</li> </ul> <p>Our village school is full. September 17 intake is already up to capacity. This primary school covers places wider than the village and it has been known that very local children were unable to attend the school. Other local villages have a choice of more than one school.</p> <p>Wildlife Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 80/81 and 85 a unique place to live sub. 11.29 11B 11.3 section 3</li> <li>Protecting and enhancing policy 11D</li> <li>Page 79 11C Landscape character</li> <li>Page 94 Strategic Green Infrastructure B</li> <li>Page 112 Infill Policy 18B a desirable place to live i,ii</li> <li>Page 113 18.8, 18.9, 18.10</li> <li>Page 137-144 Sustainable Tourism 23</li> <li>Page 79 Section 11.c Landscape Charter</li> </ul> <p>We sit on the very edge of The Wyre Forest and provide a corridor for wildlife. Habitat will be affected, if hedges, trees, grassland are taken away. They support insects, birds reptiles local to this area. Grazing land would be lost for the local farmer along with a hay meadow. Our bats, deer, owls, moths would be displaced from an area where they are renowned. Any development would have a detrimental affect on all forms of wildlife at both sites.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/7 – NEW ROAD, FAR FOREST

Company / Organisation	ID	Type of Response	Summary of Response
			<p>Loss of Dark Skies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 80 Protecting and enhancing</li> <li>• Page 81 Biodiversity and geological</li> <li>• Page 103 Conservation Policy 11D</li> </ul> <p>Dark skies are part of the village life and important to its character. I believe any new development would have to include street lighting something in Far Forest that was always fought against.</p> <p>Skyline Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Page 112 Section 18.10</li> <li>• Page 113</li> </ul> <p>Residents around the Plough Lane plan mostly consist of bungalows so they will be overlooked should houses make there way there. An invasion of their privacy. New Road would be devastated for ever an outlook to the Clee Hills would be lost. Extra houses means extra noise, more people. This would impact on peoples well being and have no positive benefit to them.</p> <p>We have no medical cover in the village, nearest, we believe Bewdley Medical Centre is full. Cleobury Mortimer has had very large housing developments, to which impacts on their new medical centre. Worcestershire hospital are full to breaking before all the projected housing.</p> <p>There is very little employment in the village so people have to travel, so more cars, more emissions, more pollution to the woodland.</p> <p>I don't believe that this proposed plan is good for this village for the reasons I have tried to explain. Traffic, sewage, school, medical, public transport are all an issue in this village. Therefore I object to both option A and B proposed developments on both sites.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/26 – WALNUT COTTAGE, BLISS GATE

Company / Organisation	Response No		Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2214</a>	BR/RO/26	Object	<p>Objects to BR/RO/26 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The village has no amenities (the pub is closed, the site in a neglected condition).</li> <li>2. The telephone box is disconnected and in private ownership.</li> <li>3. Lack of defibrillator. There isn't an appropriate community space to locate it.</li> <li>4. There is no school, church, shop, village hall or community centre, unlike each other part of the district.</li> <li>5. There is a poor rural bus service and no bus stop. Residents wishing to catch the intermittent service are obliged to stand in the open on the corner of two roads at a crossroads, with not even a footpath for their safety. The bus company uses buses which have on two recent occasions caught fire and burnt out.</li> <li>6. Utilities are inadequate for modern families. There is no gas, except by cylinder. There is no mains drainage in this road. Sewerage is managed by septic tanks. Electricity is delivered by overhead power lines. Strong winds, rain and trees cause frequent power cuts, a risk for vulnerable members of the community.</li> <li>7. The road is narrow, less than 12 feet wide. Any proposed access would be near a small blind summit, dangerous in either direction. Residential traffic is slight but with two farms in the road and many in the district, heavy agricultural traffic is significant during all seasons.</li> <li>8. The site is rural. It is a field with fruit trees bordered by a mature thick hedge. Converting this to a housing development destroys the rural nature of the site, reduces habitat and opens the way for further damaging development in a road where almost every house is separated from its neighbour by open land. There is a risk that, given the planning department's overload of work, a potential developer would not respect the rural nature of the area, resulting in the removal of trees and hedges, the erection of fences and great red brick walls.</li> </ol> <p>Alternative suggestions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Glass Houses site on the A456, near Long Bank.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO BR/RO/26 – WALNUT COTTAGE, BLISS GATE

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Churchfields, Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Park Street, Kidderminster.</li> <li>• Green Street, Kidderminster, formerly Victoria Carpets.</li> </ul> <p>These brownfield sites could provide housing closer to all amenities in potentially exciting developments, more suitable as apartments for young people or the old who become stranded in the countryside.</p> <p>I am grateful to the staff of the planning department who did so much to explain the planning options at the series of open meetings. I am aware of the Council's wish to respect rural environments and I hope that the points I have raised will receive a fair reading. Unfortunately the consultation process is taking place in the summer holidays which is likely to reduce the public's awareness of the process.</p>
--	--	--	--	---



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
Victoria Carpets	<a href="#">LPPO1503</a>	Policy 30	Comment	The emerging policy notes that Kidderminster is the strategic centre when the majority of development should be located to ensure sustainable development, easy access to services and greatest ability to promote infrastructure.
King Charles I School, Kidderminster	<a href="#">LPPO2286</a>	Policy 30	Comment	<p>The Governing Body has considered the Wyre Forest Local Plan proposals and the two options contained therein in the context of their possible impact on the educational needs of the community for the future.</p> <p>We are satisfied that our School has sufficient capacity to deal with the effects of both options which are under consideration should either ultimately be adopted.</p> <p>We intend to follow closely the progress of the Review process and to assess its potential impact on the provision of secondary education locally so we will be in a position to accommodate the children of families who in due course come to reside in any new residential developments in Kidderminster.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1073</a>	Policy 30	Object	For the most part our concerns in relation to the sites proposed for development in Kidderminster are limited but nonetheless they arise as a result of the background evidence on which the allocations have been based. Of particular note is the need to determine any ecological constraints using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been considered in the evidence base or SA for the plan. This may have the effect of rendering the plan unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for sites listed in Table 30.0.1 is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.
	<a href="#">LPPO1874</a>	Policy 30	Object	<p>Objects to new development because the roads are already busy and not made for extra traffic. The area also lacks proper crossings and it is difficult to cross the roads. Concerned that the schools and doctors will not be able to cope.</p> <p>Suggests trying to drive down Sion Hill.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2336</a>	Policy 30	Object	<p>Object to Option A: traffic is already congested, public transport is poor and there is no budget for a relief road.</p> <p>Wilden Lane is ill considered due to the flood risk/loss of wildlife link/buffer for adjacent SSSI. Without its support systems, Wilden Marsh, one of Worcestershire Wildlife Trust's Flagship Reserves, will die.</p> <p>How will water/sewage disposal for 5400 households be provided?</p> <p>Bring empty houses back into use?</p> <p>The hospital is already inadequate and new schools places would be needed</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4330</a>	Policy 30	Comment	<p>Kidderminster has 'zoned' parts of the town centre for commercial development which is just not happening.</p> <p>Office occupancy rates on Green Street for example are low.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2986</a>	Policy 30	Support	<p>*Policy 30 relates to homes in the town centres. I fully support the idea that people should live in town centres. It makes sense to use the unused space over shops and business premises for housing. Worcester Street and Oxford Street should be redeveloped for housing as the retail units in these streets are either empty or under-used.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4363</a>	30.2	Comment	<p>On the redevelopment of the Horsefair area and the proposed one way system.</p> <p>Surely it is undeniable that the Horsefair Shopping street is a disgrace to look at especially as an entry/exit portal to and from Kidderminster. It certainly does not give a good reflection of what to expect when visiting the town.</p> <p>This area needed refurbishment 40-50 years ago and again when the ring road was developed it should have been redeveloped. The Horsefair has been totally ignored for most of this time,</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>resulting in the first of possibly more buildings collapsing like the original Post Office earlier this Summer 2017, the collapse presumably occurring in part due to lack of good maintenance, which applies to most of the buildings on both sides of this short street area.</p> <p>On visual inspection alone most exposed brickwork is in desperate need of drastic repair work.</p> <p>If the Council are considering the purchase of CMS Car Sales/workshop/display ground to ensure access to new homes being built and to install a one way system at what one can only assume is a considerable purchase price plus install a new access road from the roundabout through this area at another high cost.</p> <p><b>Why not</b> actually improve the area correctly by demolishing the two rows of shops/accommodation buildings that line the road, then rebuild a new row of shops and accommodation this could be multi storey to offer a large selection of apartment sizes. This allows sufficient room for a much needed wider road approach to the ring road roundabout and access to a road network which heads towards the new housing planned area.</p> <p>This would give a dramatically improved entrance view to the town for any visitors using this arterial road from Wolverhampton and Stourbridge areas. The cost surely would be very similar to proposed alterations costs and the extra costs along with the benefits for the Town, Horsefair appeal, Horsefair small shops and residents would be immense.</p> <p>It would give excellent accommodation above the shops which could be offered to the existing tenants first, Plus excellent shops built to a suitable size for small business' and again offered to existing Horsefair business' they could have a loading/unloading rear access in Silver Street access from Radford, for vehicles and parking for residents of the flats.</p>
Historic England	<a href="#">LPPO1292</a>	30.4	Comment	There is mention in paragraph 30.4 about historic buildings being retained on site - are these heritage assets?

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO917</a>	30.5	Comment	'Spennells Brook' should read 'Hoo Brook'
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1074</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>We have significant reservations about some allocations proposed under this policy. Overarching issues are set out in comments we make under Policy 6D and elsewhere. We urge you to take these comments into account but we also wish to provide further information here.</p> <p><u>Sites in Table 31.0.1</u></p> <p>Allocations BW4 and OC 4 may have adverse impacts on the adjacent Hurcott and Podmore Pool SSSI and the NERC listed Hornet Robberfly. These and other biodiversity implications need further consideration prior to finalising the allocations though we note the commentary in paragraph 31.3 of the consultation document. OC12 and 13 North are likely to affect designated sites including, Spennells Valley and Hoo Brook Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). So far as we can ascertain the allocations are not underpinned by up to date ecological information and so the assumptions in the SA (suggesting positive biodiversity outcomes) seem extremely optimistic. Whilst mitigation for some of the biodiversity issues may well be possible it will require land take that is likely to have implications for the net developable area (and accordingly the number of dwellings allocated) set out in the plan.</p> <p>WFR/ST1 appears to directly overlap Captains Pool LWS and so we object to the allocation as it stands. Further work to determine the net developable area and any indirect biodiversity implications will be needed prior to finalising the allocation or it is likely to be found unsound.</p> <p><u>Sites in Table 31.0.2</u></p> <p>OC13 South, WFR/ST/2. We object to these allocations because of their likely impact on</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Captains and Stanklyn Pools and Spennells Valley LWS and species of principle importance listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006, including Corn Bunting and Tower Mustard. Notwithstanding the fact that large parts of the sites would be left undeveloped we do not consider that these biodiversity constraints have been considered properly in the evidence base for the plan and we do not accept the findings of the SA. Further comments on these Option A allocations can be found elsewhere in our response.
	<a href="#">LPPO2917</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>I live along Hurcott Lane, by the Pool and have some safety concerns that I think should be considered.</p> <p>Daily, I observe local people of all ages, in groups and alone, with dogs and children, dice with death as they experience 'near misses' from speeding cars, lorries and vans that hurtle through the village between the two main roads. It is only a matter of time before there is a fatal accident.</p> <p>If more houses are to be built, and more people enabled to access this wonderful haven of nature, it is imperative that some safety measures be put in place. A suggestion would be to separate the two access routes from the main roads. i.e. maintain access from the A456 up to the woodland entrance but no further and maintain access from the A451 up to the woodland entrance but no further. Drivers would then drive back up the way they came down, on both sides. The car park could be split in two and fenced off, to accommodate both entrances and ensure that it couldn't be used as a 'cut through'. This would reduce vehicles speeding through and causing a danger to pedestrians, children, dogs and residents.</p> <p>I am also aware of the proposal to build the housing in areas where facilities are limited and road access is poor, i.e. Offmore, at the back of Baldwin Road and at the back of Hurcott on the Stourbridge Road. This would increase traffic in the dangerous zones, as people will have to drive more to shops and schools. Would it not be safer and more environmentally friendly to develop one large new housing estate that would include the necessary facilities for the families who move there - e.g. shops and a primary school.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3508</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The web pages are not user friendly, neither is this form. It is difficult to choose a particular section from the document. I have however been to a consultation meeting, talked with officers and perused the documentation.</p> <p>The Core sites will take out a considerable chunk of Green Belt land and there appears to be no alternative within the plan; to consult without alternatives is not consultation.</p> <p>The statement that there is not enough brownfield land in the area to cope with the amount of housing required raises the question of whether the land within Kidderminster is zoned appropriately. There are an awful lot of empty offices which could be converted into living accommodation and reinvigorate the town centre.</p> <p>Land banking needs to be stopped.</p> <p>The plan seems to pursue urban sprawl and needs to be more imaginative, without building on farmland.</p>
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO219</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>As with our comments on the planning application relating to Lea Castle Hospital there is a need to ensure onsite playing field is protected AND improved as well as other provision made in the light of the PPS recommendations to ensure there is no loss of playing field and that new provision is made to meet the additional needs generated by the proposal.</p> <p>New provision will also be required with the East of Kidderminster sites and this should be addressed in a strategic manner (e.g. perhaps a multi pitch sports hub which they all contribute to rather than having several single pitch sites across individual extension plots as this is not sustainable.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO959</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Allocation of sites east of Kidderminster will encourage commuting to Birmingham. Wyre Forest is not part of the Birmingham/Black Country Housing Market Area and this will worsen traffic in Blakedown / Hagley. Bypass around Hagley would be required which would probably</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				make sites unviable.
	<a href="#">LPPO344</a>	Lea Castle - All Options	Object	<p>I am totally against removing Lea Castle and the east of Kidderminster from the Green Belt, this needs to be preserved at all costs. The woodlands should be protected and no dwellings should be seen from the roads, all should be encased in woodlands for wildlife. Development would put extra pressure on an already busy A449 and Stourbridge Road.</p> <p>I agree for dwellings to sit on the blue print of Lea Castle only. These should be used to cater for the housing needs of Cookley residents already on the waiting list. I therefore reject and object to option A and B.</p> <p>I also reject it on the grounds of local plan vision for the area in 2034 we want Cookley to continue to maintain its distinctive and separate identity and to grow organically to meet our own community needs... It also says section 3.2 of vision for the area to protect and support the role of the Green Belt, if these visions go ahead you will be contradicted 3.2 point 6 this plan goes beyond a limited incursion of Green Belt land.</p> <p>We are a village and wish to remain that.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO740</a>	Policy 31	Object	Surrounding Green Belt fields used for walking and new development will erode this. Noise will destroy peaceful countryside
	<a href="#">LPPO2015</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How are people supposed to make informed choices/engage in consultation without adequate information indicating scale/what is to be built where?</li> <li>2. What infrastructure is planned to support extra housing- new school places, roads/parking, more GP surgeries will be needed. Access to/from of Comberton Park Road at school times is already very hard.</li> <li>3. What are green spaces in plans?</li> <li>4. I cannot understand the concept of an eastern by-pass without description/visual aid to show how such a road would be built/its impact on the area, people and the</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				environment. The financial aspect also sounds prohibitive.
	<a href="#">LPPO2066</a>	Lea Castle General	Object	<p>I agree with building more affordable housing- a small proportion of the planned 6,000 houses and location uncertain.</p> <p>Villages like Cookley cannot be made.</p> <p>Would need more schools/doctors capacity and entertainment Build in Kidderminster town centre first to reduce traffic/pollution and save Green Belt.</p>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1423</a>	Policy 31	Support	<p>Gladman supports need to plan for growth in Kidderminster. Agree that this is likely to require carefully considered GB release. Support proposed intention to review Green Belt.</p> <p>GBBR Part I - note conclusions on parcel NE1 - contributes to purpose of GB to prevent encroachment of urban edge into open countryside. GBBR part II - site WFR/WC/16 (land south of Park Gate Road) - support conclusion that development here would not be out of character or proportion with area.</p> <p>GBBR Part I on parcel N6 also noted - contributes to purpose of preventing encroachment into open countryside. Gladman consider that this parcel should have been considered in part II and should be considered for release for development. It is well contained and with careful masterplanning could contribute positively towards establishment of strong new relationship between town and country.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2682</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The population of Kidderminster over the last few years as remained fairly static and this proposal will unnecessarily attract more people into the area with the following consequences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of a tremendous amount of Green Belt and agricultural working farm land.</li> <li>• The loss of wildlife in the nearby woodland areas. The Council has a duty to protect</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>woodland and the wild life under the UK BIO Diversity Action Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The loss of valuable heavily used recreational spaces for the local populace of all the age groups to enjoy.</li> <li>• Disruption of local footpaths and bridleways.</li> <li>• Loss of the natural break from the other nearby communities, creating an ugly urban sprawl.</li> <li>• More, excessive, housing would increase the Carbon Footprint.</li> <li>• Heavy traffic on local roads which are not suitable for the amount of housing proposed. They are always in a poor state of repair.</li> <li>• The proposed housing is situated too far for most people to be able to walk into town so additional bus routes would be needed.</li> <li>• There will be an over capacity for local schools, doctors and hospitals. .</li> <li>• At a time when the nearest fully functioning hospital is already stretched to capacity and under special measures and the local Kidderminster hospital is operating as a “drop in centre”, what guarantees can the Council make that the necessary amenities for healthcare would be actually provided?</li> <li>• Where will the extra funding come from at a time when the public finances in general, face sharp cuts over the next decade in face of the potential austerity brought about by BREXIT?</li> <li>• What Job opportunities are there for this added population in a run down and depleting Kidderminster, where shops and businesses are closing at an alarming rate?</li> </ul> <p>I urge the council not to consider building on the Green Belt or farmland, but to utilise as much brownfield sites as possible, and to spend the money on regenerating a rundown Town Centre.</p> <p>I strongly object to all proposals to build extra houses on Green Belt land and therefore reject option (A) of the council plan entirely for the reasons given above. However, if housing has to be built then option (B) is my preference.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2738</a>	Policy 31	Object	We would like to strongly object to this ridiculous plan.
	<a href="#">LPPO3460</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>We do not and should not build on Green Belt. There are many empty buildings in Kidderminster.</p> <p>It will cause lots of traffic on our road and create a lot of noise.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3472</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The Council has commitment and planning policy to protect the open countryside. They should therefore follow its own policies in this regard.</p> <p>Some proposed development areas are on good agricultural land (e.g. land around Spennells) and could be a visible intrusion on the landscape and detract from the surrounding landscapes with further development eroding the rural character of the area Two proposed sites (rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road) are elevated. Development here would be very visible and not blend within the area. There would also be a loss of trees and hedgerows, community leisure spaces and public rights of way.</p> <p>In addition, some proposed development sites have steep gradients (land at Baldwin Road and near Hurcott for example) and parts of the sites which could cause flooding issues from run-off. Some fields afford natural drainage and there could be increased problems in the Spennells area where STW have already had to address flood defences.</p> <p>Some proposed sites are very near SSSIs. The land behind Baldwin Road and either side of A456 and at Spennells are teemed with wildlife – in particular a number of breeding skylarks, linnets, corn buntings, yellow hammers, house sparrows, sparrow hawks, owls, herons, plus badgers and bats. Development could result in loss of wildlife habitat and permanent urbanisation of important landscapes.</p> <p>Some areas of proposed housing development and the associated increase in vehicular movement would have a further detrimental impact upon air quality within the existing</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>AQMA and residents' health plus the increase in noise. Some of these proposed developments would therefore be contrary to the NPPF. E.g. increase in traffic to the Horsefair from proposed housing around Hurcott Village (both sides), Lea Castle site and Sladen School site. The A449 and A451 lead to the Horsefair, so does Hurcott Road which would see a large increase in traffic. This would cause longer tail-backs either side of the lights, increased air pollution and potential for increased damage to vehicles.</p> <p>Road capacity is lacking and some roads simply cannot be enhanced to take extra capacity. Means of access to some proposed sites would be difficult to overcome. There is a shortage of primary school places – many primary schools in WFDC area are already full to capacity (e.g. Offmore and Spennells are full and can not be expanded). Many GP surgeries in WFDC area are already fully stretched, as are hospitals. It is also very unlikely that new open spaces, parks or community centres would be provided by any of the developers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2566</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I <u>strongly object</u> to Option A in particular East of Kidderminster for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt and threat of loss of existing rights of way. If all brownfield sites are used then only a small amount of the least environmentally-attractive Green Belt is needed.</li> <li>• The new development will increase pressures on schools, hospitals, doctors and social care.</li> <li>• There is little chance of employment development or growth in Kidderminster and job prospects are bleak. Either Option A or B will result in Kidderminster becoming an even larger commuter town, resulting in traffic gridlock at peak times.</li> </ul> <p>Commence work on the 3000 homes on brownfield sites. Use the income you receive from Crown House to pay the salary of an officer to effect the regeneration of the town centre, alongside any grants you may receive.</p> <p>I am proud of Kidderminster and the surrounding countryside, please think again and not be</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				driven by hungry developers who will be here today and gone tomorrow.
	<a href="#">LPPO2668</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>Kidderminster currently has a very poor town centre which is in desperate need of improvement. Building residential properties instead of more shops would give the place more vitality and attractiveness.</p> <p>Why desecrate good farm land while these eyesores remain?</p> <p>Not to mention the loss of habitat to wildlife and recreational facilities. The area is already crowded and does not need further housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2712</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I <u>strongly object</u> to Option A in particular Policy 31.5 - Kidderminster Urban Extension:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt which protects our countryside from urban sprawl, threatening existing rights of way. Only a small amount of Green Belt is needed if all brownfield sites identified are used in the first instance.</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat. This area is home to Kingfishers, Skylarks, Corn Bunting, Song Thrush and Mistle Thrush, bats, grass snakes, badgers all protected species.</li> <li>• Increase pressures on schools, hospitals, doctors and social care.</li> <li>• There may be TPOs at the far end of Captains Pool.</li> <li>• There are interconnecting brooks/streams between Captains Pool and other pools in the area.</li> </ul> <p>Surely this area for consideration under Option A must be a 'SITE OF BIODIVERSITY AND GEOLOGICAL CONSERVATION VALUE' in particular the pools, streams and brooks that support our varied wildlife and if not it should be. See attached document.</p> <p>What assurance is given from WFDC that if Option A was chosen that all necessary legislation has been complied with backed up field studies in order to maintain a wider buffer wildlife corridor to protect all pools, streams, brooks, trees and hedgerows so that any one part of the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>system will not fail and cause the drying out of any of the above. If yes is this information available.</p> <p>If work commences at Captains and the Lodge off Kittiwake Drive where will the access be located. Recent planning permission for additional storage of caravans on this site was refused due in part to access and Green Belt issues. (Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/09/2118087 Captains, Bromsgrove Road, Stone, Kidderminster, DY10 4AJ) In addition I believe Tree Preservation Orders exist in this area have all TPO's been identified</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2872</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The Green Belt to the east will be attractive to the house builders for the provision of luxury detached houses where the housing need does not appear to lie.</p> <p>Development within the Green Belt to the east and south of the town, including Option A, will lead to considerable increased congestion. This is acknowledged under the section in the review "Transport and Accessibility"</p> <p>There is no clear indication of how the development to the south and east of the town would be accessed. The estate roads on Spennells and Offmore are already congested and of insufficient width to take additional traffic.</p> <p>Even without the proposed new development car ownership is projected to grow in the coming years providing greater pressure on the existing estate roads. Further new developments are also being proposed on brownfield sites within the existing town with a bias to the eastern side namely the Stourminster school site (56 dwellings), Comberton Place (23), Victoria Carpet Sports Ground (45) as well as numerous other brownfield sites within the town which will put pressure on the arterial roads of the town.</p> <p>There is already considerable congestion at the roundabouts on the Worcester Road with Wilden Lane and the Chester Road South and also the Worcester Road Stourport Road</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>roundabout.</p> <p>At rush hour there is congestion on roads out of Kidderminster particularly at Mustow Green and on the Worcester Road.</p> <p>Near doubling of the Spennells estate would completely alter its character and due to its size and isolation from the towns facilities may lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour and crime.</p> <p>The proposals would lead to the loss of amenity and good agricultural land. The area behind Spennells (Option A) is high quality agricultural land. It provides an attractive barrier to the Spennells and provides valuable walking and recreational facilities for the estate. In addition these fields provide a wildlife habitat for protected species such as Bats and Skylarks. The Sustainability Appraisal recognises this 'this option would have an impact on the Green Belt, a loss of Grade 2 and 3 agricultural land and would have a significant effect on the character of the area.'</p> <p>There are many mature and attractive trees growing along the A448 into Kidderminster. It is not clear how the necessary estate roads would link into the A448 and the eastern relief road if built. It is likely that the A448 would need substantial improvement which would lead to loss of this attractive corridor of trees which provide an attractive barrier to the road. Any proposal needs to safeguard this corridor.</p> <p>For these reasons Option A should not be adopted. If Green Belt land is required that should not be substantially based to the east of the town due to the likelihood of congestion and loss of amenity.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3161</a>	Policy 31	Object	Development in the Green Belt should NOT be considered until all possible brown field sites and areas of dereliction have been utilized.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>If we are that short of housing why on earth did you sanction a KFC and a Starbucks on Stourport Road. There are plenty fast food establishments in Kidderminster.</p> <p>The council would be better to promote affordable housing on that site than sanction fast food outlets in the middle of an obesity epidemic!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3272</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I object to development at Cookley, Hurcott and Spennells.</p> <p>Large numbers of additional housing on one side of Kidderminster will put strain on the inadequate infrastructure, increase congestion, pollution and change the character of independent communities, particularly Cookley, Hurcott and Stone.</p> <p>Development will encroach onto pasture land, green field and Green Belt areas. This will affect wildlife and remove amenity areas enjoyed by the communities.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3282</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I disagree with the proposal of option A for a number of reasons. This would impact deeply on the Green Belt area which is an important part of keeping the town separate from the West Midlands Conurbation. The main focus of this proposal seems to be the Eastern Bypass which would be extremely expensive and surely adding a bridge over the railway near Hartlebury would solve the need for this road as Lorries would be able to access the roads that go around the town. This Bypass would also have to be elevated which means there would need to be a buffer from the traffic noise. This along with development behind Baldwin Road which would be considerably higher than the houses that are there at the moment and would put a great deal of extra pressure on Hurcott Lane.</p> <p>Having developments behind Baldwin Road and Hurcott would impact the wildlife habitats around Hurcott woods. There is also apparently endangered bird species in this area: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers and Skylarks.</p> <p>I also do not see how the school provision would work with a development behind Spennells</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and Offmore. Even if an extra Primary school was built how would the local High Schools be able to cope especially as they are situated on sites with restricted space.</p> <p>I think there should be some development on the Lea Castle site and the development should be dispersed. There is already a great deal of development on the Silverwoods sites which are not all occupied it seems silly to concentrate all the developments in one area if they might not be filled. I also think that the situation in the Town Centre could be addressed. The council own a great deal of properties in and around the town centre which are currently unused and create an eyesore and derelict look to the town. Even though it probably costs more to develop these areas than the Green Belt I think it should be done. There are a number of primary school sites that are still unused- Sion Hill school still stands and probably costs a fortune to protect from vandalism.</p> <p>I also think that there should be more development in Stourport, there would be scope for another High School which would give people more choice.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3449</a>	Policy 31	Object	Green Belt land is essential to maintain wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO3458</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Environmental Damage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on brown field sites should be executed before Green Belt is even considered.</li> <li>• The vehicle increases are at odds with the commitments to improve air quality in Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Impact on local wildlife</li> </ul> <p>Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of local community</li> </ul>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our local schools, GP surgeries and road systems are already stretched</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3471</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The Council has commitment and planning policy to protect the open countryside. They should therefore follow its own policies in this regard.</p> <p>Some proposed development areas are on good agricultural land (e.g. land around Spennells) and could be a visible intrusion on the landscape and detract from the surrounding landscapes with further development eroding the rural character of the area Two proposed sites (rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road) are elevated. Development here would be very visible and not blend within the area. There would also be a loss of trees and hedgerows, community leisure spaces and public rights of way.</p> <p>In addition, some proposed development sites have steep gradients (land at Baldwin Road and near Hurcott for example) and parts of the sites which could cause flooding issues from run-off. Some fields afford natural drainage and there could be increased problems in the Spennells area where STW have already had to address flood defences.</p> <p>Some proposed sites are very near SSSIs. The land behind Baldwin Road and either side of A456 and at Spennells are teemed with wildlife – in particular a number of breeding skylarks, linnets, corn buntings, yellow hammers, house sparrows, sparrow hawks, owls, herons, plus badgers and bats. Development could result in loss of wildlife habitat and permanent urbanisation of important landscapes.</p> <p>Some areas of proposed housing development and the associated increase in vehicular movement would have a further detrimental impact upon air quality within the existing AQMA and residents' health plus the increase in noise. Some of these proposed developments would therefore be contrary to the NPPF. E.g. increase in traffic to the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Horsefair from proposed housing around Hurcott Village (both sides), Lea Castle site and Sladen School site. The A449 and A451 lead to the Horsefair, so does Hurcott Road which would see a large increase in traffic. This would cause longer tail-backs either side of the lights, increased air pollution and potential for increased damage to vehicles.</p> <p>Road capacity is lacking and some roads simply cannot be enhanced to take extra capacity. Means of access to some proposed sites would be difficult to overcome. There is a shortage of primary school places – many primary schools in WFDC area are already full to capacity (e.g. Offmore and Spennells are full and can not be expanded). Many GP surgeries in WFDC area are already fully stretched, as are hospitals. It is also very unlikely that new open spaces, parks or community centres would be provided by any of the developers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3488</a>	Policy 31	Comment	Please ensure that the Husum Way Junction on the A459 Birmingham Rd junction is made safe.
	<a href="#">LPPO3502</a>	Lea Castle General	Comment	<p>Any adopted option for the development of the Lea Castle Hospital site should not result in "joining" existing development at the north of Kidderminster to create a continuous "sprawl" and that the Green Belt buffer is maintained or increased.</p> <p>Develop Lea Castle so as to be "self-contained".</p> <p>The village of Cookley is a clearly defined settlement and its existing services (e.g. primary school, doctors surgery) would be unable to cope with further demand from the Lea Castle Hospital development.</p> <p>The crossing of the A449 near the Cookley turning is notorious accident blackspot and consideration should be given to the Lea Castle proposal to have vehicular access to the development at the junction of the A449/The Crescent.</p> <p>Include sustainable transport provision such as cycle lanes/bus services, esp. between the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				new settlement/Broadwaters and Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO3283</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I disagree with the proposal of option A for a number of reasons. This would impact deeply on the Green Belt area which is an important part of keeping the town separate from the West Midlands Conurbation. The main focus of this proposal seems to be the Eastern Bypass which would be extremely expensive and surely adding a bridge over the railway near Hartlebury would solve the need for this road as Lorries would be able to access the roads that go around the town. This Bypass would also have to be elevated which means there would need to be a buffer from the traffic noise. This along with development behind Baldwin Road which would be considerably higher than the houses that are there at the moment and would put a great deal of extra pressure on Hurcott Lane.</p> <p>Having developments behind Baldwin Road and Hurcott would impact the wildlife habitats around Hurcott woods. There is also apparently endangered bird species in this area: Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers and Skylarks.</p> <p>I also do not see how the school provision would work with a development behind Spennells and Offmore. Even if an extra Primary school was built how would the local High Schools be able to cope especially as they are situated on sites with restricted space.</p> <p>I think there should be some development on the Lea Castle site and the development should be dispersed. There is already a great deal of development on the Silverwoods sites which are not all occupied it seems silly to concentrate all the developments in one area if they might not be filled. I also think that the situation in the Town Centre could be addressed. The council own a great deal of properties in and around the town centre which are currently unused and create an eyesore and derelict look to the town. Even though it probably costs more to develop these areas than the Green Belt I think it should be done. There are a number of primary school sites that are still unused- Sion Hill school still stands and probably costs a fortune to protect from vandalism.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				I also think that there should be more development in Stourport, there would be scope for another High School which would give people more choice.
	<a href="#">LPPO2894</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>Concerned resident living on the A456 in Hagley.</p> <p>The air pollution that this road creates will potentially cause significant health problems.</p> <p>If we have further development on the south eastern side of Kidderminster this will result in a further increase in traffic volume causing further traffic congestion and increased pollution.</p> <p>It is imperative that diversion of traffic away from main population areas is considered using a link road to avoid the villages of Blakedown and Hagley.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4176</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>The proposed expansion can only result in Kidderminster becoming a satellite town for Birmingham. Joining the existing dormitory towns of Bromsgrove, Redditch, Lichfield and Tamworth WFDC may refer optimistically to new employment coming into the town with the new housing. Historically the town has always been unable to compete, in terms of introducing new businesses, with the facilities of Birmingham to the north or the attractiveness of Worcester to the south. Therefore, the only result of in-migration will be an increase in commuting. Incoming families will shop where they work in Birmingham - consequently money will not go into the local economy.</p> <p>From the West Midlands agricultural land survey, it can be seen that the site of the proposed housing development lies within an area of agricultural land graded as 'Very Good' by Natural England. Land with this classification represents just 16.6% of agricultural land in Worcestershire. The continuous loss of quality agricultural land will further reduce the ability of the country to become more self-sufficient and to decrease our import bill.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO160</a>	Policy 31	Comment	What sort of housing is planned in Kidderminster extension? Is it all detached family houses or are bungalows or flats proposed? Concerned about impact on roads which are already congested. Offmore primary is full and little room to expand. No mention of community

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>facilities for the Hurcott Road development but this number of houses will mean significantly more people for school, shops etc.</p> <p>Would like to see more imaginative solutions provided for housing than just big blocks of new development. Are there old industrial sites or town centre buildings that could provide some property and move people to the town centre to use shops there?</p>
Kidderminster Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1168</a>	Lea Castle - General	Support	The Lea Castle site should be used to its maximum potential as this parcel of land, with the extension, will provide many residential units, including affordable and social housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO696</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p><u>Policy 7 and 31</u> — We agree with the notion that the Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC. since the 1970s and note WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district. This policy draft states that the Spatial Strategy seeks to minimise impact on the Green Belt. Minimal impact would be better achieved as discussed above, by removing a larger volume of smaller sites across the district rather than a smaller number of large sites which will have greater impact. This would better contain development and prevent urban sprawl in larger volumes in more limited areas which is in conflict with the requirements of the Green Belt as outlined in the NPPF</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1890</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Opposed to developing on greenfield land. All the lovely walks will be gone – our wildlife and nature is already under threat – please do not assume that green land doesn't matter to us, as it really does.</p> <p>Concerned about traffic congestion in Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2046</a>	Policy 31	Object	Kittiwake Drive is listed as having a flood risk. Any extra building upstream of this will increase this risk. If these developments go ahead the culverts, that the Hoo Brook flows through, will need to be a lot larger. Presently, it would not take much drift wood and rubbish to block the culvert near the junction of Kittiwake Drive and Herons Wood Road.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Chester Road and Spennells Valley Road regularly becomes grid locked in the mornings and sometimes in the afternoons, or when there is a problem with the M5 or 6. Any more housing and you can forget about getting through Kidderminster at all.
King Charles I School, Kidderminster	<a href="#">LPPO2285</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>The Governing Body has considered the Wyre Forest Local Plan proposals and the two options contained therein in the context of their possible impact on the educational needs of the community for the future.</p> <p>We are satisfied that our School has sufficient capacity to deal with the effects of both options which are under consideration should either ultimately be adopted.</p> <p>We intend to follow closely the progress of the Review process and to assess its potential impact on the provision of secondary education locally so we will be in a position to accommodate the children of families who in due course come to reside in any new residential developments in Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2342</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I object to building adjacent to Spennells/Comberton &amp; Offmore:</p> <p>Traffic/pollution would increase</p> <p>Pressure on school places/Drs, Hospitals/Opticians and Dentists.</p> <p>Regenerate Brownfield site e.g. Lea Castle, the old war hostel in Stone inc Grain Dryer, the former Glades site, Crown House and the empty buildings in Park Lane, Kidderminster plus any others in Bewdley/Stourport.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2343</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I object to building adjacent to Spennells/Comberton &amp; Offmore:</p> <p>Traffic/pollution would increase</p> <p>Pressure on school places/Drs, Hospitals/Opticians and Dentists.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Use Brownfield for regeneration which would save the Green Belt/wildlife:</p> <p>e.g. Lea Castle, the old war hostel in Stone inc Grain Dryer, the former Glades site, Crown House and the empty buildings in Park Lane, Kidderminster plus any others in Bewdley/Stourport</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2396</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I have recently returned back home to Kidderminster after 3 years at University. As someone who in the near future will be looking to move out of my parents' home and into my own property, I would like to express my opinions about the planning proposals.</p> <p>Both proposals A and B propose to build houses on green land behind established housing estates. Not only do I believe that this will destroy beautiful nature and land, I also believe that it would make the houses less desirable for incoming residents. Plans A and B would leave house hunters dissatisfied. These developments would have no heart, and would leave house hunters reluctant to move here due to the lack of school places available with Offmore Primary being full.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2681</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I hope the Council watched Dispatches about the big builders carving up the Green Belt land for development.</p> <p>Don't make the same mistakes please with Kidderminster</p>
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1198</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Concern with proposed Kidderminster Urban Extensions:</p> <p>WFR/WC/15 – Lea Castle Hospital – Site Allocations Plan identifies Lea Castle Hospital site as suitable location for business (B1), health and sports facilities, residential institutions (C2) and residential (C3) uses. Policy advice is that any application for C3 dwellings must be accompanied by a viability assessment that supports a case for the proposed mix, tenure and overall quantum/density of housing on the site to facilitate the other uses. The emerging plan has moved away from this approach by suggesting that the site should be developed for 600</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>dwelling. Not aware of evidence to demonstrate that the site has been properly marketed as a mixed use led scheme with enabling residential development. Inappropriate for the status of the site to be changed from that in the Site Allocations Plan. SHLAA advises the site is considered to be 'achievable' subject to 'site viability'. Not aware of detailed evidence that explores the viability of the site for residential development and the implications for affordable housing provision. This allocation is inappropriate.</p> <p>BW/4 – Hurcott ADR – The site is also clearly a sensitive Green Belt site and this must be weighed up as part of the “exceptional circumstances” test when considering releasing the site from the Green Belt. This process has not been undertaken, as such the allocation should be removed.</p> <p>WFR/CB7 et al – East of Kidderminster Road – Concerned about this allocation given the conclusion of the Green Belt assessment. Parts of the site are identified as having a 'significant contribution' to the Green Belt by the Green Belt assessment (e.g. WFR/CB7 addition). The Green Belt assessment looks at each individual parcel of land for its contribution towards the Green Belt in isolation. No comprehensive assessments have been undertaken of the entire allocation and the impact its release as a whole would have on the development of the Green Belt. The Green Belt assessment is flawed in this regard.</p> <p>Sections of this site would not be permitted for development by the land owner according to the SHLAA (site OC/6 for example). The availability of all the site is, therefore, questionable.</p> <p>Questionable whether such a large amount of housing in this location could be built out during the Plan Period. Core Sites to the east of Kidderminster are in close proximity to one another. This is also true of the further urban extensions proposed under Options A and B. Between them these sites have the capacity to deliver between 3,615 and 2,895 dwellings. Will take a number of years before a start can be made on site, dwellings likely to be delivered during last ten years of the plan period. The housing market will not sustain the number of sales to deliver this quantum development in close proximity to another. If these</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>sites are allocated they will deliver long beyond the plan period. As such, the capacity of the sites during the Plan Period should be significantly reduced. In our view a 50% reduction should be the minimum.</p> <p>WFR/WC/16 and WFR/WC/32 – Lea Castle Hospital Extensions – Not possible for the east of Kidderminster to sustain the completion rates required to deliver the urban extension allocations in this location during the course of a plan period. In addition, this site is identified as making a ‘contribution’ and ‘significant contribution’ to the Green Belt by the Green Belt assessment. The site should not be allocated for development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1604</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Objects to sites being allocated for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on highways</li> <li>• impact on wildlife</li> <li>• loss of good agricultural land</li> <li>• loss of and impact on Green Belt</li> <li>• loss of amenity</li> <li>• noise and air pollution</li> </ul> <p>(also see comments raised on various sections of the document)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2694</a>	Lea Castle General	Object	<p>I had a few concerns regarding the housing development of the Lea Castle site. I understand the plans have gone ahead for housing but many are concerned it is aggressive and will have an impact on the nearby villages. Cookley is a village that is separate from Kidderminster. I therefore hope that a large majority of the Green Belt land can be saved to maintain the beautiful landscapes and the village.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3005</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly object to any proposal to add pockets of new housing around the area, specifically the rear of Baldwin Road, around Offmore and Comberton towards Hodge hill, and extending the Spennells estate. Green Belt land ought to be protected; it is home to a variety of animal species, including some endangered birds, and the Green Belt is what</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>separates Kidderminster from the West Midlands conurbation. Kidderminster town itself needs a lot of work, the green spaces around Kidderminster and its many pleasant areas and attractions are what keep us here.</p> <p>Aside from the destruction of wildlife habitats and open green spaces which so many enjoy, the proposals to add pockets of housing are not viable owing to a lack of infrastructure to support a growing population. New primary schools will be required and Offmore School cannot expand further. The roads around the area suffer from congestion most times of the day, whether it is school holidays with people travelling through for the safari park, or term time when people are simply trying to get to work. Current proposals would require a major Eastern bypass otherwise even the current rat runs will become congested. However such a road would need an expensive railway bridge and a 30m min tree screen to buffer housing from traffic noise. Pockets of linear housing would have no facilities such as a school or community centre.</p> <p>Will WFDC also consider transforming and investing in the town centre itself, within the ring road? When we were renting we struggled to find good quality flats, and there appears to be a lack of these near to town centre facilities. Yet we now suffer from a major drug crime epidemic and anti social behaviour as the town centre gradually becomes derelict; this is especially true around Worcester Road and Bromsgrove Street since the leisure centre facilities moved out of town. The town centre is a depressing place to visit and too many people are happy to destroy and ruin anything nice. Make the area residential and bring life back into this area. Don't destroy our Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3183</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>Any objections we raise are motivated by a desire to keep our rural environment – to keep things how they were when we decided to live where we live and to preserve as much as we can the value of our home.</p> <p>We question whether the provision of the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would be at the mercy of central government funding? If so, what happens if option A is adopted and the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				relief road doesn't materialize? Presumably chronic congestion on the existing estate roads.
	<a href="#">LPP01887</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>Overall, object to both options A and B.</p> <p>The eastern side of Kidderminster would bear the brunt of development and a higher proportion of Green Belt would be lost than the figures quoted – thus bringing us nearer to the West Midlands conurbation.</p> <p>The land around Offmore is very versatile agricultural land. There are no public rights of way so it is a wildlife haven for bats, owls, foxes, badgers, hares and many endangered species of birds. Development would destroy their habitat. Previous planning at Offmore Farm was very restricted because of the bat roost. The suggested relief road would not relieve traffic in Kidderminster, only more problems to another replace. It would only serve as a distributor road to service any new housing development. One or possibly two railway bridges would be necessary to take any road to join A456, the cost of this would be prohibitive and no private developer would pay for it. If funded by central government the cost would then fall to the tax payer. The prospect of a relief road running into Husum Way is extremely worrying. The junction is already dangerous and then even more heavy traffic is alarming.</p> <p>Blakedown station has inadequate parking facilities and a large influx of people would cause more problems for local residents.</p> <p>We feel that brownfield sites and ex-factory building etc. should be prioritised and land in and around Lea Castle would be expanded to Axborough Land, to build homes. This would have less impact on local residents and the environment. It also has better access than land around Offmore and Comberton. The Lionfields site should be used for affordable and social housing to bring vitality into the town centre.</p> <p>Whilst we understand the need for more housing and the difficult decisions that have to be made, we ask that it could be more proportionate around the area.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				We oppose to both option A & B for the reasons stated.
	<a href="#">LPPO2005</a>	Lea Castle General	Comment	<p>Comment on the Lea Castle site:</p> <p>We need shops, school, doctors, and some activity for children.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2171</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants to keep the Green Belt land.</li> <li>• SSSI in the area re important for our future.</li> <li>• There are other areas to develop.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2284</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>To loose Green Belt on the eastern side of Kidderminster would make our town just like all the faceless areas of Birmingham and the West Midlands. Our town is lucky to be surrounded by Green Belt because it lets you know you have arrived and are travelling into a town that is proud to stand on its own, otherwise who would know if you are just arriving or leaving Kidderminster, also to loose the fields on the eastern side of our town would tragically see the end of the most the wildlife living there.</p> <p>There is wheat growing in the field at the moment and produce has been grown there every year since we came here fourteen years ago. Surely getting rid of all that farmland would reduce the amount of local food produce available to us.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3442</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will totally destroy beautiful countryside.</li> <li>• It will take habitat away for any wildlife, trees and plants.</li> <li>• Using Green Belt land will also cause more pollution.</li> <li>• Schools, GP practices, hospitals are already bursting with the capacity.</li> <li>• It will make the town over populated.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3450</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>The area is a treasured green field site and is home to many different plants and wildlife. The area is also useful for leisurely activities.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2528</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposals to extend Kidderminster in a north-easterly direction as proposed by Policy 31. The proposed plan Policy would cumulatively create a linear extension of Kidderminster towards the north-east and the merging of the built form with the southern edge of Cookley, resulting in loss of Green Belt land and unacceptable urban sprawl by creating a corridor of continuous development between the two settlements.</p> <p>Loss of this Green Belt land, in combination with development of the Lea Castle hospital site, would create a significant and unacceptable narrowing of the designated Green Belt between Kidderminster and Stourbridge and the wider West Midlands conurbation. Whilst acknowledging that the Lea Castle hospital site has been previously developed, the site is distant and disconnected from Kidderminster town centre and the proposed policy, in utilising the site for housing, in combination with either Option A or Option B sites does not provide for any gain or improve the sustainability of the location. Limited public transport facilities, combined with the lack of retail provision, would result in residents would be reliant upon car transport to access services. A more sustainable use of the site, utilising the existing building footprints and acknowledging the parkland setting should be sought.</p> <p>Inclusion of these parcels of greenfield, Green Belt land for development combined with the Lea Castle site will actively encourage urban sprawl to the north-east and thus should be removed from the Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2532</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I write to express my grave disappointment that the council would even consider the destruction of the Green Belt surrounding Kidderminster, let alone the apparent large-scale disregard that the local plan review seems to favour.</p> <p>We live in Cookley which, I am sure you are aware, is one of the many established, self-sustaining villages around Kidderminster and is inset in Green Belt. It, and the surrounding villages, is/are not extensions of Kidderminster and destruction of the Green Belt in order to make this so by building more houses than any available paperwork (other than the local plan) suggests are needed meeting the need of Cookley as an inset village (and the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>surrounding inset villages) which the WFDC is supposed to have an obligation to protect?</p> <p>Therefore we oppose the Local Plan Review for usage of the Green Belt but are happy for usage of brownfield sites without extension onto the Green Belt (such as removal of the woodland around the Lea Castle Site).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2535</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I wish to register my objections to Options A and B (all development on Green Belt land).</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to large scale development on Green Belt land. I believe the land should be protected from development as Green Belt status should ensure. I feel that there are plenty of brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest that could accommodate the proposed housing development.</p> <p>I also do not feel that the sites have the infrastructure to cope with the additional population. Traffic on the Spennells estate at peak times is already extremely heavy. I do not believe that the link road being proposed would do anything to alleviate the problem as it would have to cross one of the major routes hereby creating further congestion. There is also insufficient educational provision for the additional population. There are not enough school places in the local schools and no new school is included in the plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2295</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I do not think the benefits of easier school provision and eastern bypass option outweigh large scale expansion east of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3769</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>Whatever development is proposed for Kidderminster (whether at Lea Castle, Baldwin Road or Stourbridge Road/Hurcott Lane, it needs to address the dangerous junction between Hurcott Lane and the A456 and the weak road bridge at Hurcott Pool Reservoir.</p> <p>The junction of the A456 and Hurcott Lane is already a dangerous blackspot. There was another serious accident there only last week. The Highways Authority has already acknowledged the danger in part by reducing the dual carriageway to single carriageway access on the approach to and exit from Kidderminster. Hurcott Lane is also used as a rat run</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>between Birmingham Road and the Stourbridge Road, during the morning and evening commutes. This starts in the morning with constant traffic from as early as 5.30am, and that would only massively increase with development either on the Baldwin Road site or at Lea Castle. There is also the issue of whether the road bridge on Hurcott Lane could support any material increase in traffic.</p> <p>One way to address both concerns about Hurcott Lane would be to put bollards across the road adjacent to the access to the Hurcott Nature Reserve, thereby allowing vehicle access to the Nature Reserve from both the Stourbridge Road and the Birmingham Road, but preventing through traffic to anyone other than the emergency services with key access to the bollards. The bollards would need to go across the car park, to prevent people driving into the car park one way and out the other side to maintain through road access. This solution would also reduce traffic from additional development, in a way, which would protect the road bridge and alleviate the need for strengthening works.</p> <p>The Council might also want to consider cutting off Hurcott Road at the point where it narrows to a single track road, maybe putting an additional car park to the side, thereby improving the amenity access to Hurcott Nature Reserve for pedestrians, cyclists and horses. That would make that stretch of road much safer for people who today struggle with oncoming traffic if they try to negotiate that road on foot. Hurcott Nature Reserve is the most beautiful park/reserve on the eastern edge of Kidderminster, within walking distance of the town centre, and has SSSI protection. I would like more people to visit it, see it promoted more in local literature about the town, and make it easier for them to get there without the use of a car.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3787</a>	Policy 31 - Urban Extensions	Comment	<p>The band of proposed development on the East side of Kidderminster running from Cookley down to Offmore would not appear to address the core policies of the Local Plan Review (Sections 6 to 11) in encouraging the growth of Wyre Forest with Kidderminster at its centre. It would not attract a younger population into the centre of the town but encourage the corridor of growth along the A456 and A451 for commuters to Birmingham and Stourbridge</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and areas served by Bromsgrove District and Dudley Metropolitan Borough Councils.</p> <p>Wyre Forest's ageing and static population (Table 2.0.1) would not be served by housing that would require greater mobility to access the amenities provided by Kidderminster town centre. The bus services along Birmingham Road and Stourbridge Road (25 &amp; 192 run by Diamond) are infrequent and unreliable and any train travel would require a long journey to Blakedown which is almost outside of the WFDC area and in the opposite direction to the town centre.</p> <p>The development of the central business district would seem to be a better way of encouraging growth and making the centre a desirable area to live. Recent coffee shops near Castle Road are a welcome addition and the River Stour and canals could become features rather than inconveniences, similar to Brindley Place in Birmingham. The 'gentrification' of awful eyesores like Crown House and empty carpet factories would improve and encourage investment, while celebrating and preserving the town's heritage.</p> <p>Amenities could be concentrated and developed as part of the town regeneration - like Kidderminster Medical Centre - rather than the band of proposed housing placing extra burden on existing schools and surgeries that are already over-stretched. e.g. St. Mary's, St. George's and Offmore Primary schools or Stanmore House Surgery.</p> <p>Developing semi-rural sites would be detrimental for the district, destroying open spaces and ruining the approaches to the town from the East which are currently green and inviting. The government pledged to protect Green Belt (Theresa May, February 2017) and the Plan Objectives (Table 3.0.2) also aim to "protect and support the role of the Green Belt". The government has reiterated that Green Belt should only be built on in "exceptional circumstances" and "absolutely sacrosanct" (Sajid Javid, Communities Secretary, 2016).</p> <p><b>Hurcott Woods and Village</b></p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>One area that the proposed core development would engulf is Hurcott Village, with core housing proposed either side of the village and Hurcott Woods. The village is of historic and scientific interest, being developed on a site that is regarded as one of the oldest sites in British papermaking dating back to the middle ages. The woods is a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and developing the land around it would destroy much of the wildlife it supports. Buzzards, kingfishers, muntjac deer, otters, grebes, herons, woodpeckers, bats and newts are some of the wonderful wildlife regularly seen in the area and the delicate balance of nature needs to be surrounded by Green Belt to preserve it. It should be seen as an amenity and asset by WFDC and a jewel in Kidderminster's crown.</p> <p>The village and woods are served by a single track road, Hurcott Lane, from the North and South ends and an even narrower road, Hurcott Road from the West. Pedestrian access is only via these roads that have no pavements and a national speed limit of 60mph. There are regular incidents and accidents as a consequence of increased traffic from drivers using it as a cut-through from Stourbridge Road to Birmingham Road. Van drivers in particular hurtle through at dangerous speeds and despite the "not suitable for HGV" signs, lorries and coaches are directed by their satnavs through the village. Any housing developments in the area would put unbearable pressure on Hurcott Lane and the bridge and dam that are already showing signs of stress.</p> <p>The village is wholly residential; there are no shops and no pub and the road should only serve residents and those visiting the woods. That is clearly not the case and at least 95% of traffic dangerously speeds through, using it as a short-cut. Any surrounding residential development would put unbearable strain on Hurcott Lane and it is not clear from the Local Plan Review whether an Eastern Relief road would stop this cut-through traffic and could be a very expensive construction given the extra railway bridges that would be needed.</p> <p>The village is currently crime-free and - with no street lighting - free of light pollution. These would inevitably increase if surrounding Green Belt is built on and the area would soon be swallowed up by the contiguous conurbation.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2708</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the Local Plan Review because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Green Belt should be protected land that preserves the rural nature of the community and stops urban sprawls into the countryside.</li> <li>2. There are ample brown field sites in the District, that should be developed first: empty industrial factories, waste land and empty shops.</li> <li>3. Kidderminster is already a busy commuter town. Adding major developments to the Spennells estate would just exacerbate problems: commuting during peak times, added demands to local schools, hospitals, doctors, road structure, car pollution, etc.</li> <li>4. If you allow any more development in the Green Belt, there will be no stopping it and whole villages will be swallowed up by larger towns.</li> <li>5. Existing Green Belt is for wildlife, flora and fauna. Not for further housing developments.</li> <li>6. If you approve the local plan, then Option B is preferred because it shares the development around the District, rather than just putting it all together on the Spennells, Offmore and Comberton Estates. Other parts of the District should share the developments and responsibility.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3577</a>	Policy 31	Object	<p>You are taking away the Green Belt land which is home to a massive amount of wildlife. We teach children to preserve and look after this wildlife but this ideal is lost when money is involved.</p> <p>I am concerned about the new road and the amount of traffic that will be generated in and around Kidderminster and the air quality with the additional fumes and noise. The additional pressure on hospitals, doctors, dentists and schools, it was really quite the challenge to get appointments at my doctor's surgery that they changed the appointments system as it is!</p> <p>I bought my house with the view that I have and I love it, this will be destroyed when the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>houses are built.</p> <p>We have a very beautiful countryside that is right on everyone's doorstep, people can access the wildlife, birds, badgers, hedgehogs, bats, flowers, rabbits etc on our lovely public walkways and paths. I appreciate the need for more housing, but there is also a need for a healthy population, as humans we have a need for a quiet environment, this area gives us endless health benefits and therefore we should preserve what we have.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3580</a>	Policy 31	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realises extra housing is necessary but doesn't think it is a good idea to focus developing just one side of Kidderminster - especially on Green Belt land.</li> <li>Concerned about Hurcott Village as it is already used as a rat run.</li> <li>Road is not large enough to take the traffic now - this can only get worse.</li> <li>All infrastructure in the area is already under considerable pressure.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3509</a>	Policy 31	Comment	<p>There is no guarantee that building more housing on the eastern side of Kidderminster will make the development of an Eastern Relief Road more likely.</p> <p>It will create more congestion in that area.</p> <p>So of the 2 options I prefer the more dispersed one.</p> <p>I am not convinced of the need to build so much housing on virgin land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4529</a>	Lea Castle General	Support	<p>I believe that the building should actually be in Lea Castle as this would be of benefit to that area and sustain schools in that area such as Wolverley.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3571</a>	31.1	Object	<p>The 'necessary housing' has been falsely derived by a flawed OAHN report. This document dismisses three independent analysis in favour of one that supports the Council's original agenda. The Council has misled the Community with the scale of future provision. The scale of development will unbalance the town of Kidderminster converting it into an urbanised sprawl</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				unattractive to tourist so vital to the economy. It is unnecessary to pave over Green Belt when other forms of buildings can be considered within the curtilage of the existing town boundary utilising modern design of apartments to suit affordable housing. The idea to continually spread out over fields is ill thought through and destructive to the wider landscape, viability of remaining farming and detrimental to wildlife. The proposed mitigation in the form of education and community facilities simply undermines the relevance of the town centre. The proposed relief road will simply attract more vehicles along the A449/A456 route decreasing safety and isolating the town centre from custom. The statement is in direct contradiction to 25.2. I object strongly.
	<a href="#">LPPO4570</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc “ However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> <li>3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley &amp; Cookley Parish.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4571</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc “ However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley & Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO1080</a>	31.1	Object	<p>31.1 states “there is insufficient sustainably located readily available brownfield or non-Green Belt land to accommodate the necessary housing and employment growth required in the plan period.” I would counter that for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brown field sites that are not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park, Wolverley, partially owned by the Council and with limited economic benefit to the area; and the site of the old quarry on the opposite side of the B4189 to the above site. There is brownfield land still not built on behind The Range at Crossley Park in Kidderminster.</li> <li>• I see no evidence in the review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for the 2800+ people that will move in to the homes on the Green Belt “based around the redundant Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley”. One convenience store next to the Park Gate Inn &amp; a small office building is insufficient.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4560</a>	31.1	Object	<p><b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt land...etc “ However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> <li>3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley &amp; Cookley Parish.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4576</a>	31.1	Object	<b>Justification 31.1 states</b> “there is insufficient readily available Brownfield or non-Green Belt

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				land...etc “ However:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are brownfield sites not on the plan, e.g. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley/site of the old quarry opposite that/behind The Range at Crossley Park, Kidderminster plus others.</li> <li>2. No evidence in review of any employment provision or any commercial activity for incomers</li> <li>3. Share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley &amp; Cookley Parish.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4699</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4700</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4708</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4846</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4767</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site. I wonder if you could explain to me please why it is felt necessary to desecrate an area of woodland and destroy the homes of countless species of wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO4575</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4930</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPO5134</a>	31.2	Comment	31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPO4764</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site. I wonder if you could explain to me please why it is felt necessary to desecrate an area of woodland and destroy the homes of countless species of wildlife?
	<a href="#">LPO4559</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPO2317</a>	31.2	Object	The outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPO2609</a>	31.2	Object	On page 178, Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site. In the face of climate change, Green Belt land has an increasingly important role in the storing of carbon and in preventing flooding and is a vital economic resource for food security and soil protection.
	<a href="#">LPO456</a>	31.2	Comment	WFR/WC/15  Extend the Lea Castle site to use the land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of the Lea Castle site and extending the site up to Axborough Lane.  This would alleviate the need to build housing at the rear of Baldwin Road and Offmore Estate. It would create a sustainable community with its own Primary School, Doctors' surgery, shops etc. It would also alleviate any issues that a smaller site would have on Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPO363</a>	31.2	Comment	I think that you really need to have a robust plan for traffic management - although I don't live near the Lea Castle site, I do drive past frequently: at certain times of the day, there is a

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				big queue down to the traffic lights on the A449 from Wolverley. The junction by the park gate onto the Stourbridge Road is quite blind and would need remodelling. For such a large housing development, I'd consider the instigation of a new public transport service an essential item.
	<a href="#">LPPO446</a>	31.2	Object	This paragraph refers to the 'proposed' development of up to 600 homes at Lea Castle. Once the outline planning consent has been approved, it is no longer a proposal. I've objected here, but it makes no difference at all, as you are not consulting - the decision has been taken. So this is not a consultation, it is a presentation after the fact.
	<a href="#">LPPO1081</a>	31.2	Object	31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4569</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4568</a>	31.2	Comment	<b>Justification</b> 31.2 fails to mention that the outline pp for the core proposal involves the removal of woodland/Green Belt land on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4665</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4673</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4820</a>	31.2	Comment	31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland (Green Belt) on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4885</a>	31.2	Comment	31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4906</a>	31.2	Comment	On page 178, Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland- Green Belt land- on the



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				site.
	<a href="#">LPP04938</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPP04942</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPP04816</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland, (Green Belt).
	<a href="#">LPP04889</a>	31.2	Object	31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPP04934</a>	31.2	Comment	Justification 31.2 fails to mention that the outline planning permission for the core proposal (for 600+ homes) involves the removal of woodland – Green Belt land – on the site.
	<a href="#">LPP0501</a>	31.3	Object	<p>Document is too long, too technical and too prescriptive. Ridiculous to expect people to read and digest it then comment on specific points. The timing of this review coincides with the summer holidays and the period allowed is far too short for people.</p> <p>No specific reference to proposed development along Hurcott road a single carriageway prior to entering the village of Hurcott. I wish to make an objection to any development that can be seen from the above mentioned road or Hurcott Pools nature reserve itself. Both the road and the nature reserve are used by local residents on a regular and frequent basis for recreation and appreciation of the special nature of this area. Any development which impinges on the seclusion of the road and the reserve will be detrimental to the health of the site and the well-being of a significant number of local people. In addition, any development in this area will effectively end the status of Hurcott as a village, resulting in the loss of a picturesque setting which is loved by both residents and those who visit it en route to the nature reserve, ANY development here should not happen.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO179</a>	31.3	Object	Increased development will encroach on the SSI at Podmore and increase pressure on the natural wildlife, planning was restrained in the past because of studies of the wild life and ecology of the area This must in your archives.
	<a href="#">LPPO260</a>	31.3	Object	<p>The provision of a link i.e. footpath or cycleway will because of the isolated position of existing properties create an increased security and unwanted intrusion risk. At present access has been restricted by the present landowner who has discouraged local residents from using the land. With the growth in development the whole area will be under a much greater invasion than it has been in the past.</p> <p>The proposed pathway will leave the SSSI more vulnerable to unwanted visitors who could harm the ecology and do untold damage to wildlife.</p> <p>In short the greater the access the more unwanted criminal activity will arise</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO716</a>	31.4	Comment	Concerned that there is no core infrastructure for all these houses. Schools/doctors in Cookley/Wolverley are full. Main roads already busy will cause gridlock.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1417</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Details of the so-called “Eastern Relief Road” are vague and not in a form that can be fairly assessed in this consultation. There is only one large-scale map with a dotted line running from approximately the junction of Stanklyn Lane with the A449 to Hodgehill. If this were the route, a road tunnel and rail bridge would be needed near the A449 and another expensive and intrusive bridge over the railway line would be needed at Offmore. This expenditure is totally unjustified, since the A450 already serves the purpose.</li> <li>2. No definitive route or traffic model has been provided for this proposal, meaning that local residents are not being provided with sufficient details to make an informed judgement. This is in breach of Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice. Local people are unable to evaluate the true effects of a proposed new road when there is no definitive route indicated.</li> <li>3. Estimation is provided in the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) of the</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>cost of building such a road to be £17.5m. A route must therefore have been put forward to enable preliminary costings and this information should have been transparent in the local plan review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The idea that this would create the means for traffic to by-pass Kidderminster en-route to Birmingham or the M5 is misleading since the A450, less than 2 miles to the east, already provides this facility. If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450 without constructing an entirely new road over Green Belt land and potentially through a new housing development, together with the hazards to residents and children this would involve. Improving the A450 would provide relief to any congestion on the A449, without bringing increased air, light and noise pollution to the already heavily-populated Spennells estate.</li> <li>5. We understand that a proposal to either raise the railway 'Black Bridge' over the A450 or to lower the road under the 'Black Bridge' has already been investigated, so that HGVs could use this route.</li> <li>6. An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster since any regeneration is desperately needed within the run-down town centre, not on the outskirts in Green Belt land.</li> <li>7. A new road would create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife (as shown in further sections below).</li> <li>8. A new road such as that floated within the Kidderminster Local Plan would cause catastrophic effects by crossing existing wildlife corridors. The Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and its green corridors would be compromised by the building of a new road – a road which is not needed for the purpose presented in the Local Plan.</li> <li>9. There would be difficulty for such a road to pass through the proposed development at OC/13 south which crosses the water course incorporating Captains Pool and the Green corridor to Stanklyn Pool in order to then link up to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</li> <li>10. The proposed new road (the Eastern Relief road) would impact environmentally sensitive areas with increased air pollution, more noise pollution, light pollution and the destruction of large amounts of natural habitats.</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>11. A more likely route for Eastern Relief Road would necessitate the construction of an elevated bridge in order to cross the railway line, near Easter Park. Allowance would be needed for electrification of the rail line uses in the future. This would cause significant visual and noise impact upon existing Spennells residents to their obvious detriment in both health and wellbeing. The road would also have an adverse effect upon people who currently live on the Spennells estate due to increased ambient lighting, increased traffic noise, air pollution and additional traffic vibration.</p> <p>12. The construction of the Eastern Bypass is likely to encourage more car journeys to be undertaken. Although the Local Plan Review says that S-NE traffic will be diverted away from the town centre, locally generated traffic on the eastern side of Kidderminster could use the bypass as a shortcut between areas. This could lead to increased pollution including emission of CCGs, more road casualties, a reduction in walking and cycling and a consequent rise in obesity and associated health conditions.</p> <p>13. The claim that the Eastern Relief Road will facilitate an improvement in AQMA at Churchfields is bogus, since it goes nowhere near this area. The AQMA at Churchfields/Horsefair will be improved with the proposed new roads and one-way routes in the area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1826</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	An eastern bypass from the A456 to the A449 is not sufficient to alleviate the traffic problems in Kidderminster, especially at weekends. What is really required is a bypass for the A456 road, to remove all the traffic congestion around the ring road past St Marys, and on the Bewdley Road.
	<a href="#">LPPO3821</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed eastern bypass will require two railway bridges at the A449 and A456 trunk roads which would be wholly or partially funded by the developers as a condition of their approval by the local authority and it may not be acceptable to developers to incur the cost of building railway bridges in add</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2496</a>	Eastern Relief	Object	I believe the consultation is not in accordance with the guidelines for Public Consultation and

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		no rationale reasoning has been given for the need of an Eastern relief road.
	<a href="#">LPPO2607</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO3831</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	The proposed eastern bypass will require two railway bridges at the A449 and A456 trunk roads which would be wholly or partially funded by the developers as a condition of their approval by the local authority. This additional cost of funding the provision of railway bridges for a dual carriageway could well be prohibitive.
	<a href="#">LPPO3957</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Although the draft proposals say that an eastern by pass could be provided, this has been suggested on previous occasions and has not come to fruition due to the cost of development and would be unlikely to be paid for by any developing company whose main priority is profit. There should be no development to the east of Offmore until after an Eastern By Pass has been constructed. To do so would cause further congestion and pollution which is the opposite to what the local plan is trying to achieve.
	<a href="#">LPPO4175</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>WFDC need to explain to voters why this 21 year old proposal has now been resurrected apparently following another “useful contribution” from Greater Birmingham &amp; Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership.</p> <p>If this by-pass was, in fact, built can WFDC confirm that there would be no need to connect to Turnstone Road which has, conveniently, been built without a turning head. Most district councils would deem it ridiculous to route additional traffic through the roads of an existing estate.</p> <p>The construction of this road would be purely to enable quicker access to the motorways for overspill commuting to Birmingham plus opening up the possibility of future housing to the south of the by-pass. This is, no doubt, why Greater Birmingham &amp; Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership are willing to contribute to construction costs</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4561</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<i>If extended as far as the A449, the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would cause congestion further up the A449 so affecting the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.</i>
	<a href="#">LPPO4929</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall
	<a href="#">LPPO4837</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>There is no evidence in the report to show that a new access road, which would be essential to gain access to the sites, would relieve town centre traffic. An effective eastern relief road, relieving congestion, reducing air pollution and linking all major development sites is put forward.</p> <p>Option A would facilitate an eastern by pass and relieve congestion on the A449 and Town Centre? It is difficult to see how it would relieve the town centre. The proposed development would generate more traffic with the new road feeding existing pinch points and causing more congestion elsewhere. A more diverse development programme as in Option B is more likely to spread the load over the highway network as a whole and not have such an impact on pinch points. A traffic modelling exercise could indicate what is likely to happen. I understand that research has been carried out by Halcrow Consultants on behalf of Worcestershire County Council and a 'Wyre Forest Transport Model – March 2013' produced.</p> <p>It was explained that the exact line has, at this stage, not been determined but it would link the A449 to the A448 (Bromsgrove Road) crossing the railway line (presumably with a new bridge or tunnel) and is likely to be to the south of the proposed development, not passing through the centre of it. It is clear that this new access would be needed to serve the proposed development. This led to the examination of other options that would reduce congestion and pollution in and around the Kidderminster Town Centre. One option was to utilise the existing A450, which leaves the A449 at Torton to the south, passes through Mustow Green and joins the A456 just South of West Hagley. As requested, a suggestion is put forward under the 'Consultation Questions' section. The proposal would also reduce congestion and pollution in Blakedown and should not increase traffic volumes in West</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Hagley.</p> <p>The Draft Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017) under 3.1.5 states ‘Once a preferred option has been identified, a comprehensive network wide (Wyre Forest) assessment of the transport network will be undertaken...’. It appears to me that each Option could have a significant impact on infrastructure and this should be taken into account in Option choice. I would recommend carrying out an assessment for each Option.</p> <p>I have included suggestions of how an Eastern Relief Road could work. This would need much greater examination to verify its practicality.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5085</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>WFDC have signed up to the Carbon Emissions Programme – yet the end goal based on the Local Plan Review is to get the Eastern Bypass/Relief Road funded from Central Government. The Bypass is an unnecessary expense with two other routes already linking the A449 to Birmingham and motorways. Both of which could be significantly improved with lesser funding and impact on the local environment. The LTP4 states that it is a misnomer to say just building a road alleviates a problem - the very building of that road leads to ‘that road’ becoming the next problem. LTP4 identifies the need for WFDC to address public transport issues and support the use of cycle lanes. The air quality on Spennells is not always good especially on a dank day. The nature of its position within the valley and the heavily trafficked Spennells Valley Road plays a large part in this. It would be questionable then to add a relief road to the rear of Spennells and not consider AQI levels for residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5089</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. Spennells already absorbs noise from the railway line, Worcester Road and factory units at Easter Park (which recently had a request for extended hours rejected on the grounds of noise) and further noise pollution would be unacceptable and would have an adverse effect on health and quality of</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>life.</p> <p>A <u>new road</u> would simply move traffic a little further away to existing congestion areas on the Worcester Road, Husum Way, Blakedown, Hagley and Mustow Green/Bromsgrove. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5013</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>WFDC presentations / literature give the impression that their preference is option A due to the opportunity it gives to create the Eastern relief road, however I would question why this road is needed and what benefit it would provide? The A450 already links the A449 with the A448 and the A456, taking away the need for the proposed relief road. The only problem with the A450 is the 'Black Bridge' railway crossing at the A450 /A449 junction but this issue can easily be resolved by improvement to the A449 / A442 Somerfield junction to enable heavy goods vehicles coming from the Worcester direction to turn onto the A422 and join up with the A450. Can you please advise if this option has previously been considered?</p> <p>I would welcome an answer to my question regarding my road suggestion, I would also like you to forward me a copy of your environmental impact report for the local plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5082</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The plan shows the creation of an Eastern Relief Road for Option A from the A449 to the A456, this will not alleviate any congestion on the Kidderminster ring road or help poor air quality in the town centre. Travellers from Worcester to Birmingham or vice versa do not need to enter the town centre now, they will continue to use the A450. This proposed road will need to cross the railway line at 2 points, at great expense to local people. It will cause noise and air pollution for everyone on the eastern side of town, as well as a huge loss of wildlife habitat. The plan mentions creating cycling and walking paths for people, we will lose the public footpaths and routes currently available on the eastern side of town if you go ahead with option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4698</a>	Eastern Relief	Object	<p>The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4734</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	The route of the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road shown in the diagram on page 108 of the plan appears to run from the A449 at Easter Park and end on the A456. It makes little sense to consider building this relief road which will take the traffic back towards town to either the Chester Road or the ring road and will therefore cause jams at these junctions as well as air pollution and the other environmental issues this road seeks to avoid. If traffic wants to head towards Hagley or Birmingham they will use the A450 from the Black Bridge to Hagley and adjustments at Mustow Green to alleviate jams is already being considered. It only makes sense to build this relief road if it continues across Hurcott to the Stourbridge and Wolverhampton roads. Is this the ultimate intention not stated and is this why the development at Lea Castle is split into options? See other comments in about the previous proposal for this road - it never got off the ground as there was no money and no great need. I would refer you to the words in 13.7 'traffic congestion cannot just be tackled by building new roads'.
	<a href="#">LPPO4762</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5088</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. Spennells already absorbs noise from the railway line, Worcester Road and factory units at Easter Park (which recently had a request for extended hours rejected on the grounds of noise) and further noise pollution would be unacceptable and would have an adverse effect on health and quality of life.</p> <p>A <u>new road</u> would simply move traffic a little further away to existing congestion areas on the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				Worcester Road, Husum Way, Blakedown, Hagley and Mustow Green/Bromsgrove. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.
	<a href="#">LPPO4605</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4646</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Design an Eastern Bypass road to reduce congestion
	<a href="#">LPPO3937</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>There is no clear information about a proposed Eastern Relief road. At the numerous' drop in' sessions I attended, the planners acknowledged they did not know where it would go. There is however a costing for it within the WFIDP, so therefore some knowledge is available, but it is has failed to appear in the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>It would therefore suggest the necessity for further scrutiny and subsequent review to ensure transparency.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4132</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>We fail to understand how this ribbon development can be contemplated without first considering an eastern bypass. A true bypass, from the A449 Worcester Road to the A449 Wolverhampton Road, whilst desirable, is probably a pipedream, as the cost of two new railway bridges, at least three traffic islands and associated works would no doubt be deemed prohibitive.</p> <p>It is unarguable that a development to the east of Offmore would provide a faux bypass with consequent dangers in the development itself and traffic delays at Hoo Brook, Spennells Valley and the Chester Road A456 junction at Land Oak.</p> <p>A long narrow development such as this, with access only from Spennells Valley and the A456 will act as a high speed bypass through the very centre of a large housing estate. This is evidenced by the very real problems experienced at the moment in Tennyson Way and</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Husum Way. This despite the speed cushions in Borrington Road, these estate roads are used as a rat run by large numbers of cars and even articulated HGV's. A speed measuring device placed half way up Husum Way near to the Shakespeare Junction would demonstrate the problem at minimal cost. To even consider a large new development with a nice new racetrack through the middle is madness. Please note that a speed limit is irrelevant, as demonstrated by the problems in Husum way.</p> <p>We would also point out that the proposal that we are asked to comment on is falsely entitled as a Plan. A sketch of an area with portions coloured in and with no indications of existing road numbers, proposed roads and junctions, no infrastructure, no community facilities and no indication of the number of dwellings involved in each part of the plan, nor how the choice of each plan would affect the other is not a plan. Asking for constructive criticism of such a vague unformed "plan" means residents will end up with a development that suits and enriches only the developers, not the town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4847</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4919</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is no meaningful information about the proposed new road in the Local Plan. There is a costing for it within the WFIDP so someone must have an idea of its location but has failed to put it in the consultation. I believe the consultation is not in accordance with the guidelines for Public Consultation and falls short of both YouGov and Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice.
	<a href="#">LPPO4709</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley
	<a href="#">LPPO4714</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	A potential Eastern Relief Road is drawn on Map A, which appears to bisect the residential area, although this would depend on government funding and approval. A relatively high speed road would lead to a reduction in air quality in what would be a residential area and

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				make any existing rights of way unattractive for recreational activities, especially important in Kidderminster, with its relatively obese and elderly population. There would be a deterioration in the quality of life, both for existing and future inhabitants of the area. The Spennells Valley Road already links the main Worcester Road with the Bromsgrove Road and could potentially be improved, with traffic lights to allow ease of access to the two roads into the estate. A much shorter extension would then connect the Bromsgrove Road to the Birmingham Road. Footbridges should be provided for both pedestrians and cyclists.
	<a href="#">LPPO4701</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4768</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4776</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Details of the “Eastern Relief Road” are vague and not in a form that can be fairly assessed in this consultation. There is only one large-scale map with a dotted line running approximately from the junction of Stanklyn Lane with the A449 to Hodgehill on the A456. If this were the route, a road tunnel and rail bridge would be needed near the A449 and another expensive and intrusive bridge over the railway line would be needed at Offmore. This expenditure is totally unjustified, since the A450 already serves the purpose.</p> <p>No definitive route or traffic model has been provided for this proposal, meaning that local residents are not being provided with sufficient details to make an informed judgement. This is in breach of Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice. Local people are unable to evaluate the true effects of a proposed new road when there is no definitive route indicated.</p> <p>It has been suggested that this road will also serve as a “bypass”. However, it cannot serve as a route which will carry HGVs as well as run through a housing estate. The rough map indicates that it would terminate at the A456, which makes no sense in terms of where</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>bypass traffic is expected to go from there – clearly the A456 and the Land Oak junction would experience higher traffic flows. A Kidderminster bypass would attract traffic from the M5 and A450 and contribute to noise, air light pollution in the District.</p> <p>Estimation of the cost of building such a road is £17.5m, so a route must therefore have been put forward to enable preliminary costings and this information should have been transparent in the local plan review.</p> <p>The idea that this would create the means for traffic to bypass Kidderminster en-route to Birmingham or the M5 is misleading since the A450, less than 2 miles to the east, already provides this facility. If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450 without constructing an entirely new road over Green Belt land and potentially through a new housing development, together with the hazards to residents and children this would involve. Improving the A450 would provide relief to any congestion on the A449, without bringing increased air, light and noise pollution to the already heavily-populated Spennells estate.</p> <p>I understand that a proposal to either raise the railway ‘Black Bridge’ over the A450 or to lower the road under the ‘Black Bridge’ has already been investigated, so that HGVs could use this route.</p> <p>A new road would create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife.</p> <p>There is virtually no room for such a road to pass through the proposed development at OC/13 south which passes the water course incorporating Captains Pool and the green corridor to Stanklyn Pool in order to then link up to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</p> <p>The proposed new road would impact environmentally sensitive areas with increased air pollution, more noise pollution, light pollution and the destruction of large amounts of</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>natural habitats.</p> <p>A more likely route for Eastern Relief Road would necessitate the construction of an elevated bridge in order to cross the railway line, near Easter Park. Allowance would be needed for electrification of the rail line uses in the future. This would cause significant visual and noise impact upon existing Spennells residents to their obvious detriment in both health and wellbeing. The road would also have an adverse effect upon people who currently live on the Spennells estate due to increased ambient lighting, increased traffic noise, air pollution and additional traffic vibration.</p> <p>The construction of the Eastern Bypass is likely to encourage more car journeys to be undertaken. Although the Local Plan Review says that S-NE traffic will be diverted away from the town centre, locally generated traffic on the eastern side of Kidderminster could use the bypass as a shortcut between areas. This could lead to increased pollution including emission of CCGs, more road casualties, a reduction in walking and cycling and a consequent rise in obesity and associated health conditions.</p> <p>An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster since any regeneration is desperately needed within the run-down town centre, not on the outskirts on Green Belt land. The claim that the Eastern Relief Road will facilitate an improvement in AQMA at Churchfields is bogus, since it goes nowhere near this area. The AQMA at Churchfields/Horsefair will be improved with the proposed new roads and one-way routes in the area.</p> <p>There is <b>NO</b> justification for the Eastern Relief Road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4802</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The Preferred Options Document suggests linking the A449 at Easter Park to the A448 and A456 without any analysis other than relieving Chester Road. Having lived in Kidderminster for 38 years I have never found Chester Road North or South a major problem.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>A road link at Easter Park would have to cross the railway presumably with a bridge. This would have a significant visual and noise impact on the area.</p> <p>A Kidderminster eastern relief road would attract more traffic, particularly HGVs, along any new development between Stanklyn Lane and Spennells. The aim should be to divert traffic away from Kidderminster entering from the south and east. Such roads already exist linking the A449, A448 and A456 with the A450. The railway bridge (Black bridge) at Torton on the A450 is, however, too low for HGVs and a short crossing over the railway could be built, between Torton and east of Hartlebury, to connect the A449 and A450.</p> <p>A more extensive relief road linking the A449 north and south of Kidderminster would encourage M5 and M6 traffic to leave the motorway and hence increase the passing traffic, particularly HGVs, around Kidderminster. Such a by-pass would increase pollution and noise with a detrimental impact on the health of the community</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4811</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>When asked where the Eastern bypass may be, there are vague ideas. When better options are shown, the officials are not aware of the Kidderminster road topology. Especially the A450 and minor roads. The majority of this route could be upgraded without major disruption to traffic flows whilst being built. This would greatly reduce traffic on the Chester Road North and South and remove pollution from Kidderminster. The vague options for the Eastern bypass go through, or on the edge of, the proposed local plan, putting pollution right on their doorstep?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4830</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>There is mention of an eastern relief road. This has been a long held aspiration abandoned in the 1990s along with the western orbital motorway. The Review states that if the core sites development goes ahead without the Spennells Option A development then the relief road would not be built. This would then lead to unacceptable congestion on the existing highway network.</p> <p>If the By Pass was built but without the previously mooted western orbital motorway it is only</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				likely to increase the severe congestion in Hagley and further along the A456 through Halesowen into Birmingham.
	<a href="#">LPPO2899</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The Local Plan Review includes the proposal for a so called Kidderminster East Relief Road. And the not-to-scale plan shows an indicative line that it might take once constructed.</p> <p>This road will connect the A456 Birmingham Rd, the A448 Bromsgrove Rd and the A449 Worcester Rd by means of passing via the proposed developments adjacent both Spennells and Offmore Farm Estates. It will serve no other purpose than to give access/egress to the new developments. And it will not relieve any congestion on the A456, A448 or A449 since the points at which it will dissect the existing roads fall well outside of any congestion that congregates on those routes during rush hour.</p> <p>It will require significant investment from the public purse because it will have to cross an existing rail network at one or two points by going under or over. Similar major engineering works will be required to merge onto the A456, A448 &amp; A449.</p> <p>WFDC cite that any developers will be required to provide funding toward this road, and I assume that this will probably be via a section 106 agreement. But those developers will only contribute toward the easier/cheaper engineering which cross through virgin land, they will not expect to fund major engineering works.</p> <p>The Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery plan sec. 3.1. confirms that Worcestershire County Council will decide upon the exact route of the relief road once the local plan options have been finalised.</p> <p>Given that the proposed road will not relieve any existing congestion on the aforementioned routes, and that its primary function will be to serve new housing developments, it is factually incorrect to promote it as a relief road or by-pass. In fact it will be a local distributor road the definition of which is <i>“a low-to-moderate capacity road which series to move traffic from local streets to arterial roads. Distributor roads are designed to provide access to residential</i></p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p><i>properties</i>". There can be no other designation for this road whilst remaining within fact.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review Page 178 para 31.5 cites that a relief road "<i>would help to alleviate the severe congestion currently experienced along the A449 Chester Road</i>". Once again this is factually incorrect for the simple reason that traffic movements congesting on that road are making journeys into Kidderminster and not past it. The relief road will merge onto A449 &amp; A448 at points on the outer approaches to Kidderminster beyond the end of the line that the current congestion already exists. The so called relief road will not provide an alternative to the current congestion on A449 or A448.</p> <p>I can see no justification for the local authority to spend public funds constructing a road that will only serve the interests of the developers in terms of profit from house sales and will not immediately address any traffic congestion on the approaches to Kidderminster. Likewise there is no evidence being offered as to where this relief road will actually give relief in Kidderminster and there is no evidence of any traffic survey data to prove such a road is required.</p> <p>Local authorities should not be spending public money on schemes that have no direct benefit to the community at large.</p> <p>In summary I object to the proposals in the Wyre Forest District Council Local Plan Review.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4577</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p><i>If extended as far as the A449, the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would cause congestion further up the A449 so affecting the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.</i></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4691</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocated as Green Belt for significant reasons.</li> <li>• Wildlife - Endangered species e.g. Corn Buntings, Yellow Hammers, Deer, Barn Owls and bats also live in these fields.</li> <li>• Railway bridge needed for development and massively increased flow of traffic through Comberton impacting on mental health of local residents. Hurcott Road will</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>become a dangerous rat run.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Industrial development will ruin the area.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP03328</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The proposed route would open up Green Belt to unnecessary development.</p> <p>The Green Belt separates Kidderminster from other conurbation and protects delicate eco systems.</p> <p>There is no excess traffic on Tennyson Way to warrant a bypass. More development is not sustainable as the town's infrastructure is not sufficient for the existing population.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0498</a>	31.5	Object	<p>Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services. As a council WFDC should be supporting Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council to meet it's local needs in a sustainable way and not by destroying our Green Belt and putting a development larger than our village, joining our village and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster. I am happy to see a residential development on the Lea Castle Hospital site on the brown field part of the site but believe that a 540 unit development for elderly persons would be more suitable and safer.</p>
Hurcott Village Management Committee	<a href="#">LPP01628</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>Regarding the Eastern By-Pass. Is it not premature to be changing the Green Belt designation of this land? Would it not be more appropriate that any final decision is left at least until not only its route is definitely known but also that it is actually to be built?</p>
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPP0562</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Not necessary to allocate this land if consideration given to allowing development outside Green Belt on the western side of District.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01592</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The extent of the proposals include a new Eastern By-pass. This will have to incorporate at least one bridge over the railway and the topography suggests some sections would need to be elevated above the surrounding land. This will cause a massive loss of amenity to the Residents via noise, visual amenity, pollution and additional vehicle traffic. The A456 is</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>restricted to single carriageway through Blakedown and further to the east at Hagley where recent residential development has added to the traffic congestion problems. A by-pass would also cause road traffic congestion problems elsewhere on the existing road network. In particular on the A456 which is the main route for access to the M5 and M42 motorways from Kidderminster and Bewdley. Road widening at Churchill and Blakedown as well as at Hagley would be required.</p> <p>A by-pass would need to pass on from the A456 north to the A451 and A449, otherwise the narrow Hurcott Lane would become a “rat run” and create further traffic issues into Kidderminster at the Land Oak cross road to the west and Blakedown to the east.</p> <p>An Eastern By-pass would need to be built before any other development occurs.</p>
Kidderminster Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO1170</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Any option that includes a relief road should not be followed without a guarantee that the relief road would be constructed.
	<a href="#">LPPO2012</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is absolutely no rationale given for why an eastern relief road should reduce congestion?! No evidence is given of traffic flows that need to by pass Kidderminster in such a way as to require a relief road such as this. No research has been done to show that carving up our Green Belt land for such a road would serve the purpose, had such research been done it would have been provided in the document for all to understand!
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPPO1732</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>After twice previously failing to gain acceptance for an Eastern Relief Road, the Council appear to have taken the opportunity to resurrect the chance of proposing the construction of an Eastern Relief Road tied in with the perceived need for more housing in Wyre Forest.</p> <p>This is contested on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road would require two expensive road bridges over the railway line; from the A449 somewhere near Easter Park and near Husum Way on to the A456. This expenditure is totally unjustified, since the A450 already serves the purpose of an</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>eastern bypass.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As no definitive route or traffic model has been provided residents are unable to evaluate the true effects and make an informed judgement.</li> <li>• An estimation of cost is provided in the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) so a route must therefore have been put forward to enable preliminary costings. This information should have been transparent in the local plan review.</li> <li>• The idea that this would create the means for traffic to by-pass Kidderminster en-route to Birmingham or the M5 is misleading since the A450, less than 2 miles to the east, already provides this facility.</li> <li>• If an improved means of road transport is needed, this could be provided by widening the existing A450. Improving the A450 would provide relief to any congestion on the A449, without bringing increased air, light and noise pollution to the already heavily-populated Spennells estate.</li> <li>• We understand that a proposal to either raise the railway 'Black Bridge' over the A450 or to lower the road under the 'Black Bridge' has already been investigated, so that HGVs could use this route.</li> <li>• An Eastern Relief road would not help to regenerate Kidderminster since any regeneration is desperately needed within the run-down town centre, not on the outskirts on Green Belt land.</li> <li>• The proposed new road would totally destroy this environmentally sensitive area and create a whole series of dangers, hazards and disadvantages to local residents and local wildlife. There would be catastrophic effects by crossing existing wildlife corridors. The Spennells Valley Nature Reserve and its green corridors would be compromised by the building of a new road – a road which is not needed for the purpose presented in the Local Plan.</li> <li>• There would be significant visual and noise impact upon existing Spennells residents to their obvious detriment in both health and wellbeing. The road would also have an adverse effect upon people who currently live on the Spennells estate due to increased ambient lighting, increased traffic noise, air pollution and additional traffic vibration.</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is virtually no room for such a road to pass through the proposed development at OC/13 south which passes the Spennells Valley water courses incorporating Captain's Pool and the Green corridor to Stanklyn Pool in order to then link up to the A448 Bromsgrove Road.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4674</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4677</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The proposed road is supposed to relieve air quality on the Horsefair and take traffic away from the ring road. I do not believe this is the case. The A450 already accommodates the need for the majority of traffic going towards Birmingham, and the intended 'end' of your new road would not benefit anyone as the A450 comes out much lower down with quicker access to the A456. The proposed new road is basically a parallel road to the A450 along the Spennells fields, and money would be better spent on amending the bridge to allow larger vehicles to pass under, rather than increase light, noise and exhaust pollution elsewhere.</p> <p>The junctions either end of Stanklyn Lane are extremely risky and difficult to pull out of, and the increase in traffic trying to get on to the 'new' road would make this even more difficult. The close proximity of the Roxel site should also be considered as there have been incidents that affected residents and safety should be considered.</p> <p>The cost of building bridges to get over the railway will be very large, and this money would be better used in supporting town centre infrastructure or the area around Lea Castle to support users of roads out of Cookley and surround so they can bypass the town centre and relieve the air quality of Horsefair. Network Rail will also no doubt place strict guidelines on any building of roads, bridges and houses near their lines which will also increase costs considerably.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3931</a>	Eastern Relief	Object	The necessary housing figure is derived from a flawed OAHN report, dismissing 3 independent

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		<p>analyses in favour of one that supports the Council's agenda so misleading the community with the scale of future provision.</p> <p>The scale of development will make Kidderminster unattractive to tourists.</p> <p>Use Brownfield sites before Green Belt saving landscape, farming and wildlife.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation undermines the relevance of the town centre and the proposed relief road will attract more traffic affecting safety and isolating the town centre. The statement is in contradiction of 25.2 and I strongly object.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4687</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Finally - The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended, (something which the district council have no control over) as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall. The increased traffic of potentially up to well over 2000 vehicles coming from the housing sites using the A449 and adjoining roads will create huge congestion issues, impacting on the local countryside and environment and access issues from the village and surrounding areas. Planning new housing needs to consider this and take a more staggered approach - building smaller housing sites across the area, not concentrating housing in a way that will create the above congestion issues.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4781</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>This appears to have been resurrected apparently again due to another 'useful contribution' from the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP.</p> <p>This was originally due to start in 1996 but was abandoned in November of the same year presumably due to shortage of finance. In 2004 WFDC ceased to protect the line of the road.</p> <p>Wyre Forest seems to have survived quite well for the last 21 years without the need for this bypass. The sole reason for resurrecting this proposal must be to enable easier access to the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>motorway network for the proposed and any future Birmingham overspill.</p> <p>The construction of this link would enable quicker access to the motorways for overspill commuting to Birmingham and the possibility of further housing to the south of the by-pass. Presumably this is why the LEP are willing to contribute to the costs of construction. They would be unable to do this unless they could substantiate the longer term advantages to their board.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4784</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>I fail to see how the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would help reduce town centre traffic. Apparently, a new cinema complex may be built on the old Glades site, so any person or family wishing to access this, or the town centre shops will have to use the Ring Road. If all the housing is built in one area that will overload these already busy roads from one direction and cause even more traffic mayhem. The very idea that a road on the outskirts of town will relieve town centre traffic, a place which all residents need to access, is absolutely ridiculous and incomprehensible. The town centre will become busier than ever, with such a substantial growth in population. All residents require access to the town centre and only an element is through traffic. Perhaps an improved public transport system would better achieve this objective, with more reliable and better quality buses, unlike the current buses, which are run down, highly polluting (very evident if you have ever driven behind one) and regularly cause traffic jams due to breakdowns.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3932</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>The statement is in direct contradiction to 25.2. The proposed relief road will increase traffic on the A449/A456 route decreasing safety and isolating the town centre. I object strongly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4072</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p><b>Eastern Relief Road</b> I would be very open to further investigation into the Eastern relief road regardless of which option is taken as I feel this could be necessary in the future to reduce traffic flow through the town, Chester Road and Land Oak areas. In the future maybe a link from the A541 to the A456 is possible as this would reduce the need for traffic to go through Broadwaters, Horsefair, and Land Oak. I appreciate relief roads are not popular but neither is congestion and poor traffic flow and in the modern world this is an ever increasing problem. Relief roads, done in the right way, help control this. I trust any relief road would be built</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				sympathetically to the surroundings taking nature and wildlife into consideration. Circumventing the town to commuting traffic is important and better for everyone. You cannot expand the housing in Wyre Forest successfully with the current road systems in place. If not dealt with, traffic flow will be a problem and will create unhappy residents and Kidderminster will not be as an attractive place to live. On this subject serious thought needs to be given to finding another entrance/exit to Crossley Park as congestion here will only get worse with an expanding town.
	<a href="#">LPPO4146</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<p>I would like to see the detailed work on traffic flows around Kidderminster that demonstrates that an Eastern Bypass is viable financially, practically and ethically.</p> <p>Over the past few years, Kidderminster has seen a new road that cuts across ‘Silver Woods’ and links through to the Stourport Road. Although beneficial, it seems that not enough work was put into considering traffic numbers and flow as the road has resulted in much traffic back-log up the A449 towards Worcester. Many times traffic is backed up as far as Hartlebury.</p> <p>Coming along the A449 there are already the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Island at Mitre Oak</li> <li>2. Island at Esso garage</li> <li>3. Traffic lights at Black Bridge</li> <li>4. Traffic Lights at Droitwich Road</li> <li>5. Island at Easter Park</li> <li>6. Island at Hoobrook</li> <li>7. New traffic Lights at Silverwoods link</li> <li>8. Island at bottom Worcester Road (Aldi)</li> </ol> <p>A new road – Eastern Bypass will require another junction/island/traffic lights.</p> <p>There are already many islands and traffic lights on the A449 approaching Kidderminster and</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>often traffic build up. The planner that I spoke with talked about a new road across Spennells fields stopping Stanklyn Lane being used as a 'rat-run'. This is not the case – the only time we see through traffic on Stanklyn Lane is when there is an accident, or once a month for the Stone sale. A new junction near to the vehicle testing station would only consolidate the existing traffic problems. It would be unfair to the residents of Stanklyn Lane who would then have roads on 2 sides. It would not stop vehicles who want to travel to Kidderminster or Stourport. The only people who would use it would be those who live along it and perhaps others travelling to Wolverhampton side of Kidderminster. Where is the data to show the need?</p> <p>A road bridge over the railway would be extremely costly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4480</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>31.5 I Strongly Oppose OPTION A and the massive road expansion scheme proposed.</p> <p>This would have huge impact on the area ad advised in terms of health, well-being, crime, and safety, congestion in Spennells, Schools, community facilities, wildlife, and characteristics of Kidderminster.</p> <p>The road network would serve to bypass the town when you have proposed to develop the town. This is contradictory.</p> <p>There are no proposals for Spennells road network.</p> <p>This is Green Belt land and you have not demonstrated the requirements necessary under the NPFF to fully justify building on this land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3969</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>In regards to the details of the so-called “Eastern Relief Road”, these are extremely vague and not in a form that can be fairly assessed in this consultation. If the proposed route for this “Eastern Relief Road” were the route, a road tunnel and rail bridge would be needed near the A449 and another expensive and intrusive bridge over the railway line would be needed</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				at Offmore. Estimation is provided in the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) of the cost of building such a road to be £17.5m. I struggle to believe that this local council would be willing to spend this amount of money. Also, the vagueness of any proposals for this road suggests that there is a lack of commitment for this road. Including how many homes would have already been built before construction of the road begins.
	<a href="#">LPPO4034</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would also like to challenge the building of what is described as a "Relief Road" between the A449 Worcester Road and the A448 Bromsgrove Road and then onto the A456 Birmingham Road</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Building of a "Relief Road"</u></b></p> <p>I strongly object to the building of a "Relief Road" which may become a "Bypass" as I do not believe you have carried out any form of survey or census on any of the roads feeding to and from this "Relief Road" and if you were to simply look at a map would realise that the only traffic that would use this proposed road now would be lorries travelling between Hartlebury / Worcester and Birmingham or Birmingham and Hartlebury / Worcester that are not allowed to use the Black Bridge on the A450. All other forms of transport have no need to use it as it doesn't go in the direction people want to travel.</p> <p>For example somebody coming into Kidderminster on the A449 wanting to go to Kidderminster Town, Stourport, Wolverhampton if they went along this road would not be going in the direction they wanted and would end up in one of the other pinch points on the Chester Road namely Comberton Road to turn right or Birmingham Road to turn right.</p> <p>The only people perhaps to use it would be Offmore residents coming from the Worcester direction.</p> <p>If option A development were to go ahead along with core sites then these would probably</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>need to use this road as an access point, so it's an access road not a "Relief Road".</p> <p>Please look at a current map of this area and you will see this is not a problem solving road, the only way it would be if it was a bypass that went from Worcester Road to Wolverhampton Road.</p> <p>The location of this Relief Road has not been defined but it has to go from the Worcester Road over the railway and across to the Bromsgrove Road. Presumably at each end will be a roundabout then at the Worcester Road end the road will need to rise in a bridge / flyover over the railway creating both an eyesore and would result in a substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area giving both visual and noise problems to new builds and the existing back of Spennells. Similarly at the other end there is a line of woodland from Captains Pool to Stanklyn Lane with two further pools inset, the woodland is subject to Tree Preservation Orders ( TPO 285 and TPO 213 ) so a Relief Road here would require either removal of protected woodland, filling in of pools or another flyover giving further substantial adverse change to the character and appearance of the area and giving both visual and noise problems to new builds and the existing back of Spennells in Kittiwake Drive and Cardinal Drive. There would be a huge amount of investigations and reports needed with regards to the flora and fauna and whether a road would be justified or not.</p> <p>There is a further issue to the location of this Relief Road and that is the electricity pylons and cables that cross the land from Stanklyn Lane to Bromsgrove Road.</p> <p>Within your local plan there is mention of trying to raise funds for this "Relief Road", what will you do if there funds are not available?</p> <p>There is no need for a "Relief Road" this could easily be substantiated with a survey and census to judge likely usage.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4572</a>	Eastern Relief	Comment	<i>If extended as far as the A449, the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would cause congestion</i>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
		Road		<i>further up the A449 so affecting the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.</i>
	<a href="#">LPPO4581</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	No reason given for a relief road. No traffic census done. No reason to why or how this will reduce congestion.
	<a href="#">LPPO4664</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO3618</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>When attending a consultation event the titled “Eastern Relief Road” was brought up. I was talking to the route on which it was going to run. This was a very vague description as it was explained no route had been decided yet and that the road would only be built if the extra housing was built on the Spennells fields. This was one of the reasons why option A of the local plan was being pushed.</p> <p>The route which was vaguely explained would run from the A449 near where the disused VOSA inspectorate is, across the fields crossing the A448 Bromsgrove road and meeting up with the A456 Birmingham road. I was told this route was chosen because it was identified that the majority of traffic using this road would come from Worcester travelling to Birmingham. When pointing out that there were two main roads from Worcester to Birmingham already in use, M5 and A38 and why the need for this road to be built an answer couldn't be provided. The fact is that the road in this format is of no use at all.</p> <p>If an Eastern relief road is to be built the road needs to extend from the A449 as planned to the A449 on the other side of town creating an outer ring road. In its current format there are major towns and a city (Stourbridge and surrounding area, Kingswinford and surrounding area and Wolverhampton) travelling in on the A451 &amp; A449, coming together at Broadwaters. If any traffic wanted to go to Worcester then it would still have to go along the A449 Chester Road to get there. Any traffic wishing to go to either Bewdley or Stourport would either use the same A449 Chester road or go through the A451 Stourbridge road via the Horse Fair to the Kidderminster ring road. As stated in the Local plan the Eastern relief road would be built</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>to relieve the traffic pressure on the Horse Fair. This could not be the case as the relief road would not be accessible if you were travelling from these places.</p> <p>I believe also that if Option A was chosen and an Eastern relief road was built it would be a pointless road and rarely used. The reason being is that if people wish to travel into town they would still only have three main access roads, the A456 Birmingham road, A448 Comberton road and the A442 Worcester road. When using the Eastern relief road traffic would still have to turn onto these roads to access town. At the present moment in time the junctions of these roads with the A449 Chester and the Spennells Valley road are heavily congested and would only get worse with all the extra traffic that will be created with the extra houses being built.</p> <p>This is another reason why I think the WFDC Local plan is flawed and needs to be revisited with a more considered look into the Eastern relief road and whether it is even required.</p>
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO2250</a>	31.5	Support	<p><b>Landscape Sensitivity</b></p> <p>Preliminary Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) undertaken. Identifies key constraints and opportunities and likely impacts of proposed development. Landscape mitigation strategy proposed. Western boundary is woodland along watercourse and residential estates. E/SE edges - localised ridgeline. Substantial landscaping buffer can be developed on E and S edges. Greatest visual effects will be from locations on or directly adjacent to site. Aim to maintain and enhance existing Green Infrastructure network by using existing landscape components. This will also help to set an appropriate and robust Green Belt boundary.</p> <p><b>Accessibility to Amenities</b></p> <p>Proposed site has good access to services and town centre. Provision of relief road would help to ease congestion. Plans also include potential land for new primary school and other community facilities. Potential pedestrian/cycle links to neighbouring estates with local retail</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and other services.</p> <p><b>Highways and Transportation</b></p> <p>Site access possible from roundabout off Spennells Valley Road. Southern part of site could be accessed from new roundabout junction on A448 as part of proposed relief road. Northern part can be accessed off Husum Way. Site is also well placed for Kidderminster Rail Station. Given scale of development it is likely that a bus route will be diverted through site. (see Highways and Transportation Technical Note). Land N of Comberton Road can deliver significant section of relief road with secondary links onto Husum Way and Spennells Valley Road/Comberton Road. A Transport Assessment will be undertaken to support a future planning application.</p> <p><b>Flood Risk and Drainage</b></p> <p>Majority of site is Flood zone 1. However, Hoo Brook traverses site with small areas of zone 2/3 alongside. These areas will be left undeveloped. There are also several watercourses, drains and ponds on site. Majority of water storage will be in form of balancing ponds with swales and linear features adjacent to the watercourse if required. Site drains naturally to W edge (lowest point). Sandstone site - good drainage likely.</p> <p><b>Noise</b></p> <p>Unlikely to be significant issue. Dwellings will be set back from main roads and railway. Landscaping will be used together with careful orientation of dwellings.</p> <p><b>Ground Conditions</b></p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Initial Phase 1 Environmental Risk Assessment undertaken. Not contaminated land.</p> <p><b>Utilities</b></p> <p>Sewers present near roundabout on A448. There are surface water outfalls into watercourse on W boundary. No sewers or main water within site. Electricity, gas and phone diversions will also be needed.</p> <p><b>Agricultural Land Classification</b></p> <p>Natural England's Land Classification Map for the West Midlands shows majority of site is Grade 3 (good to moderate) with rest being Grade 2. This is the case around most of Kidderminster.</p> <p><b>Suitability</b></p> <p>Taylor Wimpey is please to see these sites form part of proposed Kidderminster Urban Extension.</p> <p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <p>Agreement in place with landowner to facilitate development. Technical work undertaken shows no physical or other constraints likely to render site undeliverable within Plan period. Many potential impacts can be mitigated through design, and in most cases a positive outcome can be achieved. Site is deliverable and immediately available subject to allocation and removal from the Green Belt. Development of land to south of Comberton Road is dependant upon securing route through to Worcester Road A449.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2784</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Abandon the aim of building an Eastern Relief Road which logically cannot be seen to be

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>dependent on the urban expansion of East Kidderminster.</p> <p>The current plan does not include any detail as to the route the relief road is to take other than the reference "from the A449 near Easter Park linking through to the A456 Birmingham Road".</p> <p>Given that this hinted route is within 2 - 3 miles of the centres of Kidderminster and Stourport, what traffic flows are anticipated to use the relief road? When traffic reaches this point on the A449 or A456 its destination is almost -certain to be Kidderminster or Stourport. No traffic census has been included in the plan and thus there is no evidence given of the likely traffic that would use the relief road. Had this road been routed from a point much further away from Kidderminster and extended to the A449 Wolverhampton Road then there might be some justification for its existence but the proposed cost of £17.5 million, being ridiculously low, suggests that this has not been considered.</p> <p>As the plan stands this relief road will have a major impact on the Green Belt; certainly raising the % of Green Belt taken shown in Option A. In addition the resultant congestion, noise and air pollution will increase greatly and will aggravate further, rather than lessen, the health and safety of both the existing and potential residents of Spennells and Offmore.</p> <p>The plan under Option A is proposing a further new estate road that also runs from the A449 to the A448. Does this road in effect become another relief road or "rat run" compounding the consequences of traffic congestion, abnormal noise levels and poor air quality as well as using more Green Belt land?</p> <p>The present Local Plan should be significantly rewritten to include the full impact of both of the above road proposals so that the residents of Kidderminster can have a much clearer understanding of the impact they will have on theirs and future generations' lives before giving their verdict on the proposed urban extensions.</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1660</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4935</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4939</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5071</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is passing information about the eastern relief road, hidden within the depths of predominately technical, jargon enriched scopes of planning/proposal documentation. These technical documents show contradictions and are open to differing interpretations. Any infrastructure plans for relieving the east of Kidderminster (A449/A456) would have to take into consideration the effect on the railway. The last time this proposal was looked at was in the days of the “Western Orbital”, kicked into the long grass by John Prescott.
	<a href="#">LPPO5105</a>	31.5 Eastern road	Object	There is a budget of £17.5 Million in the plan for this Eastern Relief Road hut, as it would appear to require a fairly substantial carriageway capable of carrying, in both directions the cars and heavy commercial vehicles that currently use these aforementioned roads, this budget seems grossly under-estimated, especially considering that the Worcester Road to Silverwoods Link Road cost in the region of £6.5 Million. If there is evidence that traffic flows require to by-pass Kidderminster then surely there are other roads that serve this cross-country purpose, further away from Kidderminster without resorting to yet another road carving through the Green Belt, at great cost to the Wyre Forest residents. The plan also mentions that the Eastern Relief road will “provide access for the new development to the east of Kidderminster “. It is not clear whether the aforesaid access will be directly from this road or whether smaller circular roads, linking the A449 to the A448 and the A448 to the A456 would be needed to allow residential traffic to leave the enlarged estates, thus taking up even more of the Green Belt, increasing traffic noise and pollution in the affected areas

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>and destroying the habitat for wildlife. More seriously this link will take estate traffic directly on to the A448, A449 and A456, resulting in even more traffic and congestion on these already busy roads. There may also be a danger of creating a “rat-run” situation along this road.</p> <p>The Plan appears to have a strong bias towards the promotion of Option A, seemingly to facilitate the building of an Eastern Relief Road to carry traffic between the A449 Worcester Road to the A448 Bromsgrove Road and onward to the A456 Birmingham Road and the reverse, and thus to take traffic away from Kidderminster. The route of this major road has not been outlined, but it is likely that it would necessitate the removal of even more Green Belt land from the Wyre Forest area. Is this not a resurrection of the ill-fated Kidderminster, Blakedown and Hagley Bypass, the proposed route of which was designed to start in Summerfield, link to an unbuilt Kidderminster Southern Bypass before heading North East to the north of Stone, curving round the Kidderminster urban area, and crossing the A448 before turning eastwards to join the A456 to the west of Hagley Wood? In 1996 that plan was withdrawn.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5144</a>	Eastern relief road	Object	I do not consider that we need an Eastern Relief Road. Traffic is not at a bottleneck in this area, the main permanent traffic jam in Kidderminster is by the hospital, something that this won't help.
	<a href="#">LPPO4905</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to on pages 42, 45 and 108 if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO4551</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	A particular concern is the proposal within Option A for a relief road between the A456 Birmingham Road, A448 Bromsgrove Road and the A449 at Easter Park accompanied by a very large concentration of new housing (para 31.5). This would result in a significant increase in the traffic levels in the area combining additional through traffic with additional traffic from residents in the new houses travelling south to and from Worcester with the result of a catastrophic increase in the already intolerable congestion on the A449 south of Easter Park, particularly around the Black Bridge. And it would do nothing to alleviate the

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				congestion issues at existing pinch points such as Mustow Green, Kidderminster Ring Road and Horsefair because it does not provide an alternative to these routes. Adding further employment use in the area will also exacerbate the congestion issues already caused by businesses in that area such as Roxel having access on to what is an already very busy and congested road. Adding up to 30% to the population of Kidderminster without addressing the extant fundamental transport link issues into and out of the town is a disaster waiting to happen.
	<a href="#">LPP04821</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPP04835</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council and the authors of the Report praise the virtues of an Eastern Relief Road, to ease traffic congestion in Kidderminster, together with the perceived benefits of easing air pollution in the Horsefair area of central Kidderminster. This totally ignores the fact that the current A450 road, only 2 miles to the east of Kidderminster already links the A449 Worcester trunk road to the A456 Hagley/Birmingham Road. Traffic wishing to avoid Kidderminster can already do this without the expense and environmental damage which would be caused by constructing yet another road through the Green Belt.</li> <li>The only traffic which currently avoids the A450, due to the low level of the 'Black Bridge' involves large HGV lorries. Surely the authors of this Report are not seriously suggesting building a trunk road suitable for HGVs through a new housing development, with the traffic and pollution hazards which this would essentially involve. If the Council wish to provide a route for HGV's to link these roads more effectively, the obvious choice is to improve the A450 and its access under the 'Black Bridge'.</li> <li>The claimed potential benefits to air quality in the Horsefair are completely irrelevant to these plans, since only a road improvement built into the Churchfields redevelopment in Kidderminster will provide benefit to the air quality in the Horsefair. The only effect that these proposals would bring would be to cause</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				deterioration in air quality in the Spennells area of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4236</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	An eastern by-pass would be very expensive and would impact on the local countryside. There would be no proper community.
	<a href="#">LPPO4470</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Any new road should run the whole eastern side of Kidderminster from A449 North to A449 South, possibly to A451.
	<a href="#">LPPO4943</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5078</a>	31.5	Object	<p><b>Proposed Link Road:</b> We were informed that an Eastern road link would be built if one option was given the go ahead, linking the A456 to the A448 and onto the A449, what are the benefits of such a scheme which carves up of the country-side to gain so little. We all know that you can build a 6 lane highway but at some point it goes into a 2 lane road, hence a bottle neck in traffic congestion. There is already a road A450 which people use to bypass Kidderminster, many use this route, and there are still bottle necks at each end.</p> <p>I'm not convinced that comprehensive investigation has been carried out to ascertain the true advantage of this proposed link and how it will alleviate congestion; for people trying to travel from the A456 to the A449 or visa versa.</p> <p>One only has to look at the recent opening of the link road from the A451 to the A442 and the Island by Mac Donald's. A small number of vehicles using this new link causes a tail back on the island along the A442, and gaining access from Chester Road South to Wilden Lane is now impossible at certain times of the day. One more bottle neck to navigate through; a big asset this has been to relief congestion, <i>as it now adds at least 10 minutes more to one's journey.</i></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5086</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. Spennells already absorbs noise from the railway line, Worcester Road and factory units at Easter Park (which recently had a request for extended hours rejected on the grounds of noise) and further noise pollution would be unacceptable and would have an adverse effect on health and quality of life.</p> <p>A <u>new road</u> would simply move traffic a little further away to existing congestion areas on the Worcester Road, Husum Way, Blakedown, Hagley and Mustow Green/Bromsgrove. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5087</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>Option A suggests a <u>new road</u> from Worcester Road to A456. At the consultation meeting, no one was able to state where this road would actually start and end although the implication was that it would directly affect Spennells Estate in a significant way. This also has clear implications on increased traffic noise and a destruction of the Green Belt. Spennells already absorbs noise from the railway line, Worcester Road and factory units at Easter Park (which recently had a request for extended hours rejected on the grounds of noise) and further noise pollution would be unacceptable and would have an adverse effect on health and quality of life.</p> <p>A <u>new road</u> would simply move traffic a little further away to existing congestion areas on the Worcester Road, Husum Way, Blakedown, Hagley and Mustow Green/Bromsgrove. Kidderminster is not situated in an area that allows easy access to any major road network. To go to M42 you go through Bromsgrove and M5 means further congestion to Worcester and Bromsgrove. Previous plans to have a relief road twenty years ago were rejected.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5127</a>	Eastern relief road	Object	<p>The proposal to build houses behind Spennells goes hand in hand with the proposed Kidderminster Relief Road, which was proposed and rejected in 1981 (house builders would likely contribute funding for the road). There is no need for this road in terms of traffic and no</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				desire for it from Spennells residents or residents of the rest of the district. It would not make travel quicker from residents of Spennells or elsewhere. Traffic jams occur in other parts of Kidderminster such as the Horsefair, for which the Relief Road would not be an alternative.
	<a href="#">LPO4887</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road referred to, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall
	<a href="#">LPO4890</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road, if extended as far as the A449, would just lead to congestion further up the A449 further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPO4573</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<i>If extended as far as the A449, the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road would cause congestion further up the A449 so affecting the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.</i>
	<a href="#">LPO4771</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	<p>With ref to the road proposal, again, no information was forthcoming on how this would cross the railway line, type of road surface, overhead lighting etc. that would be required other than it would serve the houses only and no other traffic would use it. 40 ton trucks along with everyone else will use it to short cut onto the Worcester Road and avoid the Black Bridge height restriction creating a dangerous road for those with young children &amp; elderly parents.</p> <p>The implications of this road to Spennells and local residents would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Light pollution – lighting would be required and with 40 ton trucks using it high &amp; bright lighting would be needed.</li> <li>• As you have to cross the rail line a long gradient would be required for said traffic (trucks) which would means raised embankments across the entire length of Spennells.</li> <li>• Noise pollution – increase in traffic would increase noise levels in the area, the road surface would need to be of a type that keeps noise to a minimum.</li> <li>• Air pollution – Poor quality air will result due to the trucks etc. leading to increased</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>health issues and lowered standard of living.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short cut created – raising safety concerns for children &amp; elderly.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4787</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	Eastern Relief Road would be expensive as a railway bridge would have to be built for the new houses and would cut one side of the Relief Road from the other. The siting of a school and other essential facilities would be problematic because of the elongated shape of the Core Sites, something made worse if Option A is also used.
	<a href="#">LPPO4817</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	The Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road if extended as far as the A449 would just lead to congestion further up the A449, further affecting the quality of life of the villages of Cookley and Caunsall.
	<a href="#">LPPO5148</a>	Eastern bypass	Comment	<p>An Eastern Bypass would need to be built to accommodate the extra traffic caused by the increase in dwellings. This would need to be built from the Worcester Road to the Wolverhampton road. There are endangered species along this route so it must not be developed.</p> <p>Any eastern bypass would need to cross the railway as the Husum road bridge is inadequate. If this is not done the excess traffic would bring the area to halt as it would not cope. The expense of building a railway crossing would be extortionate and I doubt the council or developers can afford this.</p> <p>The elevated position of the new road linking the Wolverhampton Road and Worcester Road would mean it would require at least a 30m tree screen separating it from housing to buffer against traffic noise.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5149</a>	Eastern relief road	Comment	Mention was made of a Southern(?) Relief Road but no effective information has been available. If this is indeed a substantive suggestion it must be much clearer in the final document, as indeed so should the plans for further infrastructure development and schools, none of which has been very evident.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4472</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	Many people will object on the important ecological grounds. Everyone talks about global warming and we talk about destroying the countryside. It seems like a ploy to get funding for an eastern bypass, with no thought to wildlife.
	<a href="#">LPPO4797</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Comment	<b>Eastern Relief Road</b> I would be very open to further investigation into the Eastern relief road regardless of which option is taken as I feel this could be necessary in the future to reduce traffic flow through the town, Chester Road and Land Oak areas. In the future maybe a link from the A541 to the A456 is possible as this would reduce the need for traffic to go through Broadwaters, Horsefair, and Land Oak. I appreciate relief roads are not popular but neither is congestion and poor traffic flow and in the modern world this is an ever increasing problem. Relief roads, done in the right way, help control this. I trust any relief road would be built sympathetically to the surroundings taking nature and wildlife into consideration. Circumventing the town to commuting traffic is important and better for everyone. You cannot expand the housing in Wyre Forest successfully with the current road systems in place. If not dealt with, traffic flow will be a problem and will create unhappy residents and Kidderminster will not be as an attractive place to live. On this subject serious thought needs to be given to finding another entrance/exit to Crossley Park as congestion here will only get worse with an expanding town.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO918</a>	31.6	Comment	It would be good to mention in this paragraph too that the low density housing proposed provides adequate space to deal with surface water runoff from the proposed development on the site itself. This might prove essential as currently I am not aware of an existing drainage system near the site that future site drainage could connect to (attenuated). A surface water flood risk has been identified off the site, against the railway embankment (the embankment presumably acts like a dam for land naturally sloping this way). This means that it is extra important that the drainage system of the potential development will not result in any additional flow leaving the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4483</a>	Eastern Relief Road	Object	There is no meaningful information about the proposed new road in the Local Plan. There is a costing for it within the WFIDP so someone must have an idea of its location but has failed to put it in the consultation. I believe the consultation is not in accordance with the guidelines



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				for Public Consultation and falls short of both YouGov and Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice.
	<a href="#">LPPO4550</a>	Policy 32	Object	I am writing to give my views on the proposed plans for extra housing and businesses in Stourport. The road infrastructure in Stourport is not adequate to accommodate any further housing. On Bank Holidays especially the roads are grid locked and there have been several occasions recently due to the work on the new pipeline where it has taken around an hour to travel just a few hundred yards. The Wyre Forest is an attractive place to live and it is in danger of losing its character and charm if it is extended beyond recognition.
	<a href="#">LPPO4115</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the options indicates improvement to the road structure in and around Stourport, which is already badly needed. Councillors should try driving into Stourport on a Friday morning</li> <li>• AKR/14 Pearl Lane and AKR/15 Ribbesford Road – building here would have an immense impact on the already stretched local services; schools, doctors, medical centres, Worcestershire Royal Hospital etc. There are no proposals to help with this</li> <li>• AKR/14 Pearl Lane and AKR/15 Ribbesford Road - since 1963 efforts have been made to have a relief road/second bridge in Stourport. The air at the crossroads of High St, Bridge St, York St &amp; New St is highly polluted so to build at these two sites would be irresponsible. Both Bewdley and Kidderminster have had major road relief, where are the plans for Stourport?</li> <li>• Why are the developer's names not given?</li> <li>• There was no indication of the type of housing that will be built</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2874</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>We strongly object to proposed development plans for Stourport.</p> <p>Infrastructure cannot cope with the volume of traffic and congestion. Schools and Doctor surgeries are already struggling.</p> <p>If this amount of development is needed, and this seems questionable, then develop on the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>other side of Kidderminster where the plans include a relief road which would enable the extra residents viable access to work etc.</p> <p>Stourport could only cope with the extra volume if a second bridge were to be built over the River Severn.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2326</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Without more houses being built there are traffic jams every weekday early morning, mid afternoon and early evening in Kingsway, Windermere Way, Lickhill Road and Bewdley Road. There are also traffic problems outside the schools in Kingsway/Windermere Way with the school run vehicles.</p> <p>Kingsway is also used as a shortcut for lorries (Talbot largest culprit) and at times when the A451 Kidderminster Road is blocked because the town roads are blocked with traffic.</p> <p>More cars mean more pollution.</p> <p>More cars will make it more difficult for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Poor public transport adding to number of cars on the road.</p> <p>The compulsory purchase of a Care Home in Lickhill Road (another kick in the teeth for the elderly of the area), loss of a business and peoples horse riding hobby.</p> <p>Nearest doctors are based in Stourport. They will not cope with the extra numbers of patients. Are there enough places available at the schools?</p> <p>Until the council can come up with a plan and the funds to improve the roads and facilities in the Burlish, Lickhill and Kingsway area of Stourport, the idea of building houses as should be scrapped.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2953</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>Have you ever thought of the idea to ask people on beforehand where THEY think more houses (especially social housing) could be built. After all, people living in certain areas will know exactly where spaces are that are either so neglected that you may as well start afresh or where there are brown sites suitable for development.</p> <p>Just think what would happen if hundreds of houses are built in Areley Kings in about 20 years. The cost to the economy (delays on roads) and health (all this pollution from stationary cars) will be enormous.</p> <p>Can we first have a new bridge to cater for all these new inhabitants? Then building new houses in Areley Kings makes sense.</p> <p>Another problem you may face is the effect it will have on local schools.</p> <p>The local High School is already bursting at the seams. They will have a new Sixth Form College but the school will still not be able to have many more children on their books because the current High School building will not be large enough.</p> <p>Areley Kings hasn't even got a Surgery and people have to travel to Stourport (where there is not even any parking) to see a Doctor or Nurse.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1889</a>	Policy 32	Object	Object to all these sites as in Green Belt, plenty of brown sites still available.
	<a href="#">LPPO1632</a>	Policy 32	Object	The redevelopment areas in the Stourport area will impact greatly on the already over-burdened infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, dentists and access for emergency vehicles via already congested roads. There are sufficient brownfield sites everywhere in Wyre Forest area to accommodate housing needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO732</a>	Policy 32	Comment	All this would require: better roads, reliable bus service (national or sub contract).
	<a href="#">LPPO724</a>	Policy 32	Comment	Utilize brownfield sites first as you have a clean canvas for mixed housing

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1</a>	Policy 32	Object	The plan mentions the traffic issues relating to land to the West of Stourport and then proposes to allocate land there - this doesn't seem logical.
	<a href="#">LPPO207</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>I object in the strongest terms to the proposal to build on Green Belt land in particular the field at top of Kingsway, the field which runs alongside Burlish Crossing/Bewdley Road and the fields and land on Lickhill Road.</p> <p>My objections are on the basis that there is already significant house building taking place within Wyre Forest area, the population has been static for several decades (therefore why the need to build so many houses); there are already significant delays on all of the roads in and around these areas, particularly in peak times; the impact on wildlife would be significant in particular building houses so close to the Burlish Top nature wildlife reserve; the road infrastructure, in particular on Kingsway where much of the road has no pathway in either direction, is, unable to cope with the significant increase in traffic which would arise as a result of buildings houses on these 3 fields; there would be a significant impact on air quality, there are no plans to build additional schools or medical facilities which would be required with the influx of so many additional residents. These are my initial objections, having only just become aware of these proposals via a neighbour's Facebook post, I would further comment that the lack of advertising/notification to local residents in relation to these proposals falls well short of what is expected in relation to transparency of local government, coming at the very end of a very long and complex document, where it is not made obvious how to object or comment on the proposals.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO321</a>	MI/18	Support	My client's support the zoning of their two sites for employment purposes and the removal of M1/18 from the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO2337</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way</li> <li>• Traffic congestion already a problem would increase</li> <li>• Affect emergency services access</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Capacity of schools/GPs/dentists</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat esp. on Burlish Top Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• No evidence that there is a housing shortfall that cannot be met by use of Brownfield land</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO984</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>Stourport sites</p> <p>As at Bewdley, there is the dilemma of whether national policy dictates that development should be concentrated on non-Green Belt land west of the Severn or whether Green Belt should be released. On one side of the town, the presence of Hartlebury Common prevents expansion in that direction. On another, it is important that the strategic gap between Stourport and Kidderminster should not be eroded. This leaves the options of further expansion along Bewdley Road north or west of the Severn in Areley Kings</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1799</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Objects to LI/6/7, LI/5, LI/2 due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure (especially roads) needs to be improved before any development can be considered.</li> <li>2. Traffic - the one way system around the town at key times of the day are often gridlocked. Another bridge over the river Severn would alleviate this.</li> <li>3. The crossroads on the Bewdley Road/Kingsway junction often have long queues again at certain times of the day.</li> <li>4. Putting more demand onto an already overloaded town without infrastructure</li> </ol>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				improvements will destroy residents' quality of life aside from pollution issues.
	<a href="#">LPPO1806</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Increase in local traffic.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1987</a>	Policy 32	Object	No building on Green Belt. Already far too many cars.
	<a href="#">LPPO2000</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Objects to proposal for houses to be built in Stourport and Bewdley due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bridge over Stourport from Areley Kings is always congested.</li> <li>2. More houses on this side of the bridge is not viable, as more traffic will be added.</li> <li>3. There were plans for a by-pass to be built years ago, which would have eased traffic over the bridge but did not materialise.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO245</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>I recognise the need for new housing in the area, I strongly feel that greenfield sites should not be considered while there are still brownfield sites unused; some areas of land have been derelict for many years.</p> <p>More thought should be given to the infrastructure of Stourport, which has no bypass and only one river crossing which causes traffic bottlenecks throughout peak travel times and the summer tourist season.</p> <p>Stourport has also lost valuable facilities in recent times. It is ludicrous that a town with a river has no swimming facilities for teaching children, and only further adds to the road traffic that causes so many problems in an otherwise picturesque Georgian canal town.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO43</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Main roads into Stourport too small to cope with extra traffic generated by the proposed building.</p> <p>Stourport Bridge, Gilgal and Wilden Lane and approaches are all bottlenecks that have standing traffic at some time every day. In the summer, and at weekends, it is a nightmare.</p> <p>Stourport would need a relief road and another bridge over the Severn before any extra traffic could be considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1633</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Loss of Green Belt status</p> <p>Increase in traffic would affect emergency services response time.</p> <p>Significant increase in traffic on all roads in area which are already very busy.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1076</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>We are not aware of any overriding ecological constraints affecting the majority of sites listed in tables 32.0.1 and 32.0.2 but we note that some (including LI/2 in particular) are close to designated sites and will require particular care in delivery. With this in mind we refer you to our previous comments on the need to update the evidence base for the plan prior to finalising the allocations.</p> <p>We reiterate the need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been considered in the evidence base or SA for these sites. This may have the effect of rendering their allocation unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for sites listed in Table 32.0.1 and 32.0.2 is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2104</a>	Policy 32	Object	Unacceptable - reasons below:

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stourport: already gridlocked, ring road is required.</li> <li>2. Doctors/Hospital/Schools:- capacity</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO2327</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p><b><u>RE PROPOSED LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENTS IN STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN</u></b></p> <p>My objections are:-</p> <p><b>There are no plans to provide additional roads to cope with the increased traffic.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I live in Kingsway - there are regular traffic jams at the start and end of the school day and the end of the working day.</li> <li>• The traffic is even worse when there are accidents elsewhere and the traffic is diverted in front of our house.</li> <li>• I have travelled regularly from the roundabout on the Bewdley bypass up the road to the Burlish Crossing traffic lights at approximately 16:00 and this journey can take 20-30 minutes. This trip normally takes 5 minutes to my home.</li> </ul> <p>2. The additional cars from these new houses would create increased air pollution.</p> <p>3. I understand that there are proposals to demolish the Sanctuary Care old people's home. The effect on moving such elderly patients is well documented and can at least be very traumatic, if not fatal. (LI/6/7)</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2409</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>We have been to the local plan consultation at Areley Kings village hall, we do not think any homes should be built in Stourport until the ring road that has been talked about for years is put in place.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2452</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Stourport on Severn roads are congested and we don't have the infrastructure to house more people. The roads, schools, doctors just won't cope. The schools are full, the roads are not designed to cope with current traffic levels let alone more. One set of temporary traffic lights</p>



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				in this town upset the whole network.
	<a href="#">LPPO3284</a>	Policy 32	Comment	<p>I appreciate the necessity to provide sites for the Districts housing allocation. However, it is concerning that it is felt this can only be achieved at the expense of the Green Belt. Brownfield sites exist all across the district, and surely these must be fully used, before Green Belt land is taken. Many of these sites already have outline planning permission (e.g. Parsons Chain, Old Worth site), what incentives and encouragements are these for these to be fulfilled? As regards Stourport, it is important to retain the character of the town and its separate identity. Further development on the edges of the town would cause deterioration of a valuable landscape, enjoyed by locals and visitors alike, as well as a loss of worked farming land.</p> <p>The document does not seem to appreciate the role of Stourport in the District's economy - the local retail sector in Stourport does not just cater for local needs, as in Bewdley. Its town centre retail outlets, serve both the towns own needs and that of the rural hinterland. Stourport has a significant and growing night-time economy with a number of eating places and live music. Frequent mention is made of promoting heritage tourism in Stourport but there is no mention of encouraging the facilities to support this, e.g. toilets, parking and provision of facilities for visiting coaches.</p> <p>In Stourport the local infrastructure and road system are already at full capacity, particularly Stourport Bridge and the town centre one-way system. Stourport is not connected to the national Rail network, as are other parts of the district, neither does it have easy access to the employment centres of Birmingham and the Black Country via the motorway and trunk road network. There is little mention of sustainable transport proposals in the document, the assumption being made that travel from Stourport area both within and beyond the district will be primarily road based. The areas do not have the infrastructure to support this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3462</a>	Policy 32	Object	Transport: This area around Burlish Crossing is already grid locked in all directions at peak

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>periods. Stourport town centre is always busy even at off-peak times</p> <p>Health: It's difficult enough to arrange a doctor's appointment now.</p> <p>Throw in all the other concerns like parking, environment and pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO2646</a>	Policy 32	Comment	Stourport's shopping centre, congestion, air pollution and traffic pinch-points, especially for lorries means that an alternative to the present river bridge is essential.
	<a href="#">LPO1635</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not notified</li> <li>2. Increase in traffic – Bridge and Gilgal, already a problem.</li> <li>3. Air pollution</li> <li>4. Already sufficient houses in Stourport</li> <li>5. Loss of Green Belt</li> <li>6. Capacity Drs/hospitals/schools</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPO1637</a>	Policy 32	Object	Concerned about increased traffic and loss of Green Belt, consider instead regeneration in urban areas.
	<a href="#">LPO1638</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/wildlife/view</li> <li>• More traffic = more future pollution</li> <li>• No bypass/ring road.</li> <li>• Lack of GP, schools, dentist.</li> </ul>
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">LPO1964</a>	Policy 32	Support	In allocating sites we are pleased to see, in Stourport on Severn, that there is a wide range of generally smaller sites being considered for allocation and this will assist house builders of all shapes and sizes to be able to access land for development. This will assist with deliverability as well as offering a range of houses to the market. One of the key elements for such sites is that they are deliverable.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1758</a>	Policy 32	Object	Road, doctors, schools etc cannot cope now, never mind more houses.
	<a href="#">LPPO3451</a>	Policy 32	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools – where are the children going to go?</li> <li>• Doctors – difficult to get appointments.</li> <li>• Dentists</li> <li>• Traffic – already difficult at certain times of the day.</li> <li>• Lots of houses already being built in the sugar beet site.</li> <li>• Loss of Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3548</a>	M1/18	Object	<p><b>M1/18 North of Wilden lane industrial site.</b></p> <p>I am hugely opposed to any more industrial units on Wilden lane. We are surrounded by industrial units in this area, many of which are empty.</p> <p>The Worcester road has had units empty for years, why build more? There is also the Hoo Farm industrial estate and the Worcester road premises.</p> <p>A majority of the residents of Wilden lane live very close to road and we already suffer fast traffic speeding HGV's (over the weight limit) that are hurtling down the road at all times of the day and night and more industrial units would add to this.</p> <p>The traffic congestion on Wilden has become unbearable since the sugar beet development with access out on to the A449 McDonalds island horrendous at rush hour and beyond. – At 6.45pm it took me 25minutes to exit Wilden lane as the traffic generated on the A449 from the new lights do not give way for Wilden traffic. It is much worse at real rush hour with traffic tailing back.</p> <p>Any industrial units will add to noise, air and road pollution and be detrimental to the road</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				and residents.
	<a href="#">LPP02325</a>	Policy 32	Object	<p>Reasons for objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of Green Belt/public rights of way</li> <li>• Traffic congestion already a problem would increase</li> <li>• Affect emergency services access</li> <li>• More traffic noise/fumes</li> <li>• Stourport has nothing to alleviate traffic.</li> <li>• Capacity of schools/GPs/dentists</li> <li>• Loss of wildlife habitat esp. on Burlish Top Nature Reserve</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land.</li> <li>• No evidence that there is a housing shortfall that cannot be met by use of Brownfield land</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP0167</a>	32.1	Comment	There is a lot of stress on the road network around these proposed sites. Stourport is desperate for relief roads to reduce bottlenecks on Worcester Road, Hartlebury Road, Mitton Street, and Severn Road - primarily caused by the incorrect siting of Tesco's. By adding more residential development this will make the current situation worse without additional measures to divert non-Stourport traffic away. Through traffic needs to be diverted away from the one way system and back to the A449.
	<a href="#">LPP0233</a>	32.1	Comment	The planning register shows that Stourport has circa 550 dwellings constructed on the town side of the river in the last 12 years. This represents just under 10% of the population, using reasonable average occupation, from the start of the period. This can not be called a small amount of building. Using an average council tax figure from 2012 this equates to an additional circa £800,000 per year at the end of the period
Place Partnership Ltd	<a href="#">LPP01095</a>	Policy 33	Comment	The Bewdley Fire Station site is currently allocated under Policy SAL.B1 – <i>Load Street Redevelopment Area</i> of the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan (adopted July 2013).

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>However, this allocation has not been carried forward into Policy 33.</p> <p>Given that the Bewdley Fire Station site will become available for redevelopment, alongside the fact that the new Bewdley medical centre and library on Dog Lane has been delivered, we consider that it would be sensible for Policy SAL.B1 to be incorporated into the new Local Plan in an equivalent form.</p> <p>We suggest that the precise wording of the policy should be agreed via the Place Review of the District that is currently being undertaken by the Council and PPL.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1871</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>There is a need for housing but Bewdley is full up so not possible.</p> <p>There is land available on the outskirts of the town but the roads are not able to cope with the existing traffic, Welch Gate is the most polluted spot in the Wyre Forest because of emissions. Buses are the worst offenders and the most dangerous as they have to drive on the pavement in order to pass sometimes.</p> <p>People prefer to use the route through the town centre. Buses could use the by-pass but do not.</p> <p>There is a primary and secondary school situated on Stourport Rd, another traffic 'hot-spot' at peak times. An increase in housing would add to this problem.</p> <p>Why is the council trying to over-fill a small town with new residents rather than look its existing ones? What is being done to solve the issue of poor air quality in the town centre and the traffic congestion in Welch Gate.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO823</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>Object to any large-scale housing west of the river for reasons of poor infrastructure and sustainability (including a lack of public transport possibilities), the exacerbation of traffic and pollution/air quality problems in the town, the visual impact of the landscape quality of the</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				area and surface water drainage issues.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO890</a>	Policy 33	Comment	<p>Additional Suggestions and Omissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Policy to guide and direct the redevelopment and improvement of the Load Street car park area and the development of the former Surgery and Fire station site (as in the previous Local Plan Policy SAL.B1 Load Street redevelopment area). There should be a Policy to produce a Development Brief to comprehensively survey and seek solutions to its pedestrian/vehicular conflicts and visual appearance.</li> <li>• Suggest a policy for the redevelopment and/or enhancement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The riverside buildings from Bridge House to the Rowing Club, perhaps to provide additional housing and car parking.</li> <li>b) The Workhouse site in High Street</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2259</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>It is appreciated that from general political comments there is a need to increase the housing across the whole country and preparation plans are required.</p> <p>Are the 5,500 houses as stated in the conservative newsletter across the whole of the Wyre Forest Area and is that quoted for the Bewdley area the total in the plan up to 2034?</p> <p>If this is the case it equates to just over 4.5% of the total required.</p> <p>It is surely more sensible to have a plan that would not disrupt an area that already has a traffic problem particularly at holiday times.</p> <p>Areas that have better links to major roads and good public transport would be more sensible than those shown for the Bewdley area.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>If the 5,500 houses are as stated I presume this would increase the population of the area by approximately 22,000, would it not be more viable to create say a new town with new infrastructure that would then be viable rather than overloading existing?</p> <p>I do appreciate this would create the release of Green Belt land but it would be a one off strike to satisfy the target over the next 17 years.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4487</a>	Policy 33	Comment	I have heard and read about the development on the Green Belt land off Dry Mill Lane down to Dowles Rd, I have not heard anything about the traffic problems which would occur in Welsh Gate and Dowles Rd and nothing about how would the Medical Centre and the schools cope?
	<a href="#">LPPO3270</a>	Bewdley Site Allocations	Object	<p>I have been very surprised by the volume of traffic in Bewdley town centre and also along the bypass, the thought of the pollution caused by the constant traffic is a big concern. To top this off I'm extremely concerned by the proposed plans to consider building more roads and houses within this already gridlocked little town, almost with no consideration for the additional traffic and pollution this will cause.</p> <p>Over the next 5 years the Bewdley population will be getting younger. With young families moving into the area we need to ensure that there is ample green space for them to walk to without the use of transport, ensure the pollution is kept at a reasonable level and ensure that extra traffic does not become a danger to pedestrians.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4215</a>	Policy 33	Comment	Option A still identifies Green Belt/green field sites (e.g. on Stourport Road/Habberley Road/Highclere etc) which as well as jeopardising scenic attraction also in many cases jeopardises the preservation of the gap between the three towns and consequently their individuality.
	<a href="#">LPPO4423</a>	Policy 33	Support	We wish to support the development of Bewdley, as outlined in policy 33 and the core sites identified.
	<a href="#">LPPO2019</a>	Policy 33	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West of the River is not feasible because of the road structures and because it is</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>impossible to widen roads in this area, not of course forgetting the bridge which is often congested due to large vehicles and increased number of cars.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While I know 'The Gladman' land is not included in your development plan, my argument is largely the same – roads, traffic and congestion.</li> <li>• I think Wribbenhall will have to bear the development – they may assist with road costs i.e. Safari Park.</li> </ul>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0976</a>	Policy 33	Comment	At Wribbenhall, the bypass provides a strong landscape barrier, and the Green Belt boundary could conveniently be moved out to it. Any development towards Kidderminster should be resisted unless there is substantial planning gain such as new link road between Habberley and Kidderminster Roads. If more sites are needed in Wribbenhall then land off Grey Green Lane may be least damaging. Land along bypass is very open and should be low priority option. Area between town and Forest is very sensitive.
	<a href="#">LPP047</a>	Policy 33	Comment	There are several words or phrases which, when used, preclude rational argument. One example is to call something 'undemocratic'. Another is to describe something as 'uncompetitive'. In the current issue, there is a phrase whose use precludes rational argument. It is 'Green Belt'. Green Belts were, a good idea 60 or 70 years ago, but they have, in certain circumstances, become an obstacle to sensible planning. As a resident of Bewdley, I make frequent trips to Kidderminster for shopping, banking, concerts etc. Very many people who live in Bewdley travel to Kidderminster on a regular basis - rather more than those who come to Bewdley FROM Kidderminster. It would make sense, therefore to favour sites for future housing development which are as near as possible to Kidderminster to help minimize miles travelled. The Green Belt between Kidderminster and Bewdley contains a successful golf course, a safari park and a hotel with extensive grounds. They themselves provide a green space between the towns. It would therefore seem sensible to confine Bewdley's future housing development to sites east of the river until those sites are fully saturated. It would not be sensible to prefer the Highclere site over the other three sites merely because the latter are 'Green Belt. I contribute this in addition to the two points that Bewdley already has substantial traffic and air pollution problems due in substantial part to the amount of housing



## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				east of the town centre, and also remind you of the lack of safe traffic access to an extension of the Highclere housing development, since the only means of access is via the Highclere/Park Lane junction, which leads traffic either down narrow steep Park Lane (no pedestrian footpath) or else, typically past St Anne's School on the way up to the bypass.
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1425</a>	Policy 33	Object	<p>Gladman are of the view that the Market Town of Bewdley must take on a supportive role to Kidderminster in the provision of housing, to secure an approach that better responds to the nature of market towns as sustainable locations for growth. The Local Plan should be aiming to focus the development to support the district's wider needs alongside all sustainable towns with established centres and in doing so deliver its aim to make use of existing infrastructure and reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Gladman therefore object to the limited scale of growth that is currently proposed from housing allocations in Bewdley (across both options) and consider it necessary to plan for further development in order to fully support the economic and housing needs of the area. The total of 251 dwellings would deliver a mere 75 homes in accordance with the 30% affordable homes requirement, which would be barely sufficient to meet affordable housing needs over the next 3 years, let alone the 213 homes identified as required over the next 10 years and 383 over the plan period.</p> <p>Plan only proposes 4.6% of dwellings in Bewdley. Core Strategy proposed 10%.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1833</a>	Policy 33	Comment	<p>Regarding development proposals in Bewdley, I would strongly oppose development of Heathfield and also the muted Gladman sites. These sites would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inevitably increase traffic down Wyre Hill, Park Lane and Welch Gate and then through Bewdley (which has numerous listed buildings). Welch Gate has very narrow pavements which put pedestrians at risk.</li> <li>• Increase air and noise pollution</li> </ul>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Bewdley centre has lots of empty commercial buildings that should be changed into high quality living accommodation. The former Midland Bank is a good example. Also many shops here have empty space on top for residential use.</p> <p>If development of <b>any</b> green field land is considered essential, then the identified spaces on the Kidderminster side of Bewdley seem to be the least bad option.</p>
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO922</a>	33.2	Comment	<p>My concern regarding the Habberley Road site (WA/BE/5) has been included, but I would propose the following rewording to hopefully better describe the scale of the issue.</p> <p>The relevant sentence reads:</p> <p>“The small site lying south of Habberley Road would need to be carefully designed to take into account the need for a channel to take surface water run-off through the site in times of heavy rainfall.”</p> <p>I propose:</p> <p>“The small site lying south of Habberley Road would need to be carefully designed to accommodate a substantial existing surface water flood flow route through the site so this route remains fully operational during times of heavy rainfall whilst not causing a flood risk for any new development.”</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO586</a>	33.2	Object	<p>2007 serious rainfall in Bewdley. The Safari Park closed one of the sluice gates, which caused serious flood of water. The whole area is delicate with the little stream this does not need to be tampered with. How will with all the housing being built, not cause flooding to us and to them. Will the old wall Sandbourne drive be kept intact, or will this also be knocked down and lose more of Bewdley's character, which looks like is happening all around us, the whole of Wribbenhall will be a block of houses from Catchems End right down to The Great Western, and from Old Styles' Mill right up to the now Stourport Triangle. No greenery, no</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				fields, no hedges, no trees, just houses.
	<a href="#">LPO375</a>	Policy 35 - Far Forest	Comment	A local development plan for Far Forest, addressing the aging population needs, and by addressing this may then free up a lot of under occupied other property, would better address development in Far Forest than by including 6 acres of general housing development.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPO1084</a>	Policy 35 Villages and Rural Areas Allocation	Object	<p>Proposed allocation BR/RO/4/6 – Although we note the comments set out in paragraph 35.2 of the reasoned justification we wish to object to the allocation of this site. We do not think it likely that the proposed development would be capable of maintaining the orchard (and any unimproved grassland present) to any meaningful degree given the level of housing proposed and we do not agree with the SA conclusion that the site would have a neutral effect on biodiversity (which we assume has been reached because the evaluation only considered designated sites). Traditional orchards are included under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 (and often contain S41 species including the noble chafer, which is known from nearby sites) and we cannot find any justification for the losses that would be likely set out in the evidence base for the Plan. As a result we object to this allocation on current evidence and would strongly recommend that further work be done to determine the impacts prior to any final allocation being accepted. It is important to note that any significant reduction in developable area arising from biodiversity constraints may render the site unviable.</p> <p>Proposed allocation BR/RO/7 – This site is also partly traditional orchard and whilst some level of development may possible the issues set out above still pertain and again we wish to object to its allocation until further evidence is available to demonstrate that development here is sustainable.</p> <p>The majority of other sites proposed under this policy also have likely biodiversity implications and so we reiterate the need to determine any ecological constraints that may exist on any of the sites listed under this policy using up to date survey information. We cannot see that this has been done and so far as we can ascertain constraints other than SSSIs and LWSs have not been fully considered in the evidence base or SA for the plan. This may have the effect of rendering the plan unsound. We therefore strongly recommend that the evidence base for</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				sites listed in the two allocations tables is updated and that the quantum of development proposed is made acceptable in light of any overriding biodiversity constraints before the plan is finalised.
	<a href="#">LPPO3844</a>	Policy 35	Comment	The plan does not provide sufficiently for windfall housing sites in areas in the west of Kidderminster, beyond Bewdley. It has a narrow focus on 2 sites in Far Forest, introducing 40 new houses of unknown mix/type/purpose, without safeguards in respect of future housing needs for +65, who are going to be significantly in the majority in local housing. The plan should review all the local settlement boundaries to establish the extent to which small additional sites might contribute to the significant housing problem
	<a href="#">LPPO3238</a>	Policy 35	Object	<p>This site has become overgrown and dormant for many years however it has a host of wildlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Egress from Plough Lane onto Cleobury Road (A4117) is dangerous and at a steep incline with limited views in either direction. Would WFDC ensure that new road layouts are installed to accommodate additional traffic to and from the site?</p> <p>At certain times of the day New Road becomes impassable due to the number of vehicles dropping off and collecting children from the primary school. Further traffic to and from the proposed site adds to this major problem. School places at Far Forest Primary School is a smaller than average school with 136 pupils on roll. Is there a proposal to expand the capacity at the school?</p> <p>The night sky here is also considered to be one of the rare sites in which to observe the night sky as there is no light pollution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1695</a>	Policy 35	Object	I am concerned at lorries' speed and their manoeuvring causing traffic problems.
	<a href="#">LPPO1694</a>	Policy 35	Comment	Build affordable housing in Clows Top for people to be close to family and support local

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>businesses/schools e.g. Bayton where a play area would be nice.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• living on a busy fast road that there will be more traffic accidents</li> <li>• Possible problems with sewerage.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPO1697</a>	Policy 35	Object	<p>Objection to Policy 8f Page 64:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor access from the A456</li> <li>• The unstable land is not suitable for storage of heavy vehicles or caravans due to poor drainage possibly subsidence</li> <li>• With correct infrastructure provided, village land should be used only for the village,</li> </ul>
Horton Estates Ltd	<a href="#">LPO867</a>	Policy 35	Comment	<p>We wish to highlight that PDL within the Green Belt at Cursley Distribution Park could be made available through site rationalisation which could be allocated for residential development. This site lies within Parcel SE4 of the Strategic Green Belt Review (Strategic Analysis, September 2016) which was assessed as making a “limited contribution” to four of the five Green Belt purposes (NPPF para. 80). As described in more detail above, two areas of PDL (1.5ha and 1.9ha) could be released, each of which could accommodate in the order of 40 dwellings, as indicated on the enclosed Illustrative Masterplan. This would require the land to be released from the Green Belt and allocated under Policy 35.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO319</a>	Policy 35	Support	<p>Supports inclusion of BR/RO/7 as a core site. However, wishes development to be for local needs as defined through an up to date Parish Survey. Also wishes that the development be at a scale and density appropriate for the setting, possibly controlled through a ‘Master Plan’ approach</p>
	<a href="#">LPO1696</a>	Policy 35	Support	<p>I would like new houses built in Clows Top for young people and to support local</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				shop/schools.
Rock Parish Council	<a href="#">LPO1162</a>	Policy 35	Comment	<p>Council wished to draw your attention to the following points raised at our meeting by concerned residents of Far Forest namely;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential loss of wildlife and harm to the landscape</li> <li>• Various protected species are located on the proposed development land</li> <li>• Harm to the Landscape Protection &amp; Hedgerows</li> <li>• The Primary School at Far Forest cannot accommodate additional pupils</li> <li>• Concern at the increase of traffic in New Road especially after the last schools review</li> <li>• Road Safety in and round Cleobury Road &amp; New Road</li> <li>• No Car Park for Far Forest Church causes problems</li> <li>• Plough Lane used as Bus Stop for school children in morning</li> <li>• Sewerage System in Far Forest is still a major ongoing issue as the upgraded system cannot cope with the current dwellings</li> </ul>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPO1426</a>	Policy 35	Comment	<p>Careful consideration needs to be given to the role of rural settlements within the context of the spatial distribution of development. All sustainable settlements should be allowed to play their part in meeting their own housing and employment needs as well as contributing to the wider district's requirements. A flexible approach to delivering the development needs of the district will ensure the plan's ultimate deliverability and success.</p> <p>PPG advises that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas. Blanket policies restricting development should be avoided unless supported by robust evidence. It is also vital that sufficient development in rural settlements is enabled to support the District's housing market in providing a choice of accommodation that responds well to local needs and create a better balanced population structure</p>
	<a href="#">LPO256</a>	35.2	Comment	See my comments on the Far Forest allocations under Policy 35, with some objections and some support.
	<a href="#">LPO257</a>	35.5	Support	I support the redevelopment of Alton Nurseries. Consider a mixed use site with a residential

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION GENERAL RESPONSES TO SECTIONS 30, 31, 32, 33 and 35

Company / Organisation	ID	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				element. There are already 3 x residential properties on this site and next to it, and supported by a bus stop, additional residential properties would aid the development of a community at this location, rather than a group of isolated houses.
	<a href="#">LPO28</a>	35.2	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building on field adjacent school in Far Forest would spoil the landscape/cause further traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Building houses on Plough Lane behind Tolland Bungalow would increase traffic and impact on wildlife</li> <li>• New estates are not needed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPO365</a>	35.3	Support	Local employment ideas are to be commended. However, WFDC must be careful not to negate agricultural/rural opportunities by removing arable/other agricultural land.